04 Bond Breaking

By Dennis Stephens

March 21, 1993

Edited for Kindle publication

by Pete McLaughlin

Second Edition May 2014

Cover Design by Leona McLaughlin

Cover Credits:

Archie & Betty TM & ©2013 Archie Comic Publications, Inc.Used with permission.

Be sure to visit the Website WWW.TROMhelp.com for more information and resources to study and apply the TROM therapy. Also join fellow TROMers at the email group: http://lists.newciv.org/mailman/listinfo/trom

Table of Contents

Introduction

The original book "The Resolution of Mind, A Games Manual" was written from the research notes of Dennis Stephens by Greg Pickering in 1978 and published in 1979. Dennis Stephens research into the mind and how to resolve it continued after the publication of TROM and by 1992 he felt he had much new material that needed noting down. Dennis dictated to cassette tape his research notes over the two year period from 1992 to 1994. Those research notes remained unpublished until I found them in Australia in 2010. I typed up the transcripts which I found very difficult to read so I edited them to improve their readability and this series of books is the results.

01 Insanity Point
02 The Philosophy of TROM
03 Expanding on Level 5
04 Bond Breaking
05 The Game Strategy

On completing these books I found that Dennis had introduced modifications and improvements to the Practical application of TROM so I took the Practical section from the TROM manual and added in the modifications of Level 5D of TROM and the Differences and Similarities Lecture to create the:

06 TROM Therapy Manual.

After finishing the above books I reread the TROM manual and saw that it was difficult to read because it had long blocks of text that needed paragraph breaks where each new idea was introduced. I put in the paragraph breaks, added a few notes as "editor" and added graphics where it would make things easier to understand.

The result of all this work was the Kindle versions of the TROM manual, Research Notes and the TROM Therapy Manual.

Be sure to visit **www.tromhelp.com** for more information about TROM and the TROM therapy methods. Also join the TROM email group at http://lists.newciv.org/mailman/listinfo/trom.

I hope that you find this study as interesting and useful as I have for understanding and resolving your mind.

Sincerely

Pete McLaughlin

May 2014

01 Bonding - Level 6 of TROM

By Dennis Stephens

[Note. The name for this level changes from "Level 6" to "Level 2 after Level 5" to "Level 5D" as these lectures progress. Each of these articles provides a different process to erase bondings in the mind. Editor]

Hello Greg. 21st of March 1993 and I want to give you a rundown now of my Level 6. And the subject matter of level 6 is a Bonding. Bonding B-o-n-d-i-n-g.

During the last few weeks I have made a number of breakthroughs that have allowed me to complete this level, this material and all of my notes are now finalized. I am now in a position to complete the material and theory and practical.

I've had the theory of it for some time it was the practical that was holding me up. I wouldn't release the theory until I had the practical.

Among the things a person will find as they work through levels 1 to 5 in my text is that the subject of relationships will become more and more prominent in their mind. And as they get toward the end of level 5 they should start becoming intensely curious of relationships, and what is a relationship, and so on.

The reason for this intense curiosity is that as level 5 is completed and the other levels are complete, of course, that none of these levels 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 touch directly on the subject of relationships. They all address it to some degree, and they all de-intensify relationships in the mind to some degree, but there is not one of the levels which addresses directly the subject of relationships and the correct time to do this is at level 6.

Because then the person is curious about them and they're ready for it.

I wouldn't advise a person to attempt levels 6 before they've done levels 1 to 5. First of all it would be very unreal to them and second they could find the practical very heavy going.

Relations

A strange thing in our society is that not much is known about this subject of relations. You ask the average person what is a relationship and they scratch their head and say well it's a relationship.

These days you say a relationship and most people think its vaguely sexual. You know, That he's having a relationship "Oh it's something sexual about it." I suppose it gets that way because they can't figure what else it might be.

So it must be something sexual. So first off we must look at this subject of relationship and see if we can throw some clarity on it. And find out what a relationship is.

Now essentially a relationship is always something between two things. A thing can't have a relationship with itself. **So a relationship is essentially a connection or bond between two things entities or classes**. That's a pretty good definition of a relationship.

It's essentially a connection or bond between two things, entities or classes.

An example of a relationship will be the relationship between a girl, and a person who wears a dress. Now clearly the class of girls and the class of people who wear dresses are related, they are related in our society.

Connectivity

On the other hand the class of Beethoven Symphonies and the class of Eskimo's breakfasts aren't related in our society. These things have no relationship. The determining factor is the subject of connectivity. The subject of connection. The connection exists between girls and people who wear dresses but there is no apparent connection between Beethoven's symphonies and Eskimo's breakfasts.

Class

Now before we go any further it's necessary to give a few definitions. Otherwise we are going to get bogged down. We are going to get mis-interpretations. So I'd better start defining.

I've already used the word class in this lecture so I better define a class. Here is what we mean by a class. Now a class is a group whose members all posses the same quality or qualities. I'll give it again, **A class is a group whose members all posses the same quality or qualities**. Example, Men are a class, you consider men as a class because they all posses the same quality or qualities. Black beings are a class. A class of black beings all possess the quality of blackness and the quality of beings so they are black beings. So that's a class. There's a class of black beings and a class of men, so they are examples of classes, so that's what this mysterious word "class" means.

These definitions I am giving you are pretty well standard definitions in the field of logic, so they are scientific definitions in the science of logic. I am sure if you were to refer to a logical text book you'd find much more hairy definitions than I am giving you but they boil down to what I'm giving you. These are probably much more precise than the textbook definitions would be. And they are good enough for us.

Common Class

Next, we have the definition of a common class.

Now a common class is a class whose members all posses the qualities of two classes. Give it to you again. **A common class is a class whose members all possess the qualities of two classes.**

An example of a common class would be black men. Each of the members of the class of black men would possess the qualities of black beings and of men. So they would be the common class of black beings and of men. So they become the class of black men, you follow. This is quite straight forward.

Now before I proceed any further, and get into this. Your probably thinking I am about to give a talk on the subject of Logic. Well, no I am not, as a matter of fact.

This whole subject of classes and its logical and algebraic aspects and so forth is covered in the subject of Boolean algebra if you really want to dive in the deep end and study up on this subject of classes and algebra and mathematics of how to deal with classes in logic.

The whole area was discovered and worked by the English mathematician George Boole about 1850. And he came up with his algebra which is a very simple algebra. And it's the algebra of classes. And that's the algebra you need to look at if you want to become an expert on the subject of classes and how to manipulate them mathematically. But no one needs for god's sake to study Boolean algebra. It's quite unnecessary.

The material I am giving you here is quite sufficient for our purposes. I'm giving you all the definitions and all the material you need for our purposes. You don't have to go dashing off to the library and digging up books on Boolean algebra unless of course you want to.

Null Class

Ok so much for that. Now I've given you the definition for a common class. Now the next thing the next definition we have is a null class. That's spelled N-U-L-L, null. Null comes from the Latin meaning not any. Null Class.

Now a null class is a class having no members. An empty class. Give it to you again; a null class is a class having no members, an empty class.

E.g. green cats, green cats, that is a null class. There aren't any green cats, as far as I know. I've never come across one. And I've never heard of anyone coming across a green cat. Cats don't come out in that color, so green cats are an empty class. Cats are a class with members in. The class of cats is a well defined class, with the creature cats, and green objects and green entities they're a class in the universe. Both those classes exist.

The class of green objects exists. Green things exist. They are a class and the class of cats exists. But the common class of green cats does not exist. It's an empty class. So that's what we mean when we say a null class.

The null class is a class having no members. It's an empty class. And the moral here is there is no way you can combine these classes together and have common classes. You must always bear in mind some of these permutations and combinations of classes might be null in the real universe. You might be able to use them in a logical system in imaginary universes but in the real universe they're a null class.

Bonding Postulates

So I've defined a class and a null class and a common class. And defined what a relationship is, so we've got enough to work on here.

How do things get bonded or connected to each other in the universe? How do they do it in the mind? Most specifically in the mind, how do things get connected or bonded to each other in the mind?

Well it's done by postulates, of course. They are a particular type of postulate. They are a bonding type of postulate. They're a particular class of postulate called a bonding postulate. Now that is a very important datum.

You'll find that a large part of childhood, when the child learns, and discovers things about the universe around him, he's discovering the relationships that exist between things around him. And he discovers these relationships by making these little postulates, and putting these things together.

He sees this is connected to that, and he makes these postulates. These postulates are made by human beings. They are very real things. They are made by children. They are made by adults too. All through a persons' life they're making these postulates.

We're doing it so unconsciously. We do it automatically. We make these bonding postulates. This is one of the reasons you have to get up to level 6 before this material starts to make much sense to a person. Below level 6 the whole area is so confused a person can't really sort it out easily. It's only when they get up to level 6 and they've taken the charge off of compulsive games play, and their mind is quietened down, that they can really start to look at this material and see just what a relationship is. And analyze it. So never miss it. That's 5 star datum that is. That things are bonded, connected to one another by postulates.

That's absolutely fundamental. If you don't grasp that, you'll never get level 6. You'll never get the flavor of what we're doing at level 6, the subject of the postulates.

These postulates are real. When the person has completed level 5 the bonding postulates start to show up. They start to get real to the person, where before they were unreal. That's why they need address at level 6, this subject of relationships and bonding postulates.

Well now when you look over all these bonding postulates in the mind. There is something happening that is very fortunate in this area. There is a basic bonding postulate and the basic bonding postulate is the same in the human mind as it is in the field of logic.

Now, this is marvelous. There is a basic bonding postulate that the mathematical logicians discovered. They were mainly using George Boole's algebra, and they come across it and they realized that there is a basic bonding postulate. You can actually prove this by Boolean algebra, and it's just fortuitous that in the human mind, in this psyche, this basic bonding postulate is exactly the same in the mind as it is in the algebra.

All this means is that the algebra represents the mind. It's an accurate representation of what is going on in the mind and of what is going on in the universe. There is nothing magical about the algebra, it's simply that the algebra just happens to be an accurate representation of what's going on. That's all.

If A then B

Now what is this basic bonding, this basic connecting postulate between one thing and another thing in the algebra and in the mind? Well the postulate in its most basic form, in its most concise form is **"If A then B".** Give it to you again "If A then B". Now what does that mean, "If a then b".

Well first of all it's a conditional postulate. It's conditional in that it doesn't imply that A exists and it doesn't imply that B exists. It simply says that if A exists then B exists. That's what the postulate means.

If A exists then B exists and the postulate is "if A then B."
Another way to look at the postulate is to say every time we
see A we also see B. That's another meaning of "if A then B"
postulate.

Now the postulate may show up in the form of all "A's are
B's". Now the postulate all A's are B's isn't quite the same as
if A then B. You see. The postulate all A's are B's does imply
that A's exist.

Then because A's exist then B's exist by reason of the
postulate "all A's are B's" You see that? There's an
implication there when you say that all A's are B's you are
implying A's exist. When you say "if A then B" you are
making no such implication you are not saying A exists you
are saying if it exists. If A exists then B exists,

If A then B is the purest expression of the postulate and that
is the basic bonding postulate in the subject of logic and it's
the basic bonding postulate in the human mind.

Now what do I mean by that precisely? I mean that in the
field of logic any relationship no matter how complex can be
broken down into a series of "if A then B" relationships.

And similarly in the human mind, no matter how complex
the relationship is between two things in the human mind it
can be broken down into a series of "if A then B"
relationships, "if A then B" postulates.

So it's very important to understand this basic bonding
postulate because if you know the basic one you can always
take the more complicated one apart. You don't have to know
any others. You only have to know the basic one.

Once you got the basic one "if A then B" you can take all the
relationships in the mind apart, just like you can take any
relationship in logic apart by the use of "if A then B"
postulate.

I better give you a brief example of what I mean here. A person might say, "The situation is such that it's either A applies or B applies, or either A exists or B exists. How on earth can you turn that into an "if A then B" postulate? Well very simply, if the situation is one where either A exists or B exists then the "if A then B" type postulate is "if not A then B", and if you examine that situation, that either A exists or B exists or both exist means exactly the same as saying if A doesn't exist then B exists.

Now if you think about it, work through it you will see that those two propositions do mean exactly the same thing. They certainly mean the same thing in standard logic. And they certainly mean the same thing in the human mind.

Ok, so the "if A then B" type postulate is the basic building block of the subject of relationships from which you can build up any relationship in the mind, any relationship in logic using that basic building block.

What is the Immediate Effect of an " if A then B" Postulate

What is the immediate effect of an "if A then B" postulate? Now we should know this, we should know this very clearly. What is the immediate effect of making an "if A then B" postulate? What effect does it have on the classes?

I mean making this postulate is cause in action, it's your causing something to happen when you make an "if A then B" postulate. But what are you causing to happen?

It has the effect of making the common class of both A and not B into a null class. I'll give you that again. The effect of making an "if A then B" postulate is to make the common class of both A and not B into a null class.

I'll give an example of that. If all crows are birds, then the common class of crows and non birds is empty. You see that. That's a situation where "If crows then birds" maintains, "all crows are birds" maintains, then this common class of crows which are non birds is a null class it's an empty class.

And it's true in this universe that all crows are birds, and it's equally true in this universe that this class of crows which are non birds is a null class. There aren't any. It's an empty class. You can ransack this whole universe and you will never find anything in the class that's both crow and a non bird. There aren't any because all crows are birds you see.

So the effect of the "if A then B" postulate is to make the class of A and not B into a null class. That is its effect. And what's more that is it's only effect.

The making of the if A then B postulate has no other effect than rendering the common class of both A and not B into a null class, that is its only effect. That is its effect and that is its only effect.

As a scientist would say, "Making an "if A then B" postulate is a necessary and sufficient condition for rendering the common class of both A and not B into a null class." That is the way a logician might express it.

Single Bonding Postulate

Now the "if A then B" postulate is called a single bonding postulate or a single bind. B-I-N-D, bind because it bonds A to B. Every time we see A we see B. It's the single bonding. We call that a single bonding or a single bind.

Now let me see if I can give an analogy of the "if A then B" postulate something that will stick in people's minds so they will grasp it.

Tandem Bicycle

Let us imagine that we live in a town and there's a couple of men who ride on a tandem bicycle. That B rides at the front of the bicycle, he always rides at the front. And there's A, he always rides at the back of the tandem bicycle. And we go out and we walk around the town and we see A and B go past on their tandem bicycle.

Whenever we see them go past B's always at the front doing the steering and A's always at the back.

Now sometimes when we go out and walk around the town we see B going around on the tandem bicycle by himself and the back end of the tandem is empty. There is no A there. But we see B going around the town by himself on the tandem bicycle.

Now the one thing we can never see is A driving this tandem bicycle, because to do so he would be driving it from the back seat. And you can't steer a tandem bicycle from the back seat. And as A only occupies the back seat we never see A alone on the tandem.

So the situation is that we either see both A and B with B at the front and A behind him, both upon the tandem going round the town, or we see B going round without A, or we don't see either of them. We never see A going around alone. Now that gives you an analogy of the effect of the "if A then B" postulate.

The "if A then B" postulate simply guarantees that every time we see A we see B, but we might see B by itself without seeing A. See that? Might see B by itself. It tells us nothing about that. The postulate puts no constraints on B at all. All the constraints it puts is on A.

It bonds A to B. it says that if A exists then B exists. If we see A we see B. It doesn't tell us anything about B. We might see B and not see A. We might not see B and not see A. One thing we can't see is A by himself without B. Cause the postulate says so. The postulate says if A then B. see that? So we never see A without B

Does that help? That gives you an analogy of the "if A then B" postulate. Remember it in terms of the men on the tandem bicycle and I think you will get it.

Well there is one other deduction to make on the subject of tandem bicycle and that is if we don't see B we don't see A. That's the final deduction. It is a valid deduction when you say, "If we don't see B on the tandem then we certainly won't see A." B's got to be there, in other words before we see A.

Causation

Next it's necessary for us to nip in the bud any ideas a person may have that the "if A then B" postulate implies any causation between A and B. it does not imply that there is any causation between A and B or between B and A.

It is simply a relationship. It is not, does not imply a causation. The only causation involved in this "if A then B" is when the person makes the postulate. That is a causative action. And that is the only causation involved. There is no other. It doesn't imply that A is causing B or that B is causing A or any other combination of causations in the situation.

It is absolutely vital to understand that. Making the postulate is a causative action, but the postulate itself is simply a relationship postulate. It's a pure relationship postulate. So it's necessary to get that thoroughly that a "if A then B" postulate, does not imply that A is the cause of B or B is the cause of A. It is not a causative postulate. It doesn't imply any causation between A and B.

Sets

Ok we're getting along fine here. And there is one more definition we need at this point. It's a good time to introduce it. And this is the definition of what is called a set, S-E-T, a set.

Now a set is a group of classes whose sum constitutes the universe. Give it to you again. **A set is a group of classes whose sum constitutes a universe.**

Now an example of a set would be the class of men plus the class of non men. Now whichever way you chop up the physical universe in which you live, whichever way you look at it. You're going to be forced to conclude that you can divide this universe up into the class of men and the class of non men. Now in other words everything in the universe is either a man or it's a non man. Similarly you can divide this universe up into women and non women. And you can divide this universe up into coal heavers and non coal heavers. And so on *Ad infinitum* or near infinitum. Do you follow me?

That is a set. The set is a group of classes whose sum constitutes the universe. And the basic set is a class plus its negative. i.e. man and non man, that is the basic set. Ok, So much for sets. It's quite a simple concept to grasp.

Bonding and Freedom

Now we get into this very important subject of bonding and the relationship between bonding and freedom.

We already know from our theory that **all freedom lies within the class of freedom of choice.** But there is a definite relationship, within the universe or within life, in the mind between the subject of bonding and freedom. And what is that relationship?

Well the relationship is that any bonding is a limitation of freedom of choice. Give that again. **Any bonding is a limitation of freedom of choice**.

Now let me give you an example of that. The full freedom of choice in the A B set. That's the set of the class of A and the class of B. Now the full freedom in that set would be:

The common class of both A and B, and plus

The common class of A and not B, plus

The common class of not A and B, plus

The common class of not A and not B

Thus these four classes together constitute the AB set. You see. Everything in the universe would have to be in that set. Now no matter what we specify A and B as, we could specify A as a king and B as a coal heaver, if no other postulates were made then we would have specified every object in the universe would be in one or other of those classes simply because of the definition of the set.

You see, I've defined **the set as a class plus its negative constitute the whole universe.** So, I give it to you again. The full set there. The full freedom in the AB set is the class of both A and B, plus both A and not B, plus not A and B, plus not A and not B. That's the full freedom of choice left.

Now the imposition of the postulate of "if A then B" reduces the class of both A and not B to zero.

In other words it turns the class of both A and not B into a null class and so reduces the AB set down to both A and B, plus both not A and B, plus both not A and not B. There are only three classes.

We've dropped the class A and not B, because that is now a null class, It's an empty class. So the freedom has been reduced. We've lost something. We've lost the class, you see. So the freedom of choice one had as a being occupying classes where one had the full freedom to occupy any one of four classes. One can only occupy three classes because the fourth class has been reduced to a zero class, an empty class. "You can't be in that class, mate. Cause there isn't anything in there." Why isn't anything in there? Because you postulated that it's empty when you postulated if A then B, that reduces the common class of A and not B to a null class. Get it?

So that's the relationship between bonding and freedom. Every time you make an "if A then B" postulate you've reduced your freedom. And every time you get someone else to subscribe to an "If A then B" postulate you've got them to reduce their freedom. Tricky isn't it?

It's a sneaky one, isn't it? No one would suspect this until they examine it, that here is how you can lose your freedom. You know how to lose your freedom without being carted off to the local constabulary and getting locked up in a cell. **You know you can lose all the freedom there is in this universe if you make enough "if A then B" postulates. And you'll make these postulates absolutely injudiciously.** You see that?

You can trap yourself thoroughly, and work yourself into a hole, and be just as trapped as any prisoner in his cell if you make "If A then B" postulates. And you would have done it all yourself. You don't need any help from anyone else. You can do it all yourself.

Injudicious Postulates

That's the message of level 6. That's the message of level 6 and the subject of bonding. On how freedom can be lost by making relationship postulates. Or how to dig yourself into a hole without really trying

Necessity and Sufficiency

Now there is just one little bit more on the subject I'd like to mention of this clinical address on this subject of "if A then B." It's this subject of necessity and sufficiency. It's really a little bit of a side issue. But I really did ought to mention it. The "If A then B postulate" can come about in two ways in games play in the universe. There's two ways it can come about. The first of these is the subject of sufficiency. One can consider that A is a sufficient condition for B. The existence of A is a sufficient condition for B. Now let me give you an example of that.

That a person wears a dress is a sufficient condition for a girl in our society. It might not apply in the whole universe but it certainly applies in our society that a person who wears a dress is a sufficient condition for being a girl.

Now the subject of sufficiency doesn't cover the whole of the "if A then B" postulate. There is another possibility that the "if A then B" postulate maintains, where B is a necessary condition for A.

If the existence of B is a necessary condition for A, then the "if A then B" postulate" is appropriate and will maintain. A great example of that is if rainfall then clouds. It's absolutely necessary to have clouds in order for it to rain. You see?

Now it's not a sufficient condition if you have rainfall to have clouds. Rainfall is not a sufficient condition for clouds. But clouds are a necessary condition for rainfall. See that?

So that's an example of an "if A then B" postulate where B "clouds" is a necessary condition for rainfall A.

Now the example of the girl and the dress, wearing a dress is a sufficient condition for being a girl. But nobody would say that being a girl is a necessary condition for wearing a dress. Follow?

So that is an example. The dress and the girl is an example of a sufficiency. But it's not an example of necessity. See that?

Now these concepts of sufficiency and necessity are very germane to this subject of the "if A then B" postulate.

The "If A then B" postulate only shows itself in those two forms. In point of fact, the subject of sufficiency in science and logic is bound up with the "If A then B" postulate. And the subject of necessity in science and logic is bound up with the "if A then B" postulate. You simply cannot separate those two subjects. You can separate them from each other but you can't separate them from the "if A then B" postulate. They are completely determined by the "if A then B" postulate.

Sufficiency and necessity are mates, so that when you see examples in the universe of an "if A then B" postulate that sometimes it pops up as A being sufficient for B and sometimes it pops up for B being necessary for A.

Well we expect it can be either way around, it can be either way around. Either A is sufficient for B or B is necessary for A. Either is the result of the "if A then B" postulate.

In other words, we made the "if A then B" postulate under both those circumstances.

You either consider A to be a sufficient condition for B. so ok then "if A then B," That's true, A is a sufficient condition for B. That is the "if A then B" postulate.

Or we look at the situation and say well B is absolutely vital to A. Ok, it's "if A then B" postulate. See that?

Now which comes first the sufficiency or the necessity or the postulate? Well the postulate comes first. The "if A then B" postulate creates the sufficiency or creates the necessity But it depends on the circumstances, which way round, applies. You see?

The postulate comes first I can assure you. The postulate is the senior thing. Without the postulate, without the "if A then B" postulate there can be no such thing as the subject of necessity and no such thing as the subject of sufficiency.

Establishment

Before I go I'll press on to slightly more advanced aspects of this I'd like to talk about the subject of establishment. Establishment. It's a very important subject in human relationships particularly in childhood.

Now the datum here is that we establish things in life and games play, we establish the thing by bonding it to something that is already established. It happens all the time in games play.

You know, we see a person acting as an agent for a more established organization. And he finds that he can operate better by becoming an agent for the established business than he can by trying to set up as himself in that line of business. So there he is. He's established himself by bonding himself to this other entity which is established.

So establishment is achieved by bonding yourself to something which already exists with an "if A then B" postulate. In other words, you can establish A by bonding it to B providing they exist.

The subject of establishment is also the subject you find in name dropping. The game of name dropping some people play, you know, you talk to them, and they keep dropping famous names in the conversation.

Your talking to them and they suddenly say, "Oh, yes the other afternoon I was having a cup of tea with Paul Keating so on, so on, so on." So you see it's another famous name. Name dropping. You see.

The idea is that they are trying to establish their own identity by bonding themselves to established identities in the society. You see. It's a game. It's an application of the "If A then B" postulate.

But children are the great ones at this. They're the absolute masters of this one. Children do it you see because it's very difficult for a child to establish any great form of identity with establishment without bonding themselves to something which is already established. They do it all the time.

For example a young boy sees his father wearing a cap and he wants to be like his father. He wants to be a man. You see. Well it's not easy for him to be a man when he is small and so forth. So he thinks, if I wear a cap I'll be a man. You see. So now he establishes himself as an identity, as a male by wearing a cap like his dad does. You see. Little boys do it all the time.

Girl children do it with their mothers and their clothes all the time. You know, Mum buys a certain set of clothes and daughter wants something similar. Cause she wants to use these clothes to establish her femininity. You See. It's establishment.

Goes on all the time in games play, It's an aspect of the "if A then B" postulate. So don't think we are dealing with something wishy-washy here. We're looking at something that is very fundamental

Childhood

You'll find that most of the croppers a person falls into on this subject of "if A then B" postulate of injudicious bonding in their lifetime happens in childhood. They make some absolutely weird bondings, children do, which just never get corrected. They just carry on with this idea.
[Note - Come a Cropper - fall off a horse, fail at anything. - editor]
You see the trouble with the bonding is having made an "if A then B" postulate that one gets trapped within one's own postulate. It's not easy to walk back out of the postulate again. One tends to justify the postulate.
One tends to interpret the universe. The child tends to interpret the universe in terms of his postulates. It's only when his postulate is hopelessly at variance with the universe that he will attempt to change it. Even then sometimes he can't change his postulate.
If he's had a lot of trauma on this postulate he gets stuck with it. If the postulate is very necessary to him or vital to him he can't change the postulate and so the tendency is for all of us to have made some pretty weird wonderful "if A then B" bondings in childhood.

Bonding Breaking

I mean, when you are working with the level 5 materials you will come up with some weird stuff about your own childhood. Some of the postulates you made will make your hair stand on end. And when you examine level 6 you will see that these are relationship postulates.

They're if A then B postulates. Their absolutely weird and wonderful and you've been stuck with them for years and years. And they don't mean a thing.

They were applicable in those times when you were a child. They meant something then, but they don't mean anything today.

They're best broken, which is the practical side of level 6. It's to break these bondings and you'll find the technique to break the bondings is the subject of bond breaking.

But anyway, the subject of establishment is the major route into the "If A then B" postulates made by children. The postulates hang around into adulthood, but most of the damage is done before a person becomes an adult.

The damage is done in childhood. The person does it all by themselves. By their injudicious use of the "if A then B" postulate largely in an endeavor to establish their identity. To establish their masculinity when they're a boy, or to establish their femininity when they're a girl. Establish their gender and so forth, or just to establish their identity. They make these weird and wonderful bondings to establish themselves and they're most peculiar. They are weird. You will laugh at them when you come across them. Or you will cry first then you'll laugh when you've blown them.

Single Bonding Summery

That pretty much wraps up the subject of the single bind and single bonding in the mind.

Now how abberative is single bonding? Well it can be pretty darned abberative. It's rarely fatal. It will rarely lead to psychosis. But it can be very upsetting. It can ruin a person's life, single bonding can.

The thing about the single bonding is that once you spot the single bonding and there are no other postulates involved. Note that rider! You spot the singe bonding and there are no other postulates involved in the area you can usually blow it. You can usually blow the postulate and reevaluate it by inspection. So that's the good thing about the single bonding.

The bad thing about the single bonding is that as you become more and more enmeshed in compulsive games play the whole subject of postulates and particularly the relationship postulates, the bonding postulate, become completely unreal. They go completely on automatic and you just become the complete effect of them.

They don't begin to show up until you've completed the first 5 levels of the tech., then they start to show up, with a vengeance.

So much for the single bonding.

Double Bonding

Now I'll take up the subject of what is called the double bonding or the double bind in the mind.

Now I am grateful to the originators of this subject. The term single binding is my own. I don't know of anyone else who has used that term, but for the term "double bind" I am grateful to the anthropologist Gregory Bateson who first used this term some many years ago now in a work which I've never been able to track down anywhere but he used the term double bind roughly in the same sense that I intend to use it. I can't say any more because I've never read his work. I've only read references to it.

The double bind is also known in common usage as the " Catch 22".

Now the term " Catch 22" comes from the novel of that same name by the American author Joseph Heller who wrote the novel in the mid 1960's. A very good novel, a very amusing novel, one of the best novels that came out of that period, Catch 22 by Jose Heller. That's how we get the word Catch 22 in the language.

So, straight away, what is a double bind? Well simply a double bind is a single bind plus its reverse. In other words, it's not only an "if A then B" postulate. It has the additional postulate of "if B then A." **So we can define a double bind as an "if A then B" postulate plus an "if B then A" postulate.**

Well when we make a double bind we're not only saying that every time we see A we see B but we are also saying that every time we see B we see A.

Logically the effect of the two postulates is to make A equivalent to B in the mind. That is the effect. Now what do I mean by that? Well if the "if A then B" postulate applies and the "if B then A" postulate applies then A has an equal value or an equal weight in the psyche to B. They become virtually identical to each other.(A=B)

The logicians as a rule are very coy about this use of an equal sign in this context. They usually prefer the word equivalent and their no doubt right because obviously the truth of the matter is that no two things in this universe are really identical simply because they occupy different positions in space, so they are not really identical but they can certainly become equivalent in the psyche.

They can become to all intents and purposes identical in the psyche as far as the subject is concerned. The effect of the "if A then B" double bind is to not only reduce the common class of A and not B to zero but it also reduces the class of B and not A to zero.

This now reduces the AB set down to the both A and B class and the both not A and not B class. So there is an enormous reduction of the set.

Now unlike the single bonding the "if A then B" postulate, which can be upsetting, embarrassing, and so on, the double bind can be deadly.

When I first wrote up my notes on the subject of the double bind I called it the double lock on the mind and that is no exaggeration of the power of the double bind. Once a person has postulated a double bind, without therapy, without an understanding of what's going on their chances of ever getting out of that double bind are just about zilch, are just about zilch.

It is truly a double lock on the mind. That is to say if you really want to reduce your opponent to impotency in games play set it up so that he postulates himself into a double bind. If you can achieve this then he is gone. He's finished. He has now dug himself a hole and buried himself in it completely. He's gone.

Ron Hubbard in his early researches of Dianetics and Scientology was always talking about the A=A=A mechanism of reactive mind. Well Ron was no logician, for all his great attributes he knew very little about logic but he did know there was an identification factor here in the reactive bank. Well this identification factor in the reactive mind is the double bind. And the double bind is the A=A mechanism in Dianetics and Scientology.

That is the phenomena Ron was talking about when he talked about A=A in the reactive mind. He was talking about the double bind. But he didn't know sufficient logic and he hadn't analyzed it out completely.

I've now got the data out. This is what we're talking about now. When we're talking about the double bind, is the A=A of the reactive bank itself.

I'll give an example of the double bind and perhaps you'll understand the power to the mechanism.

A young man has just left school so he goes and applies for a job. And he's told he can't be given a job because he is inexperienced. So he then asks the interviewer, "Well, how can I get any experience?" and the interviewer says "Well, the only way to get experience, of course, is to get a job, which we can't give you because your inexperienced."

Now unless the young man happens to be rather skilled in logic and mathematics, and so forth, and is particularly clear thinking. All that is likely to happen is he's going to feel a little bit flattened. And he'll walk away and think that there is something odd about what he's been told. But he probably won't spot it as a double bind. He will just feel absolutely flattened, and rejected and so forth, but he won't know what is going on. But let's examine the postulate structure here.

The interviewer has told him that in order to be employable he has to be experienced. And he's also told him in order to be experienced he has to be

employable. The postulates in the set are: if employable then experienced and if experienced then employable.

Now this reduces the AB set where A is employable and B is experienced. Reduces the set down to both employable and experienced or neither employable nor experienced.

The other two classes employable and not experienced and the other class of experienced and not employable are empty classes, are null classes. They are made empty by the postulates. So the set is reduced down to just the two classes which I named.

Now the unfortunate applicant is stuck in the class of being neither employable nor experienced. And he wants to get over to the class of being both employable and experienced. And there is no way he can do it. There's simply no way he can get across from the class he's in to the class he wants to get into.

You think about it for a while and you will see that is the case. He can't go from inexperienced to experienced because he is also unemployable and he can't go non-employable to employable because he is inexperienced (chuckle) the past has trapped him with a double lock. He's locked out there by a double locking device.

The only way he can get out of the class he's in, being both inexperienced and non-employable and get into the class of being both experienced and employable is to leap out from one class into the other class which he can't do. He simply can't do it. There is no way. So he is trapped.

You've trapped him. He is trapped in the double bind. He is in a double bind or a Catch 22. It's a Catch 22 situation. He just goes round and round it like a rat in a maze. How do I get employed? How do I get a job when I need experience? That's right, how do I get experience, well I have to get a job. Well, how do I get a job? Well the only way to get a job is to get some experience. But I can't get experience because I haven't got a job.

Well, I can't get a job till I get some experience. He just goes round and round like a rat in a maze. There is no way he can get across from one postulate to the other. You see, it's a deadly devise, the double bind. It's a deadly device. The catch 22.

How could this young man resolve this enigma? Well the easiest way would be to do the practical of level 6. When he had backed up the practical of level 6 to this situation he would realize that there is something odd about these postulates "if employable then experienced" and "if experienced then employable".

And particularly there is something odd about this postulate of "if employable then experienced." And that postulate happens to be false in our society. If you think about it for a moment, the postulate "if employable then experienced" if that postulate is true then no one would have a job. You see that?

If everyone has to be experienced before they can become employable. Then on one would have a job, because by necessity everyone is inexperienced when they start their first job. You see?

The postulate is a lie. It's false. So once you realize that that postulate is false the double bind collapses. You see that the young man would realize their just having him on. The whole thing is just a Catch 22. He's just been told a lie and he'd be out the trap. You see that?

But he would have to do level 6 to do it, to get out of the double bind. You have to break those postulates. One way or the other he would have to break those two postulates. Or at least one of them would have to be broken.

If he breaks one of them and he is just left with a single bonding. If he is left with a single bonding, he's broken the double bond. And when he breaks both of them he's regained full freedom of choice in the situation.

The double bind, the Catch 22 can show up in a number of guises. A person can come up to you and say "in this matter you're either with us or you're against us" now that sounds innocuous enough but as a matter of fact it's a double bind. He is handing you a double bind on a plate.

If you agree with this situation that you're either with him or against him then you are in the double bind. And you've trapped yourself because when he says you're either with us or against us he is denying you the freedom to be both with him and against him, and he is denying you the freedom to be neither with him nor against him.

He is insisting that you be either with him and not against him or against him and not with him. Follow? That's the double bind, the double bind situation, and one to be wary of.

So the double bind can show up in many guises, many areas of life. And I can tell you this for absolutely sure the toughest incidents you ever have to erase in therapy will be double binds. These are the ones that hang on by grim death and stay on and hang around the longest and just never seem to erase, and you grind away forever and ever and ever. Sure thing.

The double bind is that incident and there are probably more than one that are there hanging fire. And that's why you can't free the incident because of the double bind. That is why you can save a lot of time by applying level 6 to a situation like this.

Oh, you'll reduce the thing by level 5. You'll reduce the thing. You'll knock it into a cocked hat by level 5 but you'll never have understood what went on in that incident. You will need level 6 to take the double bind apart, to see just why the thing was so upsetting to you.

Even though level 5 will take all of the charge out of it, you'll need level 6 to understand the incident, to fully understand the incident.

So it's a great rule of thumb. The old hand in this area of research that I am doing and these levels knows. He knows that if an incident is hanging fire look for the double bind. "Show me the double bind" is the message.

Incidents where it's just a single bind, they can hang fire for a little while but they do come apart when you spot the bonding and the thing blows by inspection.

And if there is no bonding at all in the incident well it will just resolve by inspection any old time. It probably won't be abberative at all. It never would have affected you; it would have been a null incident right from the word go.

Just finally I will give you the definition of a double bind again. It's a bonding postulate plus its reverse. A double bind is a bonding postulate plus its reverse. If the bonding postulate is "if A then B" then a double bind is "if A then B" plus "if B then A."

If the bonding postulate is "if not A then B" then the double bind is "if not A then B" and "if B then not A," and so on. It's simply the double bind is the bonding postulate plus its exact reverse. There is no difficulty there. There is no complexity. It's just a simple postulate plus its reverse.

Double Binds and Sexuality

Finally there is one particular area of human livingness that is absolutely festooned with double binds. And that is the subject of sexuality in human beings. The reason for this is the human body has adopted gender specialization.

That means that a human being can only be either a male or a female. He cannot be both and he cannot be neither. **He is either a male and not a female or she is a female and not a male, and that I can assure you is a double bind.** So from that start point you have a double bind, which you collect at birth.

You collect that when you come into the game. You can see how you could collect a whole number of double binds on the subject of sexuality. And that is why sexuality is a very difficult thing to get apart in therapy. And that's why Sigmund Freud would come forward and say the whole of resolving the human mind is entirely a matter of taking the sexuality apart.

Well he is not quite right but he was on the right track. He knew it was a damned difficult subject to get apart, a damned difficult subject to get apart because it's

festooned with double binds. Now that we know this we can get it apart rather easily.

Right, well that, wraps up the theory of the subject of double bonding that's the end of the theory and we'll now take up the practical.

Practical

The rest of this tape will be devoted to the practical of level 6.

The tech here is very simple to explain, but very difficult to do unless you're ready to do it. So I'll tell you that at the outset. This is not something for the kiddies. You see. It's not something for a person early on to play with. It's very difficult to do it and you need a clear mind to be able to do it. But it's easy to explain. The processes themselves are ridiculously simple to offer to a person but their very difficult for him to do.

Now the stable datum of level 6 practical runs as follows, and this should be written up on the wall.

Here it goes. **"A bonding is broken and its bonding postulate erased by putting members into the common class that the bonding postulate renders null."** I'll give it to you again, a bonding is broken and its bonding postulate erased by putting members into the common class that the bonding postulate renders null.

Now that was the breakthrough I made. Until I had that postulate, that understanding I just spoke of, I couldn't round out level 6.

I've tried for a number of years now to wrap up this subject of bonding I had many techniques from the practical side. None of them have been completely successful. I needed that datum to come up with the very simple technology that does the trick. I've now got that technology from that datum.

You see, we know that every bonding postulate manufactures a null class. We know that.

We can represent the bonding postulate as "if A then B" that's the class of bonding postulates. We represent them as "if A then B" and when that postulate is made it renders the class of both A and not B an empty class. And all we have to do in practical is to get the subject to look at this class of both A and not B, it's empty in his mind. His postulate makes it empty.

And all we have got to do is we've got to get him to put things into this class and see that this class can have things in it. Once he sees that this class can have members in it he will stop creating the "if A then B" postulate. You see that?

While he creates the "if A then B" postulate the class is empty. But once he sees the class can have members in it, he sees there is something wrong with his postulate. He sees his postulate is false.

He'll say, "Good God, this postulate is crazy… this class can have members in it: therefore, my postulate must be false."

He'll stop making the postulate. Once he stops making the postulate the bond postulate is broken. We've done the trick. You see that?

Now there is one other thing we do while we're working here. We not only get him to be able to put members into that null class to fill it up again, to fill up the null class. But we also provide him with a technique to take the members back out again. This gives him his full freedom of choice now on this particular class that he made null with his postulate.

We let him put members into the class. He sees that members can go in and he learns how to put them in and how to take them out. And we have given him now his full freedom of choice as far as that class is concerned.

In his own mind he can have it empty or he can have it full. He can fill it up to his heart's content and he can now empty it to his heart's content. His full freedom of choice is restored and all the charge has gone off that class. And more importantly the bonding postulate is broken.

That's the essence of our approach in the practical of level 6. It's a very simple approach.

Alright now what is the auditing command that will do this magical thing?

Here we go:

Let's assume that the null class is the AB class. It could be A and not B, it could be not A and B, it could be any class. We'll call it an AB class. The common class of A and B. Got that? We'll call it that as a symbol to recognize it while we're talking about it.

Right. Here are the auditing commands.

What could A and B have in common?

That is the first command. Now we run that command until there is no more change. We simply flatten that command off as far as we can. There may be long comm. lags on it. You may have to think about it for hours, days or weeks but that's the one that puts members back into the AB class. You see?

The AB is the null class and we want to put some things back in it. And we say, "What could A and B have in common?"

It's a creative process. It's not a recall process. It's a pure creative process. So it's quite unlimited in application. It's creative. A person has to imagine things. It's an imagine type of process. What could A and B have in common?

So we run that as far as we can until there is no more change. And all the somatics if any have gone. And the person is feeling fine about it.

Then we run "**What could A and B not have in common?**"

What could A and B not have in common? Now that command "What could A and B not have in common? We run that again until there is no more change.

Now that command takes things out of the AB set and starts to empty it again. You see that? We're doing the reverse taking things out of the AB set. That empties the set. So that's the second command. We run that until there is no more change.

Then we go back and run "**What could A and B have in common?**"we run that some more and see if that is charged up again.

When that's gone null we go back and run "**What could A and B not have in common?**"

And we null those until there is no more charge on either of them.

We run plenty of RI. Liberally, because it can be quite tough on RI, this one can particularly in the early stages. Until you get used to the process.

So run plenty of RI, liberally. And that is the way it's done. At level 6. There isn't any more to level 6 than that.

Those two commands are sufficient to do the trick.

Level 6 Therapy Example

Now to finish off this tape I will give you an example of how you would run this in therapy on a person.

We've got a person who has run through the therapy. They have completed all their levels and they've arrived at level 6. They are feeling very good about things. They are running showing clear on the meter and have been for some while.

They went clear at level 3 probably. And they have run out their goals packages. The "to know" package has gone very quiet. They can't find anything on any of the junior packages. Everything has gone very quiet and their feeling pretty darn good.

And while they were running level 5 these bonding postulates showed up. One that keeps sticking in their craw, that is in their mind still.

It's not bothering them. They remember it as a child. They had this postulate show up about girls and wearing dresses. All those who wear dresses are girls. And the other side of it "all girls wear dresses".

And the person is sort of stuck with this. And it's still sticking in their craw up at level 6. Well here we are ready now to handle it, and this is the way they'd do it.

Now before we go into it you might say, "Now how can a person in our society possibly hold a postulate that all girls wear dresses?" "If girl then wearing a dress." When so many girls don't wear dresses, they wear jeans, and so forth.

A Person Can Always Justify Their Postulates

And that's no difficulty. **A person can always justify their postulates**. Such a person can easily say, "Well, girls that don't wear dresses aren't really girls." You know a person can simply justify their postulates. There's a thousand ways they can simply justify it. It's quite possible for a person to hold that double bind.

We'll assume the person is holding that double bind. How would they go about resolving it at level 6?

Well we take each postulate in turn and we erase each one in turn. That's the general rule. We take each side of the double bind and erase each one in turn. We don't attempt anything like trying to erase both sides of the double bind at the same time. We take them in order, in turn.

Now what is A and B here? Well the postulate here is, "If a person wearing a dress then a girl."

So that's the A postulate and the null class is a person wearing a dress and a non girl. See that, that's the null class. That's what the postulate brings about.

So the null class the person is stuck with is the class "a person wearing a dress" and the class of "a non girl". That is the common class that is null, and we've got to populate that null class.

So we ask him, **"What could a person wearing a dress and a non girl have in common?"**

That would be the first auditing command. What could a person wearing a dress and a non girl have in common? And we just wait out the comm. lag, and as the person struggles with this, with their postulate. And eventually they start to fill it up. And we run it and run it and run it.

When that's gone null we then say, **"What could a person wearing a dress and a non girl not have in common?"**

And with this question we start emptying out this class again.

We run those backwards and forwards until we've nulled both of them. We've now erased one side of the double bind. It's no longer a double bind now. We've erased one side.

Double Bond Side 2

We now home in on the other postulate. The other "if A then B" postulate in this situation, "If Girl then person who wears a dress."

Well, we could now go to work with the reverse. Our first auditing command now becomes:"**What could a girl and a non wearer of a dress have in common?**" And we run that until it is null.

And then we would run the other side of it. "**What could a girl and a non wearer of a dress not have in common?**" And we would run that until it was null.

Then we would go back to the first command and the second command and then alternate until till both were completely null. We've broken the other side of the double bind.

At that point we've now broken the double bind completely. So each single bonding is broken in turn by the use of those two postulates.

It might sound a little complex when you first play this tape. Really it's childishly simple. It's much simpler to explain than it is for the unfortunate person, for the subject to actually answer the questions.

It's a very difficult question to answer. It's that sort of tough and highly charged double bind. A person will find it just about impossible to answer. He may comm. lag it for days, or a WEEK before he gets some answers up.

But you can take it from me this is the best process, the most precise process, the most accurate process and it's the most elegant process to do the job. There are other processes that do it partially and do a much more sloppy job. In other words, there's other ways to skin the cat. But this skins it precisely, does the job in the most optimum fashion.

So there's the example there. Of how you would apply this to a double bind situation, in terms of difficulty of doing the level.

Level 6 is comparable in difficulty to level 2. It's a much more difficult step to achieve than levels 1, 3, 4 and 5. Level 2 is difficult, is a tough one too, 2 is and 6 is comparable to 2. It's a toughie.

This is one for the high school. This is one for the university graduates in the terms of therapy. It's not a technique for the beginners. It really isn't. You really need your wits about you to tackle this stuff at level 6. That's why it's at level 6 and not down at level 2.

At the time of cutting this tape I haven't completely erased all the double bondings, double binds or single bondings. I have extant in my own mind. There are quite a number of them that cropped up. During my own running of level 5 which I've got notes of, strewn around the place. I'm in the process of collecting them up.

They'll all get dealt with eventually because I always keep a note of everything I've done. So it's very important that when you're working with level 5 in the earlier steps keep a note of any bondings that show up. Keep a written note, not just a mental note. Write them down for god's sake. Keep the paper because you're going to need them on level 6. You don't want them to get lost.

Write them all down on a bit of paper then when you get to level 6 you collect up all your bits of paper and you've got something to work with. So until you've got those bits of paper. Until you've got the actual bondings, the actual postulates there, unless some crop up you've nothing to work with at level 6.

You see a beginner can't even start at level 6. He's got nothing to work with. He scratches his head and says "if A then B" if this then that, I mean it just doesn't mean a thing. It will during therapy. It simply doesn't mean a thing to the subject. You know, the whole thing is just a great big mystery.

He couldn't answer the question because he can't start. When he works on level 5 bondings show up, he writes them down. Then he's got something to work with at level 6, so that the procedure is quite self checking.

You won't have people mucking around with level 6 before they ought to muck around with it for the simple reason they won't have anything to muck around with. They might manufacture a few but they won't get any hot ones.

They might manufacture a few, pick them out of thin air and play with those at level 6 when they didn't ought to be. But they won't get any tough ones, meaningful in their own bank. They are too deeply buried. They'd need level 5 to dig those out. So there is some degree of self checking at level 6.

Test for " if A then B" Postulate

Now, re-listening to this tape I recall, there is another bit of information about bonding that is of interest to you which I haven't mentioned. And I will mention it because it's of interest. It's not a vital importance but it is of interest.

That when A is bonded to B in the mind, if you have an "if A then B" bonding in the mind. If you mock up A and mock up B then B will tend to move towards A.

Now this won't happen for everyone. It only happens if your mock ups are quite real to you. And you've got a pretty good perception of them. And you'll see this phenomena there that if you've got an "if A then B" postulate and you mock up A then B will tend to move towards A.

I won't explain why this is. I know why it is but it's a little complex. It's a little bit of unnecessary logical theory to explain the phenomena. But I can assure you that that's what happens.

Now this mechanism, if it does work for a person, can be used as an indicator of an "if A then B" postulate.

In other words, **if you mock up two things and one tends to move towards the other then the thing that does the moving is the B. The B end of an "if A then B" postulate, and the thing it's moving towards is the A.** It's always that way round. It's never the other way round. It can't be the other way round. It's always that the B moves toward the A.

You mock up A then mock up B and if an "if A then B" postulate is extant then the mock up of B will tend to move toward the mock up of A.

It can be used as an indicator for the presence of an "if A then B" postulate, for those who are sensitive enough to their mock up to perceive them. As I say it's not one everyone can use because particularly early on in therapy their contact with their own creations is not sufficiently good for them to spot what's going on.

But strangely enough even though this phenomenon occurs you can't break the bonding by the use of the mockups. I've tried all conceivable variations and permutations of the mockups, mocking up A and mocking up B. moving them toward each other and moving them apart and so forth. It won't break the

bonding. It won't break the postulate. The only way to break the postulate is to use the level 6 process I've given you. It's the only one I know that will do it efficiently.

There's others that will do it less efficiently but the ones I've given you will do it spot on. Bang. They are absolutely precise; they are precise for the job in hand.

So I thought I'd mention that phenomena of the B moving towards A on the mock up level in the presence of an "If A then B" postulate. Just for a reference, if you see it happening in therapy you will know what's going on.

Well that's about level 6 Practical.

I can't tell you what it looks like when you've completed level 6 practical because I haven't got there yet. But I can tell you that it will produce case gains. And there is no harm in the process.

I've tested the process long enough now on myself. There is no harm in it. There is no way it's going to drive anyone mad. If they run it properly and run it at the time it's supposed to be run. No one's going to be harmed by the process.

So I'm looking forward to what it's going to be like without all these bondings.

It must be clearly understood that level 6 is not a requisite process of the set. The set process does end at level 5. You don't really need to go past level 5.

Level 5 will erase the bank for all intents and purposes. It will take it off the meter and it will be gone. It will leave a blank in your understanding of various aspects in life and one of the aspects it leaves a blank on is the material of level 6.

Level 6 will fill this in for you and round out your understanding of life and postulates and games play and so forth. And also give you a few extra case gains that you couldn't have gotten on level 5.

Okay, well that's about it Greg. That's level 6 theory and practical. And I wish everyone luck with the procedure and I hope you'll never be the same again.

End of tape.

Level 2 after Level 5 Part A

03 Relationships - Bonding

By Dennis Stephens

February 21, 1994

[Note. The name for this level changes from "Level 6" to "Level 2 after Level 5 " to "Level 5D" as these lectures progress. In this lecture Dennis does the name change to Level 2 after Level 5. Each of these articles provides a different process to erase bondings in the mind.-Editor]

Today is the 21st 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.

Relationships

First off we need to discover what a relationship is. Well, fundamentally, **a relationship is a connection.** It's a connection. When we say two things are related 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.

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.

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 are always two or more things involved.

I mean three things could all be related to each other. But when you examine these complex relationships any complex relationship of more than two things you can always break this connectivity down into a series of pairs.

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.

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.

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**.

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.

Well, as we already know this universe only consists of life and postulates. So 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.

Now, in life and livingness there are a vast number of ways in which a relationship can be postulated.

In other words a relationship postulate can occur in 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.

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 as 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.

That's really what he was saying. That if the universe exists then light exists.

He may have 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 is "If universe then light," that's what he was saying.

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

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" 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.

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 we could express that in another

way by saying that his postulate is that "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 you'll find they come up in therapy.

And they will come up in therapy. Don't kid yourself on this subject; they are 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."

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.

Logic

In the field of logic, this subject of how to express relationships between things was a great problem for many years. They too were struck by the diversity of relationships. The logicians were struck by the diversity in the way that relationships could exist between things. And they too looked for a 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.

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.

Now when we searched for a standardization of the relationship postulates there was 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.

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 classifying them and standardizing 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, one fundamental relationship postulate. And that's the one the logicians use.

Life doesn't use it very much. It can use something very similar to it. 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 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.

Once you take this relationship and reduce it to the standard form you are then in a position to learn much more about that relationship than you could ever learn while it was in the non-standardized form.

In other words, there is a tremendous advantage to be gained by taking the relationships as they appear in the mind and reducing them to the standard form.

[note what Dennis is saying. In your mind you don't use this standardized relationship "If A then B" but it helps to reduce what you have in your mind to this form for understanding and therapy. Editor]

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 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 a little bit about the logical classes. And then you'll see the enormous advantages that accrue by using the logical form of relationships.

Class

Well first of all we better briefly say 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. 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 class is a group whose members have one or more things in common.**

Now for example, men are a class. They are a class of beings. They all have in common 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.

Alright, so much for a class, it's 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 beings. That would be a distinct class in the universe, black beings. And "men" is a class in the universe. The class of men, but the common class of black men, they have in common that they are men and they also have in common that they are black. They're black beings. So they are 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.

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

Null Class

Now the next definition I want to give you. And this is a very important one, is the concept of the null class, Null class. N-U-double L.

The word null comes from the Latin *null* 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 are no members in it.

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 are 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, although you find plenty of cats about and plenty of green things about, you won't find any green cats. Green cat, this is a null class.

So, another example of a null class would be crows, the common class of crows that are non birds. That too is a null class. It's an empty class, crows that are non birds. There are plenty of crows about, and there are plenty of things in the universe that aren't birds. 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 cows are birds, then the common class of crows that are non birds does not exist.

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

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 won't be null. While 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 be postulates in the universe which make the postulate that you arrived at into a null class. You see that? So you mustn't always assume that all classes have got members in them. There are quite a lot of null classes in this universe, quite a lot of them.

Bonding Relationship Postulate

Right, well, so far so good. We're getting on 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 well.

We're now in a position to specify the basic bonding relationship postulate in the field of logic. Now this postulate is in simplest form "**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 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.

The postulate doesn't say that A exists. It says that if A exists. That if A exists then B exists. Follow?

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.

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. It implies that crows exist. When you say "all crows are birds", the implication is 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.

"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.

Conditional Postulate

But "if crow then bird" is a conditional postulate. We aren't saying that crows exist. But if the crows do exist, and we don't know whether they exist or not, but if a crow does exists then it's a bird. But, of course, there may not be any crows at all.

So our postulate, "if crows then birds" or "if crow then bird" could exist in a universe where there are 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 are 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 A and B happen to be in this situation we are considering. You see that's the most fundamental it can get, "if A then B".

Now, in the field of logic, **you might be interested to know this, any logical proposition, no matter how complex the logical propositions are, 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 this whole mishmash of relationships could, if you wanted to and 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?

Or to put it another way, 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?

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? It goes either way.

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

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

You 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.

And it's no different in 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 then down into "if A then B" relationships they can be utilized and can be manipulated in the logical system, if you wish. 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.

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 that's the basis of all relationships. You see?

So then any logical system can handle an "if A then B" postulate. So you get your life and livingness postulates and you reduce them down to "if A then B" so 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.

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

Now we're beginning to get into an area where you'll really begin to see the advantages of going into the simplicity of the "if A then B", rather than with dealing with the complexity of dealing with the relationship postulates of the human mind.

The Effect of " If A then B"

What is the effect of an "if A then B" postulate? Well, we know that the effect of all postulates is to limit freedom.

Every postulate limits freedom. You'll find this in one of the earlier supplementary lectures. It's in one of the very early definitions, which apply in the universe, 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.

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 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 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.

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 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.

A Postulate Set

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 there are 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 are both crows and not birds.

There is a class of things that are non crows and birds.

and a class of things that are neither crows or birds.

And the sum of those four classes constitutes the whole universe and we call this a set. A postulate set.

It's a set of the postulates. Remember I've used the words postulate set when dealing the postulates of the goals packages. It's still a postulate set. But we're

using the relationship postulate so you still call it a postulate set or loosely we simply call it a set.

So there are 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 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 non crow and a bird and the class that is neither a crow nor a bird. And 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 are only those three classes extant. The fourth class, the class of creatures that are both crows and non birds doesn't exist.

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

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 you've lost some freedom.

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

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 important datum, a vitally important datum on the subject of relationships.

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 it's not obvious is it, not obvious.

A young man or child may postulate "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 can exist in this universe, and I won't specify, I'll leave this as an exercise for you. There are three other classes in this set that can exist in this universe. But that fourth class, 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."

The class of people who wear dresses who are non girls don't exist in his world. 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. You see that?

So bear in mind, you can lose all the freedom there is in this universe by injudiciously making relationship postulates, by the injudicious making of relationship postulates. You can lose all the freedom there is in this universe.

You can dig yourself into a hole and jump into it. And you should understand that about relationships, and relationship postulates.

This is an important subject, very important subject, relationships.

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 graphic. Or make it stick it in your mind, so that you understand what we mean when we say "if A then B".

Tandem Bicycle

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?

Now, sometimes 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.

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 isn't there, if you don't see B on the tandem bicycle then you sure as hell ain't gonna see A.

So does that little example help you? There are 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.

The Reverse Interpretation

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

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 shall call it the reverse interpretation. We've got an "if A then B" postulate. 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 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 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.

So bear that in mind. Every "if A then B" postulate has it's reverse interpretation, which is not a deduction. It's just simply another way of saying it. In other words,

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?

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

All right, so much for the example of the two men on the tandem bicycle. I hope that helps you to 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."

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 get this basic relationship you see 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. 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 "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.

In other words, 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. It brings to light 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 from A to B. there is no bonding from 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.

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 can't use this rough look at it, we have to get down to more precision. And once we get down to the "if A then B" postulate, we're getting very precise. We see that 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.

To give you another example of the bonding effect, you'll see it with the man who postulates "if person wearing dress then girl." Now such a man can't 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.

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.

The general rule of thumb to help you to remember the "if A then B" relationship 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.

When you thoroughly grasp this you'll see why we say that the technical 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.

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, then start seeing relationships in terms of bondings. Then you'll start to really understand them.

Then is a Conjunction

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 word "then" is we're not using it 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 exits. 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. 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.

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, the 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 relationship, it's not a causative relationship. Get that in mind. Get that very clear. No causation here.

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

So get it quite clear. The postulate itself is like any postulate. It is a causative consideration, but 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.

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

Sufficiency Bonding Example

First of all the sufficiency bonding.

A man says to his son, "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 the picnic is not a necessary condition for the fine weather.

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.

Necessity Bonding Example

Now let's give an example of the necessity bonding.

A young boy 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 all the males and all the boys are wearing trousers so 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. Because the trousers are a recognized and accepted male gender symbol in the society in which he lives. So he's bonding his masculinity to the existing gender symbol, the trousers. Get it?

Now let's examine this in terms of sufficiency and necessity. 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 is it's a necessity bonding. That the wearing of the trousers is a necessary condition for being a boy in his mind. The relationship is "if boy then wearing trousers," with a necessity relationship between the wearing of the trousers and being a boy.

Now there is an example of the necessity relationship.

Now when you examine "if A then B" postulates you'll find that their 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. And sometimes, very rarely it means both.

Both Necessity and Sufficiency Example

I'll give you an example here that will be 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, certainly 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.

Both of them apply. The 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. We've made the "if A then B" postulate in our definition.

And this shows up when we examine the postulate. That we find the "if A then B" is a sufficiency relationship and a necessity relationship. They're both present. And it's known in logic as a logical tautology. It's a tautology. "If crow then bird" is a logical tautology.

Logical Tautology

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.

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.

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 why the phenomenon occurs when it does occur.

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 there were 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.

Now what is a double bind? Well a double bind is a single binding plus its reverse.

When the single binding is "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. We now have A bonded to B, and B bonded to A.

Now 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 then 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 take the relationship, reduce it to its "if A then B" and you suddenly realize "My God the reverse is true too." And then you realize the horror of what you're up against. The double bind, the double bonding.

Now we've met the double bind in the postulate set. **There is a double bind 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 hidden.

The double bind is just as hidden in relationships as in the goals packages. Just as hidden and just as deadly.

When I first came across the subject of the double bind in my research I called it 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.

Well what do I mean by a double lock? **Well I mean that 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.

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, they're very common in life relationship double binds are. 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.

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 he can't be given a job because he's inexperienced. So the young man says "Well now 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 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. He's going to 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 its reverse "if experienced then employable."

The effect 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 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?

And 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 employed, while those postulates are extant, while he is agreeing to those postulates.

There is no way in the world that he can 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 much stronger than he would be locked out by bands of steel. You know? I mean, iron bars have got 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.

Well let's finish the example off, how could the young man break the double bind?

Well he could treat it as an incident in therapy in TROM. And he could take it apart at level 4, and if he knew about Bondings and so forth, he could get it apart. Or at level 5 eventually 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.

Now most people have at some time in their life been caught up with a double bind situation.

Well the young man only has to examine the interview and write down the postulates that occur during the interview and he would quickly say, "Well it's these two postulates "if employable then experienced" and "if experienced then employable. Bang. This is it."

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 no, 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 postulate is false. So that is a false postulate.

Now how about the other postulate, "If experienced then employable"? Well this postulate is probably closer to being true, but 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.

Once the young man could spot it, He'd say, "Well that's 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 have hung a lie on him, he breaks out of the lie. Now the double bind becomes 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 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.

Now it's a strange thing about the entrapping effect of the 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 reverse are both true. Both of them could be false. But at least one of them is false. 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.

Signs of a Double Bind

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. Your mind feels like a rat in a maze. **You're in a double bind mate. Find it!**

And the fact is 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 is false.

In other words there's always a lie present in a double bind, and that is a 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 like the double bind in the postulates in the goals packages, there is always a lie in the double bind.

It's similar 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.

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 than one. So they stick out like beacons on your time track.

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're understanding what I'm talking about, you've got incidents that are unresolved from the subject of double binds. These incidents will be wrapped around your neck right now while you're listening to this tape.

Incidents will come searching you out, they will. Once you understand the mechanism the incident will come and search you out and plead with you to resolve it, take the lie out, to get rid of the double bind.

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

Test

Alright, well now, let's look at a few practical aspects of this. How would you find if you had a bonding in your mind? There is a 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 you are subscribing to the bonding "if person wearing dress then girl". 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.

Now what do you have to do about it in therapy? Nothing, unless it hangs fire. 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 1, do level 2, do level 3, and you do level 4, and you do level 5. **And you don't concern yourself with the relationship postulates unless they hang fire.**

Now the only place they're going to hang fire eventually, and they might show up at level 2, level 3 and you note them and you do take a bit of charge off them. Take a bit of charge off them at level 2, a bit more charge at level 3, and level 4 you get a bit of charge, and at level 5 more charge comes off then But the things still hanging fire.

Ok. You've got right at the top of level 5. 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.

Make Double Bind the subject of the Goals Package at 5C

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 5C.

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 5C.**

But don't make a big 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 5C.

Now why does that erase them? It erases then because any postulate can be made the subject matter of the "to know" goals package at level 5C.

It's an existence isn't it? Any existence can be made the subject matter of that goals package, and is erasable at level 5C. So that's the way you will take them apart at level 5C.

In other words, the technology, the final technology of erasure of the relationship of "if A then B" postulates from the mind is level 5C.

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 5C.

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

Then you just knuckle down. One of the last things you do before the whole lot at level 5 blows will be to get rid of these sticky, hanging fire relationships in your psyche.

Exceptions to the Rule

One exception to this general rule that I've given you, they can all be erased at level 5C 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 double bind between the junior universe of femininity and the postulate "mustn't sex".

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. They are 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.

Eating Double Bind

Now they are the only exceptions that I know of. 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. So look out for those as well. You could hold some relationships in common with your body on the subject of eating.

OK, well 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.

02 Level 2 After Level 5 Part B

By Dennis Stephens

January 3rd 1994

Transcribed by Leona McLaughlin

April 14, 2012

[Note. The name for this level changes from "Level 6" to "Level 2 after Level 5" to "Level 5D" as these lectures progress. In this lecture Dennis does the name change to Level 2 after Level 5. Each of these articles provides a different process to erase bondings in the mind.-Editor]

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

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

And since recording the last tape on subject the of Level 2 after Level 5, I realized so much more new material had come to light that I really better call the last tape 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

I'll give you the best way to run this procedure that I know of to date.

First of all running the process itself, after you've done everything, you see, you've done your test, you found your bonding you got your classes here, you got you're A and you got your B and you're already to break the bonding. Right, well this is the best way to run the process.

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 until 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.

There is absolutely no point in sitting there comm-lagging the answers out. The reason being that when you run differences you start as-ising the differences and then the similarities start to show up.

So you run the differences 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 running one against the other; you get the optimum gain from the process.

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.

Flip/Flop Processes are Safe

By the way that's a general principle of auditing. It's not a 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 running one side stimulates answers on the other side and running the other side stimulates answers on the first side, you could 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 flip-flop type of process.

For example you could run ARC Straightwire process, general ARC Straightwire on a person if you wanted to, in ordinary Scientology auditing. You could run it to no more answers. You would be quite safe because of the flip-flop of process running.

ARC Straightwire Commands

"Recall something that was really real to you."

"Recall a time when you were in good communication with someone."

"Recall a time when you really liked someone."

"Recall a time you knew you understood someone."

Running moments of high affinity, moments of good communication in the mind and moments of reality or agreement till no more answers.

So 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 good communication or back to high affinity to no more answers. You see that? You could run an ARC Straightwire like that, to no more answers, quite safe to do so, when you use a flip-flop type process like this.

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

But bear in mind that 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 all processes to no more answers but I think any therapist worth his salt would know this.

The Best Way to Run the Process (cont.)

OK, that's the way you would run the process, you just flip-flop between differences and similarities. Now as you run the process you will find that terminal A and terminal B will start to merge.

You will get these merging phenomena of the two and as you start to complete the process the process begins to run flat 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 class now is no longer a null class and it's got members in the class so therefore bonding is broken.

As soon as you can conceive of a common class between A and B well obviously you've achieved your goal. Your whole goal was 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 have some common qualities there.

[I think Dennis means that when the process is complete the null class of A and not B will have members. So if you run "a person wearing a dress" and a girl as A and B you will end up with members in the common class of "persons wearing a dress" and "non girl persons" or A and not B. Editor]

It's interesting to note that if you continue the process beyond this point that not only will you get the merging but 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, but then this common class will start to fade out and eventually you will find it extremely difficult to put up the two terminals.

You put up one terminal and then you've got to mock up the other terminal, you know, as you mock up the second terminal the first one vanishes, it erases, and you 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 are looking at erasure.

Now this won't happen if you attempt this process prior to level 5. Remember that I am using this process after level 5 has been flattened.

See, it's being 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 terminals start to go into erasure even as you are trying to work the process beyond the point when you should have finished it.

It's not harmful to do so, just note it in passing that you will go into erasure if you go past the point of merging so don't be surprised if that happens, don't be surprised if your terminals erase and it becomes very difficult to hold both of them in existence at the same time.

So that's the final end point of the procedure. Would be the erasure not only of the two terminals but after the erasure of the common two you would be left with a handful of nothing. That will be the end point there, the final end point.

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.

Exceptions: Eating and Sex

Now there are only two exceptions, there are two areas of life and living where this won't occur: The first of them is when you are dealing with 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, you can't break it from the body.

So you will find that with some of your A and B classes, associated with the subject of eating or the subject of sex, that 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.

And the other area where you won't necessarily get a clean erasure is when 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 wouldn't expect to get a merging there would you?

You see, because you're asking them for this merge to this common class to be both alive and not alive simultaneously which is a contradiction. So it can't merge. You see?

So if you bear that in mind, if your A and your B are 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.

There are two areas where you can expect not to get an erasure, not to get a clean merging.

One is where the body is concerned that's on the subject the body goals packages, which are mainly on the subject of sex and less on the subject of eating.

And the second area is where A and B are intrinsically different. You wouldn't expect to get a clean erasure there or even a clean merging.

RI

OK, now the subject of RI, running of RI can be helpful in this procedure.

The procedure, as I say, is extremely fast.

The matrix itself is a little sort of energy mass. It is strange but there it is. As the matrix blows there is a slight 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 Level 2 after Level 5.

The theoretical reason for this is that loss of matrix is also loss of importance so you have to repair this importance. Be prepared to use your RI. OK?

Now if you've been following this very carefully, following this through very carefully, you will have realized that Level 2 after Level 5 is a erasure process, which tells us that 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 life goals packages, you know that you've erased the "to know" goals packages and 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 checked 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 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.

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

Level 3, by the way, is also an 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 run Level 2 differences and similarities. 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 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 similarly as general procedure Level 3 timebreaking is an erasure process after you've run Level 5. You see that?

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 5.

Running Assists with TROM After Level 5

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

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

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, 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 and use them as erasure processes. Follow?

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.

Rules for Level 2 after Level 5

Rule 1 Keep it Simple

Now there are 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 keep it simple, if you're not careful with this procedure you can work yourself into an enormous amount of complexity and the procedure just drowns in complexity, the procedure does.

Now the way to avoid all this complexity is, right back at the beginning of the procedure, when you do your test, when your testing to find if a bonding exists, you know where 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's the secret. Keep A simple.

If you make A complicated, then you're asking to get a 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 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?

You can't control what is going to pop up. When you think of A then 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 the procedure simple.

Now let me give you an example of this. Supposing on Level A you think of girl and 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. 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.

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 A down to a single class, you don't want common classes for A when you are doing the test. Keep them down to single classes as far as possible. Keep A as simple as you can and you will win all the time.

You make A complicated and you will drown in a nightmare of complexity. So right at the outset keep A simple then you will get a simple B.

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.

Give you an example here. You think 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?

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

So the golden rule is keep A simple when you are doing your test. But you must take whatever shows up. Once B shows up 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 the bonding you're trying to break. You mustn't muck around with B. Once you've set up A and a B shows up, well you're stuck with that B. That's the one you are going to have to work with. Ok so much for that. That's rule 1. Keep it simple.

Rule 2 The Universe of Discourse Rule

Rule 2 is 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 which they both reside and it is up to you to find it.

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

Now let's give you an example here of a universe of discourse. I'll give you more than one example. You think of a person wearing a dress, and your mind offers you up a girl. Ok. Well what's the universe of discourse?

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, they're not the universe of inanimate objects or airy spaces. They're in the universe of people.

A person wearing a dress is a person and a girl is a person. So really what your saying is if person wearing dress then girl person. That is your correct proposition, is your correct bonding.

So you have a person wearing a dress bonded to a girl 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.

Example

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

So, ok, you do your test and you think of a person wearing a dress and a non-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, there are 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.

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 non-girl. Now there both what? Well their both people. Non-girls are people and persons wearing a dress are a people. So we have a person wearing a dress and a person who is a non-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 start to find differences between those two, and the process runs, you see that, because you found your universe of discourse.

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

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

So you'll eventually bow out of that one after failure. And you think "Oh,well is there anything else that is a non girl?

So well you think a house brick is also a non girl." So you start finding differences and similarities between a person wearing dress and a house brick. And 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?

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

Now some might argue that by doing this you're short-circuiting 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! 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.

Right at the very beginning, you better find this universe of discourse and work with it. And this gets you over your major difficulty when dealing with negative classes.

You will find early on in the procedure that until you discover the subject of "universes of discourse" B quite often shows up as a negative class.

If you're dealing with a positive class or negative class or maybe you'll be dealing with two negative classes, but if you isolate 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 examples inside your universe of discourse, you see that, on either side, on the A or the B.

It doesn't matter if A is negative or B is negative once you've got your universe of discourse the process runs very easily and 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 either side, on the A or the B. Can't you follow?

It doesn't matter if A is negative or B is negative once you have your universe of discourse the process runs very easily and 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. It's simply a matter of getting the correct universe of discourse before you start doing the process.

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 and you will win. And as soon as you get both your A and your B, you think of A and B pops up in your mind so you've got B you've got your two things there. You've got what you bonded. You've got

your "if A then B," you know, what is bonded to what. Next thing to do is find your universe of discourse and that's the second rule.

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.

Theory Material

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

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 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.

If A is different from B, then A and B have no common class, and if A and B have no common class then A is different from B. But unfortunately in this universe you can't hold that phenomena. It lacks conviction.

In other words you have a couple of mockups here, you know. You mockup these two things and along comes you friend and you say, "Well I got these two mockups and A is there and there's B and A is different from B."

And he looks at them and he says "Well I can't see that A is different from B." He says "I can't see how A is different from B." And 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."

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 when your friend trots up you says look at these two mockups. And "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 phenomenon.

The actual definition of difference in the universe is that A and B have no common class. That's the truth of the matter and you must go a long way, I can assure you, to discover this truth. It is a 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.

Similarities

It's exactly the same thing with similarities. The definition of A is similar to B is that 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 AB is not a null class. You see that?

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

But again we're up against this difficulty of conviction. Along comes someone. You say "I got these two mockups and 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, "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 the definition of a similarity is that simple thing that the class AB has members in it.

And the very basic definition of difference between A and B is when A and B are different then the class AB is null. That's the basic definition of a difference.

So bear in mind the basic definitions but you can't use then in the universe. Well 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 from 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?

So it is not at all unusual in this universe to find two objects which are both different and similar. With most objects in this universe you can find differences between them and you can also find similarities between them.

So there is no contradiction between the fact the two objects A and B can be different, you can find differences between them and you can also find similarities between them. In fact that is normally the case in this universe.

That two objects will be different and similar simultaneously and it's achieved by bonding A to this quality X and bonding B to the quality not X 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.

That's the way it works in the universe. And this is very different from the way it looks when you look it up in the dictionary.

When you 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 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 attempt to do this, although you can logically define identity very precisely.

I mean A is identical to B logically if the proposition "if A then B" and the proposition "if B then A," if both those propositions maintain then A is identical to B or at least its equivalent to B logically. But certainly 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.

Certainly that applies in the human mind, so the two will be identical there.

No, no, now you're in trouble here. Your really in logical difficulty because you're not easily able to define the subject of non identity. It's difficult to define it logically like you can define identity.

You can define identity very easily within the terms of the proposition "if A then B" but you can't define the non-identity with an "if A then B" type of postulate.

Non-identity is simply the absence of identity. It leads you into an in illogic, what's known 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 an equation you end up with non-equations and it is impossible to arrive at a definition of anything when you are dealing with non-equations.

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

And I don't think anyone has done any work in this area for 4 or 5 hundred years. I think what happened, 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 things 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 ever since.

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 into very 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 real universe.

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

So I'm sure that my definition is correct. It feels right. It checks out and you can derive some very workable psychological procedures from the definition. So I am pretty darn sure that my definition of a difference my definition of a similarity is the correct definition in this universe.

The one in the dictionary is simply wrong, where 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.

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 are alike.

Ok, well that's a bit wish-washy, you can't do much with it. You know it's not a definition you can work with. You couldn't do anything with it. But at least you don't get into 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 scientific definition of a similarity. I have certainly never come across any in a scientific text book.

It's worthwhile to bear in mind when working with differences and similarities to get the technological background of it exactly right the actual definition of a difference is that if A and B are different then their common class is null. 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 are similar then their 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 are your basic definitions 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 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.

On the tape Part A of this set by the way I use the symbol X 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.

So, I can pretty well wrap this subject up now. I got this wrapped up and I am very pleased with this piece of technology. I am happy with it and I am pretty sure I have got all the bugs out of it.

I have been testing it for a couple of weeks, no less than that, but a pretty exhaustive testing for the last week, or so. And I haven't come across any more bugs. But it's a very useful piece of technology and it wraps up our 5 levels very nicely.

Why it's called Level 2 after Level 5

We go though levels 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 then 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 procedures of 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?

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.

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

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

But within those limitations the procedure is extremely powerful.

In other words what I am saying is that if the difference between A and B is only being set up by you and your psyche then you will knock it into a cocked hat by using Level 2 after Level.

If the difference is entirely subjective in your psyche and it's nothing to do with your body and it has 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 good luck with the procedure and bye bye for now.

End of tape

04 Bond Breaking

By Dennis Stephens

Transcribed by Pete McLaughlin

April 10, 2012

[Note, in this lecture Dennis introduces the final name change for this Level which has gone from "Level 6" to "Level 2 after Level 5" and now becomes Level 5D. Each of these articles provides a different process to erase bondings in the mind.-Editor]

Today is the 1st of September 1994, and the title of this lecture is Bond Breaking.

This lecture "Bond Breaking" must not be separated from the earlier lectures entitled Bonding (Relationships). The two lectures form a set. They form a pair. They form a set and should not be separated.

It's a few months now since I cut that earlier lecture on the subject of Bonding and the first thing I want to say is that everything I said on that tape is absolutely and perfectly factual. It's perfectly true. We can erase each and every bonding, each and every relationship in the mind that hangs fire in therapy. We can erase them at level 5C and it is also true that they should not be attempted; no attempt should be made to address relationships in the mind until one reaches level 5C.

All of that is true, and there's nothing on this tape I am going to give you now, which is going to change that in the slightest.

All I'm going to give you now is a faster method of breaking bondings in the mind.

A Faster Method of Erasing Bondings

This happens very much in psychological research that you discover a method of doing something and it does the trick. It's adequate, it does the trick. Then when you've used that to clean up this area of the psyche, clean up this area of the mind, and you've put the whole subject to bed, then your attention goes into other areas of the mind.

You do other research and clean up other areas. Then suddenly one day you say, "Oh my God! There is a simpler way to do that."

Well that is what has happened here. I suddenly realized that there is a simpler method of erasing relationships from the psyche, a simpler method.

Now note what I am saying here. This method I am giving you is simpler and faster, therefore, faster than the method given in the earlier lecture. And it does not in any way invalidate what I said in the earlier lecture. This is simply an alternative method of doing it, which I think you will find is simpler and faster than making the relationship the subject matter of the "to know" goals package at level 5C.

As far as level 5C, everything written in the write up, and bear in mind I said in the write up, that any postulate can be made the subject matter of the "to know" goals package at level 5C and that is true. That is true. So the write up is still complete. The write up as given, as published, will still do the trick.

As a matter of fact if it wasn't sufficient to do the trick it would never have been published. I would have spotted there was a flaw.

I gave that level 5C exhaustive research on all sorts of postulates till I was absolutely certain of my statement that level 5C can be used in that context to erase postulates from the mind.

Now there are possibly many people who will hear this lecture, hear this talk and say, "Dennis, when you say that this is a simpler method of erasing bondings from the mind you are incorrect. This is not a simpler method. This is a more complex method."

Very well, then for you, if you find this method I'm going to give you more complicated than the method given already, then fine, stay with the earlier method. It will work for you and it will do the trick but as far as I'm concerned I would consider this a simpler method. So I'm working from that reality, that I consider this a simpler method that I'm giving to you. I think both methods should exist.

Level 5D Alternate Bond Breaking

Now this method, on the methodology given on this tape does actually mean we have a new level in our therapy, which becomes level 5D.

The reason this becomes level 5D and not some level 6 or anything like that is because the procedure is still intimately bound up with level 5A.

In other words, that just as level 5C is intimately bound up with level 5A, in that every time you finish with something at level 5C you must go back and re-null the general "to know" goals package at level 5A, well similarly with this new level 5D every time you finish handling something you must go back and re-null the "to know" goals package at level 5A.

So it clearly is a part of level 5 and is not any part of any new level. It's simply level 5D of level 5. And the name of the level is level 5D Alternate Bond Breaking.

Now before we proceed with level 5D I will give you the basic postulate structure of the level, the basic rational, the basic reason why of the level. In other words, I'll give you the foundation upon which it rests.

Level 5D Fundamentals

Now there are two propositions upon which level 5D rests and here's the first one.

The reason why a bonding hangs fire in the mind is because the person is still subscribing to it.

That was the first one. And the second one is that any bonding in the mind can be erased by taking over the automaticity that is keeping that bonding in existence.

Now they are the two fundamentals of level 5D and from those two fundamentals our *modus operendi* at level 5D proceeds. It stems from those two fundamentals. So you better understand those two fundamentals.

I'll go through them in detail for you. The first one, the reason that the bonding hangs fire is because the person is still subscribing to it. Well if you think about that for a moment that is obvious but I am putting it in there because sometimes the obvious escapes people. They may wonder why this thing is hanging fire. Well, (chuckle) you need look no further.

The reason why a bonding hangs fire in the psyche is because you are subscribing to it. It's not sitting in there because your Aunty Maple subscribes to it still. Or your Aunty Maple subscribed to it once. Or your dad subscribed to it. It's in there because you are subscribing to it. You subscribed to it in the past and you are still subscribing to it in the present.

It's got nothing to do with whether or not the bonding is true or false in the universe that has got absolutely nothing to do with it. The bonding may be true in the universe. The bonding may be a pack of lies from start to finish. It doesn't depend on whether the bonding is true or false.

Its continued existence in the mind only depends upon this fact that you are subscribing to it still. Now do you understand that?

You've got to get that absolutely clear. It's you doing it. It's your mind and it's you holding it in your mind. You got to get that. You got to get that and understand that absolutely thoroughly, else you won't get anywhere with 5D.

Now let's take up this second fundamental, that we can erase any bonding from the mind by taking over the automaticity that's holding it in suspension in the mind. In other words, this bonding, that you are subscribing to, stems from some point in your past.

Bonding is Something You Use as a Solution to a Problem

The bonding is not necessarily, to use Dianetics and Scientology technology, the bonding is not necessarily part of your reactive bank. It's almost certainly more a part of your analytical mind.

In other words, the bonding is something you use as a solution to a problem. It's more likely to be a game strategy than it is to be anything to do with your reactive bank.

You must understand that these bondings are solutions to problems rather than problems. They're more of an analytical function than a reactive function. But by methodically taking over the automaticity that is keeping these things in existence we can very rapidly and very quickly take then back out of existence again. But of course, you won't take then back out of existence until you stop subscribing to them. Now you gotta get that!

In other words, your saying, "This bonding is the absolute essence, the absolute quintessence of perfect truth. And I need this bonding to live and in the absence of this bonding I will die an immediate and horrible death."

Well, while you're believing that, you're wasting your time going ahead with level 5D. You'd better understand that right from the outset. You've got to want to be free of this bonding before you can ever break it.

While you want the bonding; you will be stuck with the bonding. After all it is your mind and it is your bonding. The bonding is only in there because you once found it useful and you stuck yourself with it.

You've got to say to yourself "Do I want this bonding anymore?"

"Ok, I don't want that anymore. Right, now I can get rid of it."

How do I get rid of it? Well I can get rid of it at level 5C but also I can get rid of it at level 5D, and level 5D is what we're dealing with at the moment so I'll tell you how to get rid of it at level 5D.

Handle One Bonding at a Time

Now the most common phenomena that occurs when you start addressing a bonding in therapy with a view to erasing it is that while your addressing this bonding some other bonding shows up, which, the one you're dealing with is related to. Now this phenomenon is very common. It's so common that you're going to have to know what to do about it.

Now what you do about it is very simple. You have a piece of paper, a pad by your side and a pencil or a pen and when these other bondings show up you simply note them down. You collect them in other words. And then when you've written them down you go back and proceed to erase the one that you started out with.

And, get me on this, you start out with this bonding and while you're working with it…we'll call it X. You start out with X. This relationship X. and while your

working with X, relationship Y shows up. Now the thing you do is you write Y down on a pad. Get it?

The thing you don't do is leave X and go on to Y. that's definitely a flunk. That is definitely a flunk. You must proceed, as we know in therapy, you must complete your cycles as you go. You mustn't leave X and go onto Y. You stay with X.

Now one or more bondings may show up. Doesn't matter how many show up. You note them all down. I don't think you'll find more than 3 or 4 will show up. I never had more than 3 or 4, but maybe a maximum of 6. Let's say a maximum of 6 will show up. These bondings will show up while you're dealing with the first one.

Ok, just note them all down but you don't leave the first one. You don't leave X. you go on by using your technology, until you've erased X.

Now that's true for level 5C and level 5D, it doesn't make any difference. You don't go madly rushing around the place and taking a nibble off this bonding here, and another one shows up and say, "Oh, I've got to deal with that one first" so you get over there. Now that is one sure way to make a cot case out of yourself on this subject of bondings. You will get yourself in a frightful mess if you do it that way.

You've got to start on one and you say, "Right I've started on this one. This is the one I am going to erase first."

And it will erase. You will get there. But you may have 3 or 4 or half a dozen others show up during the erasure. Just note them down. And each and every one of those that show up will need to be addressed by you in therapy. That's why you have to write them down.

Don't try to commit them to memory, write them down on a pad so you've got them. You've got them nailed.

Cause their due for execution, they are. They're due for execution. So as they show up you write them down. Ok, you get that?

Also, as I've already mentioned to you on the earlier tape, when talking about bondings and relationships, don't be a bit surprised to discover that when you address a bonding that its reverse shows up.

You know, you're dealing in therapy with "if A then B" and it suddenly occurs to you that "if B then A" is also true for you. Ok, fine, just write it down on a pad. Just write it down. You'll deal with that one too.

In other words we deal in a methodical manner with every relationship that shows up. But we don't leave it till it's erased.

Having started on a bonding, having started to erase one we stay with that one until we've erased it, and then we go ahead with the next one. And we simply note all thoughts that show up.

They trigger each other in the mind by association, that's all that's happening. They trigger each other.

You'll soon come to see what's happening here. That their forming in little clusters in the mind and each little cluster is a separate cluster.

Either you're going to have a bonding that's a separate bonding all by itself in the mind. This single "if A then B" sits there all by itself in the mind, which is rather rare actually but it does occur.

It's either going to be that or you're going to get an "if A then B" show up and you start to erase it then another one shows up that's clearly associated with it. And then another one shows up. You've got yourself a little cluster. You see?

Note them all down. You'll eventually erase the whole cluster. And there's never more than… Well I was going to say I've never known more than three or four to be in the cluster. But be prepared for half a dozen.

Now I do know a method of getting the whole cluster. Of getting them all out before you even start. But it's a rather complex method there. And really there's no benefit to be obtained from it.

If one of these relationships is in the cluster it's going to show up sooner or later anyway while you're dealing with the other bondings in the cluster. You see what I'm getting at?

So none of them are going to escape you, simply because, if their connected to each other they're going to show because of the bonding, because of the connection. As you deal with one it's going to trigger or restimulate the others. And you're going to get the whole set.

You'll eventually get the whole lot erased. So there is no real point in getting the whole lot out before you even start. And as it's a rather complex procedure to do, I won't give it to you. But it can be done, I can assure you, but there is no point in doing it, you see.

You might as well proceed and use the system I'm giving you which is the simplest way to do it. There's no advantage in using a more complex way of going about it when the simple way does work.

So, our stable datum here is your going to have a pencil and a pad by your side when working with bondings and this is true at level 5C and at level 5D. Don't try and rely on your memory. Write them down. Then once their written down, their nailed. You've got them. Their nailed down ready for execution each one's going to be handled.

Take Over the Automaticity

Ok we're now ready to discover just how to take over the automaticity of a bonding in the mind, which is the very heart, the very core, the very essence of level 5D.

Now I suppose the easiest way I can introduce this to you is to say, if you wanted to teach a child a bonding. Supposing you had this young child and you wanted to teach them a bonding.

Well, there's a way you could go about teaching them the bonding. I mean you could sit down and give them the bonding and show it to them, and say here's "if A then B" and there's the relationship and the child would sort of look at it and think about it and, well, with a young child, you'd probably have minimal success. You know. And even with an older child they'd think about it. No, no that isn't the way children learn things.

Now if you were to go about it in this method you could actually teach the child the bonding. And we could utilize this method in therapy, as you'll see.

It's a teaching method but you're using it as a therapeutic tool because you see there's not "you and the child" involved, there's just you involved and the child is simply part of your psyche. You'll see what I'm getting at

It sounds a little complicated but as I proceed you'll understand what I'm getting at.

Supposing you wanted to teach a child this bonding "if boy then wearing cap", or loosely "if boy then cap" and with the understanding that when we say cap we mean a person wearing a cap. Cap equals person wearing a cap. Ok? Alright, our bonding is "if boy then person wearing a cap".

Supposing we wished to teach a child this particular relationship. I'm not suggesting it would be a good thing to teach a child this. Actually it wouldn't be a very good thing to teach any child that relationship because it's a most peculiar relationship, but never the less, if you wanted to there is a very systematic way you could go about it with a child.

You could teach the child the relationship. Whether the child would hang onto the relationship for very long I don't know. They might consider it the most peculiar thing and discard it. But never the less you could teach it to them.

This is how you could go about it. You say to the child "every time I say "boy" I want you to say "cap." And the child would nod his head. And you say "Right." So you say to the child "boy" and he says "cap" and you say "boy". He says "cap." And you could go on like that until there is no more change. Until every

time you say "boy" he says "cap." And he's quite happy. You say "boy" he says "cap."

And then you say to the child, "Alright now you say to me "no cap" and I will say "no boy". "Get the idea?" You say that to the child and he says "Yep"

So he says, "no cap" each time he says "no cap" you say "no boy". He gets the idea. He says "no cap" and you say "no boy". And you go on like this until all his smiles and giggles and laughter is gone off and there is no more change. And you say "Alright, that's fine." "That's fine" Now I need you to finish with that one.

Right and the third step you take with the child, you say to the child, "I'm going to say to you "no cap" and I want you to say "no boy". And the child gets the idea of that so you say "no cap" and he says "no boy". You say "no cap" and he says "no boy". And you continue on with this until there is no more change and there is clearly no more change in the situation. The child is quite happy with it. You say "no cap" he says "no boy". Right, that's the end of the third step.

You then say to the child, "I want you to say "boy" and every time you say boy I will say "cap". So the child says "Ok". Off you go and he says "boy". Every time he says "boy" you say "cap". He says "boy". You say "cap". And that's the fourth step. You'll run that till there is no more change and the child is quite happy with that.

And that is the four steps. There are only those four steps. I won't go through them again. You want what they are? Just go through them and you'll see them. But I will be repeating them later on in another context so you'll see them again.

So those are the four steps. Now if you wanted to, with the child, you could go back and repeat the four steps again. Go through them all just to make sure there is no more change there, until the child can go through each of those four steps with no more change.

And then quite a remarkable thing would happen to the child, quite remarkable. You then say to the child "think of a boy". And he'd think of a boy. And you say, "but when you think of a boy what do you think of?" and he'd say, "I think of a person wearing a cap."

You've done it. You've sold him on the bonding. See that? You could educate the child into the bonding by doing that. And for some period of time every time that child thought of a boy he would think of a person wearing a cap. And every time that child thought of a person who wasn't wearing a cap he would think of a non boy. In other words, you would have given him the bonding. You would have sold the bonding to him by that little exercise.

Implantation

Now you might say this is an awful thing you're doing here Dennis. You're teaching us implantation. Yes I am, I am! (chuckle) This is how it's done. But I'm teaching it to you as a therapeutic tool. You see?

Every coin has got two sides in this universe. There's the good side and there is the bad side. While on one side might be an implantation method, on the other side it can be used beneficially as a system for removing implantation, for removing conditioning.

Well how would that be. How could we use this? Well I've just told you, as a system for breaking the bonding in the mind. You will go in and run the thing like a goals package. Remember the goals package technology at level 5A and level 5B? How you run a goals package? Well you would run this exactly like a goals package.

Breaking a Bonding

Supposing for example, you had the bonding in your mind "if boy then cap". And that was one of those you wanted to break in your psyche. Well this is how you would go ahead and do it.

Level 4

You would mock up someone over that way in the class of not self saying to you "boy". Get that? Now that's his self determined postulate in the class of not self, over that way, saying to you "boy". As soon as he says "boy" over to you comes the message "boy" and that's his self determined postulate right? "Boy". But his pan determined postulate is "cap".

You pick up his pan determined postulate and use it as your self-determined postulate and say "cap". Now every time he says "boy" you say "cap". He says "boy", you say "cap". And you will run that just like you will run any level of a goals package. You would run it till there is no more change.

Level 3

Then you would change your postulate from "cap" to "no cap". Your self-determined postulate changes from "cap" to "no cap". Then your pan determined postulate out to the other end of the comm. line now goes into "no boy". Right?

So you then punch out "no cap" and get that person at the other end of the comm. line to say "no boy". You can see it as an overwhelm if you want to. But your saying "no cap" he's saying "no boy". And you will continue until you can do that. Until there's no more change. Every time you say "no cap" he says "no boy".

Then the third one is you move to the next level up…that was level 3.

Level 2

We are now up to level 2. Level 2 is the person saying to you "no cap" and you saying "no boy" He says "no cap" you say "no boy". And you run that till there is no more change.

Level 1

Then you move into level 1, which is you saying "boy" and the person at the other end of the comm. line saying "cap". And you would run that till there is no more change.

Test

Then you'll go back to step four again. Start in at the beginning and run the whole set again just to make sure that there is no more change on any of the levels. And a remarkable thing would happen.

When you then come to test that bonding in your mind "if boy then cap" you would now find that you could think of a boy without thinking of a person with a cap. You would have broken the bonding. The bonding is broken.

Now why is the bonding broken?

Well the bonding is broken because you've taken over the automaticity that's holding the bonding in existence. You see that?

By creating in your own psyche the classes of self and not self and going through each one of these methodical steps you've covered all four possibilities.

There are only four possibilities. You could only have got this bonding in one of four ways.

Either it's you saying "boy" and getting someone else to say "cap",

or somebody over that way is saying "no cap" and their getting you to say "no boy",

or you are saying "no cap" and they are saying "no boy",

or their saying "boy" and your saying "cap",

or any combination of all four.

It's going to be one or the other or all four of those, is the way you would have learned it in life. You get it?

If you examine any of these bondings you would find that you would have learned that way, or some way very similar to that.

There would have been you and another person involved.

You wouldn't have learned these bondings in isolation from other people.

Maybe you picked them up from your parents. Maybe you picked them up at school. Maybe you picked them up in Galaxy 4. God knows where you picked them up from. But you didn't pick them up in isolation.

They were picked up between you and other people. And you would have picked them up in some method similar to the four steps I've just given, and so therefore by creating those four steps, which are the very essence of it in your own psyche, you would break the bonding again.

In other words, what you're doing essentially is that you're creating the bonding in your own psyche. You're creating it. But because it's there already, and you are creating it, you're taking over the automaticity that is holding it in existence.

So you're becoming the one who's putting it there, and so therefore you've regained your determinism, your self-determinism to hold it in your mind or not hold it in your mind.

In other words you've taken over the automaticities. So you've regained control over this phenomenon in your own psyche.

It's the old phenomenon of taking over the automaticity of the thing that's out of control. I'm just using it in a particular form to break bonding. Now do you follow it? Follow the cycle there?

It is four steps. It's a little goals package, in other words. It's a little tiny goals package. And there are four steps in the package. There are four levels to the package.

If you'd like to see it, you could see it in terms of a goals package. You'd say, "Well it would start in at level 1 and level one would fail. And the person would then go into level 2. Then they would go into a valence shift. Then they would go into level 3. Then that would fail. And then the final level they would go into level 4. And that would be the final one in the set. You could see it that way. You could see it completely in terms of a goals package. And that would be an excellent way to see it, if you wanted to.

Now this is quite a remarkable piece of technology I can assure you, quite a remarkable piece of technology. And it's a very fast precision tool for breaking bondings. When used exactly in the method I've given.

But if you were to use this technology on other people as a method of implanting them with bondings then you'd become an implanter and you would be using this technology in a non life manner.

When used in the manner I'm suggesting you use it as a therapeutic tool. It's beneficial and it's a piece of life technology.

If you want to become an implanter and you want to dominate people, you want to make slaves out of them; you can use this technology to implant bondings into people, just like you could implant the bonding into a child by using this as an educational tool. If you want to do that well, then so be it. It's on your head.

Never the less, as a therapeutic tool, it's excellent. It takes them apart.

This technology will take a bonding apart with the same ruthless efficiency that a goals package erases postulates in that goals package. It has the same ruthless efficiency. It is based upon the same mechanism, using the same mechanism. So we could expect we could take bondings apart rather rapidly using this technology.

But as I say, many of you, might having heard this tape say, "Well it's too complicated for me. I'll stick to level 5C."

Well level 5C will get you there. It will get you there. But this is faster and simpler. At least I think so.

But never the less your always free to go back to level 5C and erase a bonding by making it the subject matter of the "to know" goals package at level 5C.

Final Step on 5D

Now this is the final thing on our steps of level 5D. Having erased a bonding at level 5D, having erased a bonding you should go back and quickly nip through the "to know" goals package and re null it.

There is a tendency for charge to reappear in the "to know" goals package after you have erased a bonding out of your mind. So you must go back to the general "to know" package and mop this charge up. Just as you must do so at level 5C.

You got no choice in this matter. Every time you erase a bonding at level 5D or at level 5C you must, repeat, must go back to the general "to know" goals package at level 5A and re-null it.

Now that is absolutely fundamental and absolutely vital. You've got to do it every time. So don't miss it. It's a necessary step. You must keep that "to know" goals package at level 5A nulled down. That is the whole secret of success at level 5. It is to keep that "to know" goals package nulled down, the general "to know" goals package, to keep it running null all the time in therapy.

So every time you break a bonding at level 5C or at level 5D, back you go to the "to know" goals package at level 5A, nip through it and re-null it. It needn't take you more than 2 or 3 minutes, maybe 5 minutes.

The amount of charge that will reappear on the "to know" goals package depends on how much trouble you had breaking the bonding at level 5D. If you had a lot of trouble at level 5D, and a lot of mass showed up, and a lot of charge showed up there where you were breaking this bonding, well you can expect a lot of charge to reappear in the "to know" goals package at level 5A.

5D Repair

Now what do you do if you're running at level 5D on a bonding and it all goes wrong, it won't erase? It all starts to grind, and it all goes black. It all falls apart

on you. Right, just stop running level 5D. Stop running 5D, run RI and back you go to level 5A and clean up this whole charge. Clean it all up, until your fields gone back clean again, and you're feeling good again about things.

[BLACK FIELD CASE, a case that could not run engrams because he could not see them. (HCOB 14 Jan 60)]

Now back to 5A, run plenty of RI, then go back to 5D and have another look at it. There's something you're doing wrong here. You've fallen foul of something, somewhere. You better have a nosey around and find out what's gone wrong. You'll find it. You're doing something odd. You're doing something peculiar. And that's why it's all gone bad on you.

But before you attempt that go back and re-null the "to know" goals package at 5A. That will get you out. That's your life line. That's your life raft. Get back onto that life raft and clean it all up, and plenty of RI.

Now that's the way you run level 5D. You shouldn't have any trouble with it. You shouldn't have any at level 5D you shouldn't have the field going black or anything peculiar like that. But god knows things can happen. If it does happen that's the way you repair it.

So the repair for level 5 D is:

Step A of the repair is stop doing level 5D. Run RI.

Step B return to the general "to know" goals package at level 5A. Re-null it.

Step C finish off with a bit more RI and repeat A, B and C until you're feeling good again.

That's the repair if level 5D goes sour on you.

Final Word of Warning

Now our final word of warning here, don't mix level 5C and level 5D up. Don't start on a bonding, you know, to erase it at level 5C get half way through the erasure at level 5C and say, "Oh well, I'm not having much success with this I'll now bailout and go on to level 5D and pick up that same bonding at level 5D. Flunk. That is asking for trouble it really is.

If you're going to start off erasing a bonding at level 5C you are damn well going to finish it at level 5C. It will erase.

And similarly with 5D. You get half way through 5D and you get into a bit of trouble and you think, "Oh, my god, I better go back to 5C." Flunk. Once you start it at level 5D your going to finish it at level 5D, but you may have to do a repair.

It may be harder than you think on some of these bondings. Don't be surprised, on some of these bonds you're going to get a tiger by the tail. I can tell you that now.

What looks like an innocent little bonding. You pick it up and it looks so nice and you say "Oh, this is a nice little bonding. I'll just nip it and erase that at level 5D." and KERunch! Roar! The tiger.

You've got the tiger by his tail. And you've pulled on the tail and now you've got the tiger. What do you do?

You erase it. You continue on with the process. You erase the thing at level 5D. You get it?

You don't panic. You just go on, but if you can't proceed, and it all gets too heavy for you.

Ok, bow out and do the level 5D repair I've just given you. Back to the "to know" goals package. And mop up the charge. But then so help me back you're going to have to go to level 5D and clean up that bonding again. And you're going to stay with it until you get it cleaned up.

So bear in mind you can get a tiger by the tail. And I've had one or two of them while cleaning up a bonding, found I've got a tiger by the tail. So don't be surprised if it happens.

It's not all sweetness and light at level 5D, I can assure you, or at level 5C come to that. You can get a tiger by the tail.

And be prepared for a bit of fireworks occasionally. There are a few tigers left in the bank at level 5C and level 5D. There aren't many but there are a few tigers in there still. So be prepared to handle them. And that's the way you handle them.

Well that just about wraps up this subject of level 5D, and I wish you luck with it. And I think that most people will find that 5D is a simpler and faster method of erasing bondings from the mind, than level 5C is. But as I say it's an alternate bond breaking procedure. It does not in any way replace level 5C.

Thank you.

Single Word Classes

Now finally, just one final last thought on this subject. That is, keep your bondings, keep your classes as single word classes.

Now I couldn't over stress the importance of this. There is absolutely no reason at level 5D to be having classes which have got more than one word in them. You know? You don't want "if to grow petunias in the springtime then kiss Aunty Mable goodbye." Well you'd better get some symbolism for that. You know, better to say, "if petunias then Aunty Mable".

You know what you mean by petunias and you know what you mean by Aunty Mable. There is no need to be long winded. Just symbolize it in your own mind. And use the single word when you're working at level 5D, just like I did when I gave you the example.

Like in the example I gave you "if boy then cap" the correct wording there would be "if boy then person who is wearing a cap", but you know that a person wearing a cap equals cap. You see?

Cap equals a person wearing a cap. Knowing that identification in your own mind, it's one you set up, and knowing that you set it up you can use it. So you only have to use the word "cap" knowing that that means a person who wears a cap. You see that? It's very simple. It just makes life a lot easier for you.

So keep them, at level 5D and at 5C come to that, keep your bondings as single word bondings and use your own mental shorthand.

It does really save an awful lot of wear and tear on your psyche, you know, to use these little shortcuts. And these little bits of shorthand. Rather than filling your mind with lots and lots of long verbiage. Get used to using shorthand and you'll get there fastest.

Well that's all I wanted to say on the subject of this bonding and level 5D. I wish you luck with it, and bye-bye for now.

End of tape

05 Independence

Lecture by Dennis Stephens

November 8, 1994

Transcribed by Pete McLaughlin

April 14, 2012

Today is the 8th of November 1994 and the title of this short talk is amplification material on the subject of independence.

This material has nothing to do with the IP(Insanity Point) tech. It just happens to be on the same spool as the IP tech. I am just putting it on to fill up this side. It's the usual piece of space to fill up.

As mentioned on the tape on the subject of Differences and Similarities two things or two propositions are independent from each other if they have no common class, or more precisely, and this is the more usual one that you will find in the logical text books, that two things are independent if they have no common deduction.

In other words, you cannot make the same deduction from either proposition.

One of the most important aspects, as far as we are concerned in therapy, with this subject of independence is its relationship to the "if A then B" postulate. We already know that when we make the general postulate "if A then B", and bear in mind as I mentioned in the lecture on Bonding that any relationship can be reduced to an "if A then B" postulate we are bonding A to B.

Bonding and Independence

So, when we make this postulate "if A then B" we are bonding A to B or we are putting A within the class of B, but we must also understand that when we postulate "if A then B" we are making the classes of A and not-B independent of each other.

In other words we are separating those two classes. So the "if A then B" postulate has this double action. It bonds A to B, it puts A within the class of B but in so doing, in putting A within the class of B it ensures and it postulates that A cannot be within the class of not-B.

And therefore it separates A from the class of not-B, or as we say more precisely it produces a state of affairs where A and the class of not B are independent of each other.

Now it's important to understand that this is brought about by the actual postulate, the actual making of the postulate. Once one postulates "if A then B" one has automatically, ipso facto, bonded A to B and also separated out the classes of A and not-B and said that A and not-B are independent of each other.

To give you an example here we'll dig up our old example I used in the earlier lecture of "if A then B". A person postulates "if a person wearing a dress then a girl". If wearing dress then girl.

Well now a person makes that postulate they've not only bonded the class of people who wear dresses to the class of girls but also have separated out and made independent the class of a person wearing a dress and a non-girl.

And if you were to examine a person who made such a postulate "if person wearing dress then girl" if you were to examine his psyche while he was holding that postulate you would find that these two classes, that is the class of a person wearing a dress and the class of a non-girl were quite independent in his mind. They have no connection between them at all. And, more importantly, he would have, while he was in the class of a non-girl, he could not conceivably get across into the class of a person wearing a dress. You see that?

The postulate would prevent him from doing so. That would be the independence you see, because the two classes are independent they have no common class. Because they have no common class he cannot occupy both simultaneously. So while he is in the class of a non girl he cannot get across into the class of a person wearing a dress. You see that?

Now that is the single locking mechanism of the "if A then B" postulate. Remember I said the double lock is the double bind. The single "if A then B" is the single lock. Well that is the single lock it locks the person out. You get it? And it's their independence, done by the subject of independence.

A person in this situation where he cannot, while he's in the class of a non-girl, finds that he cannot get across into the class of a person wearing a dress.

In order to break this difficulty and regain his ability to achieve this thing all he would have to do is review his postulate "if person wearing dress then girl". Once he reviews that postulate and changes that postulate, or erases that postulate from his psyche he could then once again be able to occupy the identity of a person who is not a girl and while occupying the identity of a person who is wearing a dress. You get it?

He would have regained his full ability on the subject and he would have broken the single lock of the "if A then B" postulate.

So you see this subject of independence has some importance in therapy doesn't it, has some importance. And when in therapy you find you are unable to move from one class to another just hunt around and see if you can find the "if A then B" postulate.

There's a postulate there somewhere. The postulate is there which is preventing you from moving from one class to the other class and if you understand this material on independence you should quickly be able to discover what the postulate is and, if you want to, to change the postulate and so regain your freedom in this area.

I won't bother to give you the logical proof in the general case which says that if you postulate "if A then B" then you have ipso facto postulated that the class of A and the class of not-B are therefore independent of each other.

I won't give you that logical proof. It's not a difficult proof but it's simply unnecessary. It's quite trivial but I can assure you it is so. That once you make an "if A then B" postulate you have ipso facto made the classes of A and not-B independent of each other.

Well that's all I wish to say on this subject. So we will wind up this little talk now. When we get to tape number 14 you'll find that we pick up the IP tech again. So thanks very much.

End of tape

Glossary

Anaten. 1 . an abbreviation of analytical attenuation meaning diminution or weakening of the analytical awareness of an individual for a brief or extensive period of time. If sufficiently great, it can result in unconsciousness. (It stems from the restimulation of an engram which contains pain and unconsciousness.) (Scn AD)
2 . simply a drop in ARC to an extreme. (PAB 70) 3 . the physiological by-product of unconsciousness. (SOS, Bk. 2, p. 170) 4. dope-off. (Abil 52)

Clear- the term clear has risen from the analogy between the mind and the computing machine. Before a computer can be used to solve a problem, it must be cleared of old problems, of old data and conclusions.

Dianetics 1 . DIA (Greek) through, NOUS (Greek) soul deals with a system of mental image pictures in relation to psychic (spiritual) trauma. The mental image pictures are believed on the basis of personal revelation to be comprising mental activity created and formed by the spirit, and not by the body or brain. (BPL 24 Sept 73 V)
2 . Dn addresses the body. Thus Dn is used to knock out and erase illnesses, unwanted sensations, misemotion, somatics, pain, etc. Dn came before Scn. It disposed of body illness and the difficulties a thetan was having with his body. (HCOB 22 Apr 69)
3 . a technology that runs and erases locks, secondaries and engrams and their chains. (HCOB 17 Apr 69)

4 . Dn could be called a study of man. Dn and Scn, up to the point of stable exteriorization, operate in exactly the same field with exactly the same tools. It is only after man is sufficiently exteriorized to become a spirit that we depart from Dn; for here, considering man as a spirit, we must enter the field of religion. (PAB 42)

5 . a precision science. It stems from the study and codification of survival. (COHA, p. 148)

6 . a system of coordinated axioms which resolve problems concerning human behavior and psychosomatic illnesses. (5110CM08B)

7 . Dn is not psychiatry. It is not psycho- analysis. It is not psychology. It is not personal relations. It is not hypnotism. It is a science of mind. (DMSMH, p. 168)

8 . the route from aberrated or aberrated and ill human to capable human. (HCOB 3 Apr 66) Abbr. Dn.

Difference. 1. 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.

2. in actual practice you have to bond A to some quality X and bond B to the absence of X or not X in order to convince others that A is different to B. Similarly you have to bond A to some quality Y and bond B to Y to convince others that A is similar to B. (see the book 02 Philosophy of TROM article Level 2 of TROM)

E-meter 1. The E-meter is a religious artifact used as a spiritual guide in the church confessional. It is an aid to the auditor (minister, student, pastoral counselor) in two-way communication locating areas of spiritual travail and indicating spiritual well-being in an area. (HCO PL 24 Sept 73 VII)

2 . Hubbard Electrometer. An electronic instrument for measuring mental state and change of state in individuals, as an aid to precision and speed in auditing. The E-meter is not intended or effective for the diagnosis, treatment or prevention of any disease. (Scn AD)

3 . used to verify the preclear's gain and register when each separate auditing action is ended. (HCOB 5 Apr 69R)

4. Electropsychometer. (HCOB 23 Aug 65)

5 . the meter tells you what the preclear's mind is doing when the preclear is made to think of something. The meter registers before the preclear becomes conscious of the datum. It is therefore a pre-conscious meter. It passes a tiny current through the preclear's body. This current is influenced by the mental masses, pictures, circuits and machinery. When the unclear pc thinks of something, these mental items shift and this registers on the meter. (EME, p. 8)

Floating needle. 1. "An idle needle, one which is drifting slightly to the right and slightly to the left very easily and gently, denotes a comfortable status of mind on the part of the patient, and tells the practitioner that he is nowhere near any subject that distresses him, or, if it follows an emotional outburst, tells him that the outburst itself is spent, and that the subject now can be abandoned for the moment." [JOURNAL OF SCIENTOLOGY, Issue 1-G (Aug. 1952), ELECTRONICS GIVES LIFE TO FREUD'S THEORY]

2. "It means an idle, uninfluenced motion, no matter what you say about the goal or terminal. It isn't just null, it's uninfluenced by anything (except body reactions). Man it's really free. You'll know when you see one. They're really pretty startling. The needle just idles around and yawns at your questions on the subject." [E-meter Essentials (1961)]

3. "Floating needle, free needle are the same thing. What does one look like? Once you've seen one you'll never make a mistake on one again. For it floats. It ceases to register on the pc's bank. It just idly floats about or won't stand up even at low sensitivity." [HCOB 2 Aug. 65, RELEASE GOOFS]

4. "It is the idle uninfluenced movement of the needle on the dial without any patterns or reactions in it. It can be as small as 1" or as large as dial wide. It does not fall or drop to the right of the dial. It moves to the left at the same speed as it moves to the right." [HCOB 21 Oct. 68, FLOATING NEEDLE]

5. "Pcs and pre-OTs OFTEN signal an F/N with a 'POP' to the left and the needle can actually even describe a pattern much like a rock slam. Meters with lighter movements do 'pop' to the left." [HCOB 7 May 69R, Issue V, FLOATING NEEDLE]

6. "A floating needle is a rhythmic sweep of the dial at a slow, even pace of the needle. That's what an F/N is. No other definition is correct." [HCOB 21 Jul. 78, WHAT IS A FLOATING NEEDLE?]

7. "Free Needle: It means the same as a floating needle (F/N), which is a rhythmic sweep of the dial at a slow, even pace of the needle, back and forth, back and forth, without change in the width of the swing except perhaps to widen as the pc gets off the last small bits of charge. Note that it can get so wide that you have to shift the Tone Arm back and forth, back and forth, to keep the needle on the dial in which case you have a Floating Tone Arm." [E-Meter Essentials (1996)]

8. "The reason a clear's needle is so free (and you've seen, certainly, how an E-Meter needle gets sticky, then freer and freer) is that his thought is separated from a matter, energy, space, time consequence." [HCOB 17 Mar. 60, STANDARDIZED SESSIONS]

Free Needle 1. "A needle which shows none of the reactions described above. It floats back and forth easily, registering only the body, its breathing, heartbeats, etc. While needle free, no facsimiles are being impinged on the body." [HCOB 30 Apr. 60, ACC TRs]
2. "A real F/N means the pc is out the top, an ARC Br needle means he's out the bottom. He ceases to mock up, through grief." [HCOB 5 Oct. 68, ARC BREAK NEEDLES]

HASI Hubbard Association of Scientologists, International. (PAB 74)

To Be Known also making known and bringing into existence –1. When you first arrived at this universe as a spiritual being you looked around and thought it would be an interesting game to play. It would be fun to communicate with the other beings here.
However you quickly realized that in this universe you can't play games if no one recognizes you exist.
In order to play games or commuinicate with other beings you must be noticed, must be recognized to exist, you must "be known."
This is what Dennis means by "to be known". You want "to be known" by others so they will communicate with you and allow you to play the games with them. Also you want the effects you create to be known by others so if you grow a garden and share the tomatoes with your friends you can say that you want tomatoes "to be known" by you and tomatoes "to be known" by others. -editor
2. This is the creative postulate to bring something into existance and to make it known.
3. Life is a spiritual quality. Life can bring things into existence. That which is brought into existence is called an effect. All effects are intended to be noticed by others so they include the postulate "to be known."

To Know – this is the postulate to learn, experience, percieve something. It exactly complements and satisifies the postulate "to be known."

L Ron Hubbard- Lafayette Ronald Hubbard, better known as L. Ron Hubbard and often referred to by his initials, LRH, was an American pulp fiction author as well as the author of "Dianetics the Modern Science of Mental Health" published in 1950 and the founder of the Church of Scientology.

Mind- 1. pictures which have been made of experiences and plotted against time and preserved in energy and mass in the vicinity of the being and which when restimulated are re-created without his analytical awareness. (SH Spec 72, 6607C28)
2 . a literal record of experience plotted against time from the earliest moment of aberration until now plus additional ideas the fellow got about it, plus other things he may have mocked up or created on top of it in mental mass, plus some machines, plus some valences. (SH Spec 70, 6607C21)
3 . a network of communications and pictures, energies and masses, which are brought into being by the activities of the thetan versus the physical universe or other thetans. The mind is a communication and control system between the thetan and his environment. (FOT, p. 56)
4 . the purpose of the mind is to pose and resolve problems relating to survival and to direct the effort of the organism according to these solutions. (Scn 0-8, p. 76)
5 . a natively self-determined computer which poses, observes and resolves problems to accomplish survival. It does its thinking with facsimiles of experience or facsimiles of synthetic experience. It is natively cause. It seeks to be minimally an effect. (HFP, p. 33)

6 . the human mind is an observer, postulator, creator and storage place of knowledge. (HFP, p. 163)

7 . the mind is a self-protecting mechanism and will not permit itself to be seriously overloaded so long as it can retain partial awareness of itself. (DMSMH, p. 165)

8 . the mind is composed of energy which exists in space and which condenses down into masses. (SH Spec 133, 6204C17)

Overt act- 1. an overt act is not just injuring someone or something; an overt act is an act of omission or commission which does the least good for the least number of dynamics or the most harm to the greatest number of dynamics. (HCO PL 1 Nov 70 III)

2 . an intentionally committed harmful act committed in an effort to resolve a problem. (SH Spec 44, 6410C27)

3 . that thing which you do which you aren't willing to have happen to you. (lSH ACC 10, 6009C14)

Preclear or PC- 1. a person who, through Scn processing, is finding out more about himself and life. (PXL, p. 20)

2 . a spiritual being who is now on the road to becoming Clear, hence preclear. (HCOB 5 Apr 69)

3 . one who is discovering things about himself and who is becoming clearer. (HCO PL 21 Aug 63)

Problems and Solutions - 1. As Dennis describes above a being when he feels he needs problems will not solve an existing problem without creating one or more new ones.

2. Routine 2-20 from the book The Creation of Human Ability" by L Ron Hubbard 1962. "The auditor asks the preclear *What kind of problem could you be to mother?* and when the preclear has found one, *Alright, can you be that problem?* And when the preclear has become it, *Can you see your mother figuring about it?* and whether the preclear can or not, *Give me another problem you could be to your mother? Can you be that problem? etc.*, until communication lag is flattened."

Scientology - 1. it is formed from the Latin word scio, which means know or distinguish, being related to the word scindo, which means cleave. (Thus, the idea of differentiation is strongly implied.) It is formed from the Greek word logos, which means THE WORD, or OUTWARD FORM BY WHICH THE INWARD THOUGHT IS EXPRESSED AND MADE KNOWN: also THE INWARD THOUGHT or REASON ITSELF. Thus, SCIENTOLOGY means KNOWING ABOUT KNOWING, or SCIENCE OF KNOWLEDGE. (Scn 8- 80, p. 8) 2. Scientology addresses the thetan. Scientology is used to increase spiritual freedom, intelligence, ability, and to produce immortality. (HCOB 22 Apr 69) 3 . an organized body of scientific research knowledge concerning life, life sources and the mind and includes practices that improve the intelligence, state and conduct of persons. (HCOB 9 Jul 59) 4 . a religious philosophy in its highest meaning as it brings man to total freedom and truth. (HCOB 18 Apr 67) 5 . the science of knowing how to know answers. It is a wisdom in the tradition of ten thousand years of search in Asia and Western civilization. It is the science of human affairs which treats the livingness and beingness of man, and demonstrates to him a pathway to greater freedom. (COHA, p. 9)

6 . an organization of the pertinencies which are mutually held true by all men in all times, and the development of technologies which demonstrate the existence of new phenomena not hitherto known, which are useful in creating states of beingness considered more desireable by man. (COHA, p. 9)

7 . the science of knowing how to know. It is the science of knowing sciences. It seeks to embrace the sciences and humanities as a clarification of knowledge itself. Into all these things — biology, physics, psychology and life itself — the skills of Scientoloa can bring order and simplification. (Scn 8-8008, p. 11)

8 . the study of the human spirit in its relationship to the physical universe and its living forms. (Abil 146)

9 . a science of life. It is the one thing senior to life because it handles all the factors of life. It contains the data necessary to live as a free being. A reality in Scientoloa is a reality on life. (Aud 27 UK)

1 0 . a body of knowledge which, when properly used, gives freedom and truth to the individual. (COHA, p. 251)

11. Scientoloa is an organized body of scientific research knowledge concerning life, life sources and the mind and includes practices that improve the intelligence, state and conduct of persons. (Abil Mi 104)

1 2 . knowledge and its application in the conquest of the material universe. (HCL 1, 5203CM03A)

1 3 . an applied philosophy designed and developed to make the able more able. In this sphere it is tremendously successful. (HCO PL 27 Oct 64)

1 4 . an applied religious philosophy dealing with the study of knowledge, which through the application of its technology, can bring about desirable changes in the conditions of life. (HCO PL 15 Apr 71R)

Serfac service facsimile, service mechanism. 1. these are called "service facsimiles." "Service" because they serve him. "Facsimiles" because they are in mental image picture form. They explain his disabilities as well. The facsimile part is actually a self- installed disability that "explains" how he is not responsible for being able to cope. So he is not wrong for not coping. Part of the "package" is to be right by making wrong. The service facsimile is therefore a picture containing an explanation of self condition and also a fixed method of making others wrong. (HCOB 15 Feb 74)

2 . this is actually part of a chain of incidents which the individual uses to invite sympathy or cooperation on the part of the environment. One uses engrams to handle himself and others and the environment after one has himself conceived that he has failed to handle himself, others and the general environment. (AP&A, p. 7)

3 . it is simply a time when you tried to do something and were hurt or failed and got sympathy for it. Then afterwards when you were hurt or failed and wanted an explanation, you used it. And if you didn't succeed in getting sympathy for it, you used it so hard it became a psychosomatic illness. (HFP, p. 89)

4 . every time you fail, you pick up this facsimile and become sick or sadly noble. It's your explanation to yourself and the world as to how and why you failed. It once got you sympathy. (HFP, p. 89)

5 . that facsimile which the preclear uses to apologize for his failures. In other words, it is used to make others wrong and procure their cooperation in the survival of the preclear. If the preclear well cannot achieve survival, he attempts an illness or disability as a survival computation. The workability and necessity of the service facsimile is only superficially useful. The service facsimile is an action method of withdrawing from a state of beingness to a state of not beingness and is intended to persuade others to coax the individual back into a state of beingness. (AP&A, p. 43)
6 . that computation generated by the preclear (not the bank) to make self right and others wrong, to dominate or escape domination and enhance own survival and injure that of others. (HCOB 1 Sept 63)

Similar – 1. the definition of A is similar to B is that 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. however this definition lacks conviction.
2. 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. (see the book 02 Philosophy of TROM article Level 2 of TROM)

Somatic, 1. by somatic is meant a pain or ache sensation and also misemotion or even unconsciousness. There are a thousand different descriptive words that could add up to a feeling. Pains, aches, dizziness, sadness—these are all feelings. Awareness, pleasant or unpleasant, of a body. (HCOB 26 Apr 69)
2 . body sensation, illness or pain or discomfort. "Soma" means body. Hence psychosomatic or pains stemming from the mind. (HCOB 23 Apr 69)

3 . this is a general word for uncomfortable physical perceptions coming from the reactive mind. Its genus is early Dn and it is a general, common package word used by Scientologists to denote "pain" or "sensation" with no difference made between them. To the Scientologist anything is a somatic if it emanates from the various parts of the reactive mind and produces an awareness of reactivity. Symbol: SOM. (HCOB 8 Nov 62)

4 . the word somatic means, actually, bodily or physical. Because the word pain is restimulative, and because the word pain has in the past led to a confusion between physical pain and mental pain, the word somatic is used in Dn to denote physical pain or discomfort, of any kind. It can mean actual pain, such as that caused by a cut or a blow; or it can mean discomfort, as from heat or cold; it can mean itching — in short, anything physically uncomfortable. It does not include mental discomfort such as grief. Hard breathing would not be a somatic; it would be a symptom of misemotion suppression. Somatic means a non-survival physical state of being. (SOS, p. 79)

Valence - an identity complete with bank mass or mental image picture mass of somebody other than the identity selected by oneself. In other words, what we usually mean by valence is somebody else's identity assumed by a person unknowingly. Dianetics and Scientology Technical Dictionary