META REFLECTIONS, 2010

2010 was year 4 of the *Meta Reflections* on the international egroup for Neuro-Semantics —
Neurons. The following were written week by week to support and promote Neuro-Semantics
around the world.

The series of articles and themes that you will find in the 2010 Neuron posts are as follows:

1) Neuro-Semantics: #55, 63
      Collaboration: #1, 53
      From NLP to Neuro-Semantics: #2— #7
      Articles on Meta-States: #8, 9 (Egypt), 50 Brazil), 56
      Emotions: #57, 58, 59, 62

2) Self-Actualization Articles: #10, 29, 30, 49, 61
      Vitality series: 22-27, 39, 44
      Leadership: 41

3) NLP
      Critiques of NLP: #11, 13, 20, 28, 31, 65 (Book review)
      History of NLP: 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 45, 48, 51, 52, 54, 60, 63, 64

4) Neuro-Semantic Trainers Training (NSTT): #12, 14, 18, 25, 27, 32

5) Hypnosis: #15–17

6) Inside-Out Wealth: #21, 63
      If Unemployed: 33, 34

7) Political issues
      Book Burning: #46, 47

IS COLLABORATION POSSIBLE
IN THE NLP WORLD?

Since I've been writing some Reflections about NLP, misunderstandings, hype, the Cult Model, etc. I've received not a few emails essentially asking the question of the title, "Is collaboration even possible in the NLP world?" A few writers have taken me to task about it saying that I'm dreaming and not realistic and holding on to a hope that's long gone. A couple people wrote to ask "How would it happen?" and "What can we do?" to encourage more collaboration in this field of individualists?

As I've reflected on this feedback, one thing I've become aware of is that if we do not collaborate, the field will not cohere sufficiently to continue as a field. That happened to the Human Potential Movement—a movement that once had 400 "Growth Centers" around the world and by Carl Rogers' estimate over five million trained in the model. And while individuals persist to this day who remember "the movement," the original flame of the HPM has long been put out and all of those original Growth Centers have long closed their doors.

So yes, maybe I am unrealistic and naive and over-optimistic about *collaboration*, yet without it NLP as we know it today has a strong possibility of not making it. And I think that would be tragic— more than tragic, a tremendous loss to the human spirit and condition.

So what can *we* do? If you share with me these convictions about the value of NLP (and Neuro-Semantic NLP), then what can *we* do? Well, *first and foremost we can operate in a cooperative and collaborative way to demonstrate what our words about working together mean.* In our attitude and talk we can develop a fully congruent inclusiveness of language and we can extend ourselves to invite others for collaborative projects and join those projects that are underway.

Along that line, I'd recommend that you take every advantage of every opportunity to go to Conferences, Congresses, and Events put on by the NLP community. Demonstrate your good will and cooperative spirit. That's one thing I attempt to do and have done every year for many years.

Then there is *the importance of dialogue*— the importance of staying in communication. It is far, far too easy to step aside and avoid the "conversation" that's occurring in the NLP field. And that's especially true for those groups that are so exclusive and judgment, who do "pure" NLP in contrast to all the rest of us who don't meet their levels of "purity." I engaged some of that camp

recently at the NLP Conference in London. For the first half hour, I just listened. I listened to one guy's judgments of the field, his judgment against any so-called "NLP" person who had not studied in their camp, and against people like myself who were "contaminating" NLP with new stuff not sanctioned by their guru. I listened respectfully for over 30 minutes. It was hard, but patience won the day.

When he had pretty much got all of that off his chest, I then asked if I could ask some questions. When I got the green light, I began asking about the when and what of his criteria regarding what made up "pure" NLP. I asked who appointed so-and-so the guru who made those decisions? I asked if he conferred with the other co-developers about assuming the right to do that. With each question, I had to do more listening, which I did. And that led to new questions which I asked.

Altogether it took 90 minutes, but after that the guys began to relax and we began laughing together about some of the silly things that emerged as we talked. And at the end, I told them to pass on my regards to so-and-so and wished them well. They both said they were surprised by me, that I was more likeable than they expected (! which made me wonder what they had been told!), and that I had made "some points that they would think about."

Now who knows what good may come out of that. Maybe none. But I felt that at least there was a human touch, there was some dialogue, there was some decent conversation. I invited them to read some of the critiques I had written on the subjects they brought up (which they didn't even know existed).

A spirit of cooperation cannot emerge when people are in isolation of each other. If we isolate ourselves, there will be no conversation and without conversation, no dialogue. So that's at least one beginning place.

Another is to more authentically operate from the position and frame of *abundance*. If we act as if there's scarcity and fight over "my" clients, "my" people, "my" participants, we deny one of the basic tenets of NLP and Self-Actualization Psychology. Now I think I know the key reason some trainers will work hard to actually hide the fact that there are *other NLP trainers out there* —they are afraid that they will be compared and will fall short in terms of competence!

So, operating out of a sense of their own inferiority, they boaster themselves as "the best," the "purest," the "special," and will not encourage their participants to experience training by others. Conversely, if you're good, if you know what you're doing—the excellence of someone else takes nothing away from you. Conversely, their skills actually add to NLP and what we can do with NLP. After all, don't we encourage differences, the unique gifts of each person? Another person's unique skills enriches me and this field. And unless I'm suffering from a paranoid inferiority, I will be proud to recommend others even if they do not agree entirely with me. Surely it's time to outgrow that childish attitude, isn't it?

Collaboration is a possibility and an essential one. Make we all do what we can to move this field to one of increasing collaboration!

FROM NLP TO NEURO-SEMANTICS
Part I

"Why 'Neuro-Semantics?' What does Neuro-Semantics offers that NLP does not? What would you say is the biggest difference?"

These were some of the questions that were asked by quite a number of people of myself and of Colin Cox and Lena Gray when we were all at the NLP Conference in London in November. Nor are these questions uncommon. Typically I am asked one or more of these questions every week. So as we begin a new year, I thought I'd begin with these questions, especially for everyone new to this egroup. For some unknown reason over a hundred people have joined *Neurons* (this egroup) just in the last month! And the number of people joining seems to be increasing as an exponential rate.

So, *Why Neuro-Semantics?* Primarily because we believe *so much* in the value and benefits of Neuro-Linguistic Programming *and* because we are so displeased with what has generally happened to NLP as a field. What began as a great idea, an idea whose time had really come in the 1970s, has proven very sad and unfortunate. After 35 years, the "field" (if we can even call it that) has no standards, no international body that governs it, no code of ethics, no self-policing, and no one who seems able to pull the field together.

And yet, the idea of *modeling the best examples of excellence in human experiences* and making those models available to others remains a truly powerful and inspirational idea. It is what originally sold me on NLP. NLP began as a study of "the structure of subjective experience" to quote the subtitle on the book that Robert Dilts put together as the first formal book on the subject (*NLP Volume I,* 1980).

Now a wonder, and surprising, fact about NLP is that NLP did not start out as a psychology, it started out as a Communication Model. It started out as *the language patterns of three world-class communicators*— Fritz Perls, Virginia Satir, and Milton Erickson. It started out as a study of the structure of language, of how "the talking cure" of psychotherapy as practiced by that original trinity of therapists. There was a sense that there was magic in their words, in the way they listened, created relationship (rapport), and facilitated a remapping within the people with whom they worked.

So the first two NLP books were volumes I and II of *The Structure of Magic.* The term "magic" undoubtedly came from Gregory Bateson who made the comment that the linguistic symbols of language can work almost magically in that nearly anything can stand for and represent anything

else. But unfortunately the word "magic" also conveyed other ideas to people which led some NLP people to misunderstand that NLP is first and foremost a Communication Model. Last year in a Professional Coaching Journal (published in London) I debated this seemingly simple fact with a person who claims to be a NLP Trainer!

That makes me wonder. How many NLP-ers don't know that *NLP is a Communication Model*? And that makes me wonder *what* are some NLP trainers teaching in NLP Practitioner and Master Practitioner? The *Meta-Model of Language in Therapy* was the first NLP model created. And yet today I meet lots of "practitioners" who were not taught the Meta-Model during Prac.!

I write all of that to say that Neuro-Semantics is also fundamentally a *communication model.* And we fully teach the Meta-Model as the beginning place, as the foundation for understanding how language works neurologically to create our mental maps about the world. Yes, language involves grammar, but in NLP and Neuro-Semantics our focus is on the *neurology* of language. That is, our focus is on *how we experience language in our bodies via our nervous systems.*

What this means practically is that our focus is not on "proper" grammar so much as on what that grammar *does* inside us. How does it affect you? What states does it create? What emotions? What skills and competencies? What limitations and interferences? For us, our interest is on the *neuro-semantic* and *neuro-linguistic* effect of grammar. That's because we communicate from state (our state) to state (to the states of the ones listening).

And the genius of NLP was the discovery of the *languages of the mind*— that we "make sense" of words by *re-presenting* them in our minds. Visually we make pictures, auditorially we hear sounds and words, kinesthetically we feel sensations and movements, and so with our "senses" we make sense by presenting to ourselves again (representing) things that we have seen, heard, felt, smelt, and tasted. These are our sensory representational systems. Then there is the meta-representational systems of words and various symbolic systems (the auditory and visual digital systems).

This is where we start here in Neuro-Semantics, but we do not end there. And while the Grinder camp of NLP continues his reductionist approach, giving up more and more of the Meta-Model distinctions, we know that mastery is in the distinctions. And that's why I added 9 additional distinctions in my book on the Meta-Model— *Communication Magic.* I found most of them in Alfred Korzybski's original work, *Science and Sanity,* distinctions that were not originally brought over into the Meta-Model.

Nor do we stop there. Above the first level of sensory representation and above the second level of meta-representations, the unique kind of brain we have— our self-reflexive consciousness— we can, and do, set layer upon layer of additional levels. And that introduces the systemic nature of our meta-states into the picture—something that those still stuck in traditional NLP do not know about. And yet it is in those higher levels of "communication" (the "communication world" as Bateson called it) that the true magic of NLP occurs. And that's at the heart of what Neuro-Semantics brings to NLP that takes it to a whole new level of modeling.

THE NEURO-SEMANTIC DIFFERENCE
Part II

"Why 'Neuro-Semantics?' What does Neuro-Semantics offers that NLP does not? What would you say is the biggest difference?"

From the communication model of NLP, the biggest difference that Neuro-Semantics makes for NLP is *the modeling of reflexivity.* Prior to the Meta-States Model, and since then, NLP had only modeled one aspect of "mind" —the representation mind (or Movie Mind). NLP never modeled, discussed, or even described self-reflexive consciousness. Yet this is the factor that makes *human consciousness* so special and so different.

Now isn't that strange? A disciplined that purported to model how the brain works so that people can "run their own brain" and manage their own state never even described the most unique feature of the human mind! When I was with Richard Bandler, the only times I ever heard him speak about this facet of consciousness was when he made jokes about people "going around in circles or spirals." "And we have lost people that way!" Nice joke. Poor psychology.

In fact, in reading both Alfred Korzybski (*Science and Sanity*) and Gregory Bateson (*Toward an Ecology of Mind; Mind and Nature*) in the early 1990s I became aware of that it is our *self-reflexive consciousness* that uniquely distinguishes our form of mind. And yet, in all of NLP that facet of consciousness has not only *not* been modeled, it has been completely ignored, or as in Bandler's case, dismissed.

Now you know what the Meta-States Model uniquely models—that's right, *self-reflexive consciousness!* Of course, not every NLP trainer knows that. Recently, a friend sent me a critique that Chris Collingsworth wrote in which he asserted that he thinks that Meta-States is just some re-packaging of time-lines and logical levels. Amazing that he would actually write something like that publically and so openly display his ignorance of Meta-States! Whenever I write a critique of something that I want to disagree with, at least I read everything I can about the subject so that I whatever I write is informed.

The one-line criticisms of Collingsworth comes from having never read the book or attended a Meta-States Training. So no wonder he doesn't know what a "meta-state" is nor what the Meta-States Model models. (Actually I don't mean to pick on him, this disease is rampant among many NLP trainers, but Chris has done it publically as you can see on the following link: http://ia-nlp.org/pdfdocs/ianlp-e-Accelerated-Learning.pdf).

What is self-reflexivity consciousness and what is it about reflexivity that makes it so unique in our form of consciousness? Glad you asked! *Reflexivity* refers to the fact that when you *think*, when you *process* information, when you *construct meaning* from words, events, experiences, feelings, etc. *you never just think once.* For humans, that's impossible! You *think* and then you *think* about your thinking. You *feel* and then you have *feelings* about your feelings. You draw conclusions, and then conclusions about those conclusions, and then more conclusions about all of those conclusions and so on again and again, layer upon layer. Your meaning-making never stops at the first level, or the second, or the third, it continues on and on. And every time you revisit a thought, feeling, experience, memory, imagination, decision, intention, etc., you keep laying more thoughts-and-feelings upon it. This is reflexivity.

You, like me and all of us, are a class of life that reflects on our experiences and we keep doing so. Korzybski's *Science and Sanity* devotes a lot of attention to this facet of the human mind and he concludes by saying that this is an infinite process. Bateson notes from his study of dolphins in Hawaii that these highly intelligent animals may "jump one or even two logical levels," but then they stop. In fact, all animals, at some point, stop. After only one or two jumps, all animals stop reflecting upon their own experiences.

But not us! Not us humans. We continue, and can continue, without an end of our reflecting. This describes the very unique characteristic of our mind, the one that leaves *our mind open at the top end.* And this means several things incredibly important and which are fundational in Neuro-Semantics:

> *Whatever you think, you are not stuck there—you can think again!*
> *However stuck you feel in your thoughts or feelings—you can always step back one more time and gain an even larger perspective!*
> *You are always just one step away from transformation.*
> *If you don't use your reflexivity wisely, it can create life as a living hell!*
> *If you don't know how to climb the meaning ladder, you will feel a victim of the meanings given to you.*
> *If you discover how to climb the meaning ladder, you become a powerful creator of meaning.*
> *It's in using your self-reflexive consciousness that you build up an empowering Matrix of belief frames.*
> *Following the energy of a person's thoughts-and-emotions is recognizing that how that person uses his or her reflexivity determines their interpretative style and quality of life.*

And there's more, much more. And some NLP trainers think that the Meta-States Model is a re-packaging of time-lines! Give me a break! What a statement of utter ignorance and one that just locks a person into that ignorance.

It is your reflexivity as a mental-emotional process that determines how you create your highest and most complex mental maps, which in turn determines your skills, competencies, expertise, quality of life, and self-actualization. And it is the Meta-States Model that *models* human self-reflexive consciousness. Now, who wants a copy of *Meta-States* (2007, $45 hardback)?

THE NEURO-SEMANTIC DIFFERENCE
Part III

"Why 'Neuro-Semantics?' What does Neuro-Semantics offers that NLP does not? What would you say is the biggest difference?"

If human *self-reflexive consciousness* is the unique kind of "mind" which the Meta-States Model focuses on and *models*, then what else does reflexivity mean besides the ever-continuous layering that creates the complexity of our minds? The answer is simple to say, difficult to comprehend, and almost impossible to describe. But I'll give it a go:

> The answer is that *human reflexivity makes our mind-body-emotion system within our family, language, business, cultural systems completely systemic.*

There, that's simple. Right? Well, not exactly. In developing and formatting the Meta-States model, I have tried for years to find and use various words and metaphors to explain the systemic nature of reflexivity. But that's quite challenging. For one thing, *as* you are *thinking or feeling* something at one level, you are *simultaneously* thinking and feeling other things at higher levels about the first thing. Now multiply that times 7 or 10 or more layers and you begin to get a sense of the complexity of human consciousness. And it is your reflexivity that creates the wondrous complexity of human experiences and emotional states.

Not only are you *responding to you* at multiple levels at the same time, but you are also simultaneously responding to multiple messages from people and events outside of you. This means that both communication loops are in play. While you are using your *vertical loop of feedback* to yourself (called "thinking" or "believing" etc.) *and feed forwarding* those thoughts and emotions into your body (called "emoting," "feeling," embodying, etc.) you are also using your *horizontal loop of receiving feedback* from people and events (called "seeing," "hearing" listening, noticing, etc.) *and feeding forward* energy to those people and events (called "responding," speaking, acting, reacting, etc.).

Wow! All of that is occurring simultaneously. Talk about a complex system all in action at the same time. Now how to we model all of that? And how do we talk about our modeling of all of that?

In the Meta-States Model, I have and others have, developed a wide variety of metaphors to help explain this and give a visual image of it. Those that are most prominent are the following: spinning, spiraling, living within a canopy of consciousness, the Matrix, following the energy

through the Matrix, seeing how far the rabbit hole goes, etc. To think systemically is to think and imaginative view the whole system, in this case, the system of a person with a mind-body-emotion responsiveness to the world of people, events, influences, a person who moves through time, and who engages people and events intentionally.

This is where NLP is far too simplistic. Even though NLP came out of several systems models such as Virginia Satir's Family Systems, Bateson's systems, Korzybski's, even Miller's TOTE model system— NLP has tended to be reductionistic (Grinder's influence on things) and downplay systemic thinking and responding. This has caused NLP in many parts of the world to be very linear in the presentation of the model and with a focus on techniques.

Many of the key thinkers in the field of systems like Peter Senge use various forms of circles and arrows to try to map out the ever-changing territory of a system. That's the problem with a non-linear model— *the territory keeps changing because the system itself is self-changing, self-influencing, and self-interfering.* So to think and work systemically, you have to not only trace out the variables and processes, but take into consideration the influence you are generating as you enter the system. The systems principle is that you cannot *not* influence the system that you engage!

NLP reduced to a set of techniques misses all of this. And there are a great many people who treat NLP as just *a set of techniques*. Their thinking is: "Do this to a person, or say that, and they will respond this way or that way." And this, of course, is what reduces NLP in the hands of some people to a set of manipulations.

But, thank God, *people are not so simple or so easy.* That's why when we test and experiment in psychology we use complicated double-blind and triple-blind studies. Why? Because people are devious? No. It's because of the mere fact that if a person *knows* you are studying them, that knowledge itself *changes* the study. They will behave differently. That was the ultimate discovery in the original Hawthorne Studies. When they went into Westinghouse to study employees and what would improve employee satisfaction and engagement, they made the lights brighter and things improved. They dimmed the lights and things improved. They gave longer breaks and the people's attitudes improved. They gave shorter breaks and the people's attitudes improved. In fact, everything they did caused things to improved!

After awhile they realized that it was not the lights, the breaks, the actions of the managers, etc., *it was the attention.* Pay attention to people in any way and they will read that as care, as that they are important, that what they are doing is significant and they will be more pleased and effective! That's the way it is with human systems. Even studying a human system influences it no matter how careful you are to try to not influence it.

NLP as mere techniques probably explains why my book, *The Sourcebook of Magic,* is such a best seller. It's a book that has a list of 77 NLP patterns (including just a few Meta-State patterns). When I put that book together I did not know that there were people who treated NLP as something that you "*do* to someone to get a particular response."

The problem is that people don't like being manipulated, and once they discover a manipulation, they will not allow the manipulation to work— even if in doing so is to their own detriment. Do you? Of course not. So even if the "manipulation" is to your benefit, just for *the principle* of your own self-determination, you will resist it. We all do. And that's why simplistic, linear, technique driven NLP only works in a Guru context where people are tricked, deceived, and seduced to give their power away to a Guru, or it only works for the first few times until people catch on. Then it stops working!

And why? Because of the self-reflexive consciousness of people. People catch on! The trick that creates the deception is seen for what it is and the seduction ceases to work— that's why. And so everyone who is using that form of reductionistic, simplistic, linear, technique-driven NLP is accused of "manipulating." What's the solution? I'll write about that in the next *Meta Reflection.*

THE NEURO-SEMANTIC DIFFERENCE
Part IV

"Why 'Neuro-Semantics?' What does Neuro-Semantics offers that NLP does not? What would you say is the biggest difference?"

In the last *Meta Reflection* I promised to write about the solution that will cure the reductionistic, simplistic, linear, technique-driven forms of NLP that are given to using NLP in manipulative ways. Now to deliver on that promise.

The solution actually involves several things — minimally it involves the following:
      1) Think and work systemically with the human system.
      2) Work with respect and care of people.
      3) Work with the higher and highest frames of people.

The first item warns that we should never treat *people* as if they are *things* to manipulate. They are not. *Things* can be manipulated— "handled" efficiently. People cannot. People have to be *related to as persons,* and not handled as if impersonal things. Do that and stand back and watch the anger, frustration, stress, fear, and other negative emotions arise! With human beings, we have to *relate to them as persons of value and significance.* Violate that principle and you will not be able to understand the actions and responses of people or get along very well with them.

So we start with rapport—with connecting mentally and emotionally with people so as to seek to understand them and support them as persons, respecting their values, beliefs, and world-view. Rapport is the way into another person's reality. *But if you treat rapport as a technique,* you are back where you started! Rapport-as-a-technique is a reductionistic attempt to short-cut the process and merely operate on-the-surface without encountering *the person* heart-to-heart. And this is the problem with a lot of superficial, linear, technique-driven NLP.

Just because you can learn how to pretty quickly gain rapport with another person does not create what is called "instant rapport" in spite of NLP books, promotional materials, and websites that promise such. I am now convinced that we should stop making such promises. Yes we can teach a person the required things to do and say that matches or paces another person and that is part of the external behaviors of rapport. But if there is not an attitude of respect and care and compassion in the person doing these things— the "rapport" will eventually be seen as superficial, shallow, and manipulative. Those who teach such things are short-circuiting *the person* and the

inner attitude which are essential for it to be real and authentic for the long-term. At best it can only create a short-term results. And those short-term results will soon fall apart. And that's the difference between traditional NLP and Neuro-Semantics. It is not only *what you do* that makes NLP effective and successful as a tool, it is *who you are as a person* and your higher level attitudes (your meta-states).

That's why "competency" in Neuro-Semantics involves both. We care just as much (actually more) about *who you are* as what you are able to *do.* Merely being able to *do,* without *being* a decent human being, is just another path to being ineffective. Ultimately, it is in setting your own personal frames of respect, care, and compassion that enables you to *be* a respectful, caring, and compassionate *person.* Then what you *do* is able to convey that. Then when you match behaviors and words and pace another person it creates a significant connection. It creates an *I-thou relationship* rather than an I-it one.

The NLP pattern of "instant rapport" is sorely and disastrously used when it is used by a person *to get something from someone or to use that person for some advantage.* In Neuro-Semantics we consider that an ethical violation of the principles of NLP. And we will confront and address the person among us who does such. Why? Because that's *not* what we are about. But in the field of NLP generally, there is no other body or organization that does that.

It is the higher frames of a person's meta-states that creates and governs the mental-emotional dynamic that we call "attitude." This is also what the Meta-States Model *models.* With the meta-layering of beliefs, decisions, intentions, permissions, understandings, identities, etc., *we are able to fully model the construction of an attitude.* And we can not only model it, we can treat the "attitude" as a meta-state strategy that we can then refine, streamline, and enrich. That's why we often train the introduction to Meta-States, the APG training, as "Kick Starting Your Attitude," because we can!

With the Meta-States Model we think of the human system as a *system* of many interactive parts and variables and so as we work with new behavior on the level of performance (matching, pacing) we simultaneously work on the level of meaning (respect, care, and compassion for the person). Together these enable the actualization of the highest and best in a person for connecting to others and creating a relationship rich enough and robust enough to collaborate effectively.

This is the Neuro-Semantic difference that the Meta-States Model offers. We can now identify and work with the highest frames of people, the belief frames that govern their intentions, designs, and understandings.

THE NEURO-SEMANTIC DIFFERENCE
Part V

"Why 'Neuro-Semantics?' What does Neuro-Semantics offers that NLP does not? What would you say is the biggest difference?"

In explaining the difference that Neuro-Semantics has brought to the field of NLP, one of the newest developments is an understanding of the historical position of NLP. After I discovered this, I wrote about it in various articles and books on Self-Actualization Psychology. You can find the articles on the website www.self-actualizing.org and in the book, *Self-Actualization Psychology* (2008). I also presented it to four different NLP Conferences from 2007 through 2009 as well as a chapter in *Neuro-Linguistic Programming: Concepts and Applications* (2008).

And what is the position of NLP historically? We know that, historically, it arose in southern California during the early 1970s from the encounter that Richard Bandler had with the materials of Fritz Perls as he listened to tapes and transcribed them for a book and then his encounter with Virginia Satir, similarly making transcripts of her work. The language patterns that he found and replicated were then analyzed by John Grinder using Transformational Grammar (TG) distinctions. Together this gave birth to *The Meta-Model of Language in Therapy* as recorded in "The Structure of Magic" Volumes I and II, 1975, 1976.

Further, because TG was part of the emerging Cognitive psychology movement that was being led by Noam Chomsky, George Miller, Eugene Gallanter, and Karl Pribram, the Cognitive Revolution informed and governed the early development of NLP. Grinder did his doctorate in TG and even wrote a book on TG with Suzanne Elgin (*A Guide to Transformational Grammmarm* 1973). Then together Bandler and Grinder used George Miller's developments of the TOTE model as their template for identifying "strategies" within the structure of experience.

Gregory Bateson then encouraged them to study the language patterns of Milton Erickson, after that came the "Gesalt Class" that Richard ran at the University as a student which turned into the first NLP study group. And that, in turn, gave birth to the movement and field. Out of that class came the first group of NLP leaders and trainers as they were inventing it as they went— Robert Dilts, Judith DeLozier, Leslie Cameron-Bandler, David Gordon, Terry McClintock, Steve Gilligan, Frank Pucelik, Bryon Lewis, etc.

That's the usual "NLP History" that's in the great majority of books on NLP. But where did

Perls, Satir, Bateson, and Erickson get their ideas? What was the larger historical perspective? If we step back just a little bit— they were all part of a larger historical movement there in California, *the Human Potential Movement* (HPM). In fact, just up the road from Santa Cruz was Esalen which Michael Murphy and Richard Price created in 1962 when they purchased the property. Then in 1963 Fritz Perls moved onto the property to become the first "scholar-in-residence." In 1964 Virginia Satir moved there to live as the first Director of Training and Development at Esalen. And in 1964 Gregory Bateson delivered the second workshop at Esalen and later moved there as the last "scholar-in-residence." That's also where he died.

So there you have it—
> *The Whos Who of the Experts that NLP modeled to launch the movement were all living and working together many, many years prior to Bandler and Grinder as some of the second and third generation of leaders in the Human Potential Movement.*

How about that! And if they were second and third generation leaders, then who were the pioneers of the HPM? Abraham Maslow primarily, then Carl Rogers, and then other key thinkers as Rollo May, Eric Fromm, Roberto Assagioli, Viktor Frankl, James Bugental, Evert Shostrum, Will Shultz, etc. And way back in 1937 Maslow was the person who began *modeling self-actualizing people.* And the first two individuals who stood out as excellent characters of the best in human kind were Max Wertheimer and Ruth Benedict. And it was Maslow who almost single-handedly created the paradigm shift in the field of Psychology from studying sickness and pathology to studying health and excellence.

And what does all of this mean for NLP today? It identifies where NLP sits historically— *NLP is a step-child of the HPM.* NLP got its basic "presuppositions" from the Self-Actualization Psychology of Maslow and Rogers. NLP with its emphasis on modeling human greatness for communication excellence is actually positioned within a much larger perspective— the development and unleashing of human potential with the *human potential movement.* It is actually within the *humanistic* movement that emphasizes the *humanity* of persons — in contrast to treating people impersonally as tools or technology.

So NLP arose from two movements— the Growth Movement of Maslow and Rogers (that later became known as the Human Potential Movement in the 1960s) and the Cognitive Psychology Movement. That's why NLP is often put in the chapter on Cognitive Psychology in textbooks.

What does all of this mean for NLP today? It means that NLP people, and especially Trainers, need to lift their eyes and minds to the larger frame, the larger perspective of what NLP is about —it is about the ongoing development of the best in human nature. It is part of a psychological perspective. It means that NLP comes out of an ethical movement in psychology to make sure that psychology is *person focused* (in contrast to the Behaviorist approach of Watson and Skinner). And when NLP people fully know this, then we can begin to stop and/or correct the mis-use of NLP and the unethical practices.

THE NEURO-SEMANTIC DIFFERENCE
Part VI

"Why 'Neuro-Semantics?' What does Neuro-Semantics offers that NLP does not? What would you say is the biggest difference?"

There's another difference I want to mention. And it goes to the systemic nature of Neuro-Semantics that I've been describing that results from the Meta-State Model. Now while NLP is "systemic," to some extent, it is just so on a surface level. And this is a sad development. After all, NLP emerged from the "family system" therapy of Satir and from the system approach in Korzybski (the non-Aristotlian system) and from the systemic thinking of Bateson. And yet for all of that, the way NLP is mostly taught around the world is very linear and simplistic.

Now, as with most things, there's exceptions to this. Robert Dilts has attempted to introduce into NLP several systems models, as has O'Connor and Ian McDermott, as well as others. And yet, most NLP practitioners *think* and *talk* in linear terms... following the Strategy model: first make a picture, then say these words, then feel this feeling, now let's anchor that, okay, future pace and we're done.

By contrast, learning Neuro-Semantics involves a much more systemic approach and one that involves many system words and processes: simultanenality, hyphenating words, both-and framing, etc.

Hypenating
First, we begin by adopting the language of systems by using a hyphen when we talk about thoughts-feelings, mind-body, thinking-doing, etc. This comes from Alfred Korzybski and the Meta-Model distinction that he offered of using the hyphen to re-connect words that are especially systemic, we more consciously and intentionally try to use a systemic language. And by doing that, to avoid falling into the linear thinking of talking about "thoughts," "emotions," "cognitions," etc. as if they were separate elements and could be separated. They are not and cannot be spoken in such "elementalism" without confusion.

Stepping in and Stepping Out of States
Then there is the shift from talking about states and emotions. You will notice that most of us do *not* use the over-simplified NLP language of "association" – "dissociation." This language comes from psychiatry, and especially from the sub-field of the Dissociative Personality Disorders. There they talk about people as "dissociated" and suffering from "dissociation." That's why it

does a disservice to NLP to talk about "dissociating" a person as in the Movie Rewind Pattern. Talk that way, and people from that field will think you are not only ignorant and crazy, but doing real harm to people.

Further, you have to remember that this language is metaphorical. The actual fact is that no one is literally dissociated, no one is literally *outside of his or her body*. They may feel that they are; they may think that they are—but those are only thoughts and feelings, mental maps about such, not the fact. They are *in* their bodies and from inside they are breathing, standing, sitting, etc. A person with the label of "dissociative personality disorder" thinks and feels numb, strange, weird, and so makes judgments about themselves that they are crazy or literally out-of-the-body.

In Neuro-Semantics we avoid all of that language and talk more simply about *stepping into and out of* various states. If you are in a depressed state and *step out of it* you inevitably *step into some other state*— curiosity, witnessing, joy, playful, laughter, neutrality, etc. *You are always in a state!* You cannot be in no-state. You may not know what to call it. You may not like it, but you are always in a state. So you are always and continually *stepping in and out of states.*

Similarly, associate and disassociate are *relative terms.* Whenever you associate into one state you are always dis-associating and can do so with hundreds of other states. Whenever you step into one, you are stepping out of many, many others. So to keep things easier to track and simpler in concept, my recommendation is to speak in the metaphor of stepping in and out of various states.

Feelings and Meta-Feelings
Whenever you think, you are at the same time thinking *emotionally.* It's inevitable! There is no such thing as "pure" thinking. We humans have bodies and as long as we do, we will always and inevitably think somatically and think emotionally! So when you buy something, anything, you think emotionally as you buy. You think emotionally whenever you make any choice or decision. How something feels to you, the emotions associated with something moves you to choose it.

Now the conclusion some people make from this is that we have a "rational" brain and we have an "emotional" brain and the emotional brain always wins out. Oh, that human psychology was so simple! It is not. This is the same old dichotomy of mind versus emotions; mind versus body that has been around since Aristotle. It posits that mind and body are polar opposites. But again, they are not.

The mind arises from the brain of the body and is both rational and emotional at the same time. That's why we inevitably and always are meta-stating our states with emotions as well as thoughts, as well as with reasons and explanations and other "cognitive" stuff. If you think systemically about the mind-body-emotion system, you will save yourself (and others) a lot of elementalistic non-sense. You'll speak and then think as if the mind-body-emotion are part of a singular system rather than competing parts. This is a distinction that we have brought from Korzybski into Neuro-Semantics.

Responsible Accountability
Finally I'll mention the systemic thinking about responsibility. This is key in Neuro-Semantics. To empower ourselves and others, we highlight our four powers of response and that we are always *able to make these responses*. This put all of us "at cause" for our mapping of reality and the responses we make as a result. So we ask, "How have you contributed to this experience that you're having or reporting?"

As a higher level meta-state, "responsibility" empowers us to take ownership of our powers, to develop them into high level competencies, and to respect the response-abilities of others. We are responsible *for* our responses and *to* others. The first creates accountability, the second relationships. Now we can positively welcome and use feedback from others as part of the system of interactions.

From: L. Michael Hall
Report on NSTT — Hong Kong
Feb. 1, 2010

NSTT — 2010

As you probably already know —*Trainers' Training for NLP and Neuro-Semantics* generally occurs once a year, every year. I say generally because last year (2009) we did not run NSTT. That was due to the recession and the low numbers who applied for the training. This year (2010) is different. This year we are not only running NSTT once, but twice— once in Hong Kong and once in Colorado USA.

Here in Hong Kong we also have introduced a new format for NSTT— as we are doing Trainers' Training in two parts. We have never done that before. And yesterday we completed Part I of NSTT—2010 Hong Kong. With 48 in the training, we have the largest group ever. And co-training this along with me was Colin Cox. And because Lena Gray has now entered into the Master Trainer Pathway, Lena was present as one of our benchmarks and also present to make some presentations (that we benchmarked for the next level). Also benchmarking were the three Neuro-Semantic Trainers that we have in Hong Kong — Mandy, Wilkie, and Salina.

Mandy Chai sponsored NSTT in Hong Kong. She and her staff of people provided a beautiful venue for the training. Most of the participants are based here in Hong Kong, but we also have people coming from many other places —two from Egypt, and one from the Netherlands, Indonesia, Malaysia, Japan, mainland China, and Qatar. And we also had people trained from just about every splinter group in NLP and that, of course, made for some very fascinating discussions.

With 48 participants, that enabled us to have 6 teams of 8 people. Four of the groups were English speaking and two of the groups Chinese speaking. Now each trainer-in-training made a presentation each day in their groups as well as a final presentation to the entire group on the last night. And while we provided benchmarks on 7 platform skills (group rapport, engagement, framing, metaphors, state induction, voice, spatial anchoring) and 4 training skills — the final benchmark for the competency scoring will occur in Part II. So in-between the two parts, each participant has a personalized Development Plan for working on his or her knowledge-base, skill development, experiences in trainings, etc. Of the 48, eight were already NLP trainers and some others were already trainers in other disciplines.

Colin and I co-trained this part and in June, Omar Salom (from Mexico) will be here to co-train Part II with me. And we have just confirmed that Colin and Lena will be returning as well. So Colin will join Omar and myself .... and we will find another place for Lena to do another presentation.

A group picture was taken and when I get it as a file, we will put it on the website or send it out. Part II of NSTT—Hong Kong occurs in June, June 4-10. And immediately following that is the next NSTT this year— NSTT—Colorado. The dates for that training is June 19 through July 3. Already I have received the registration and application of several people for that one.

If you are interested in becoming a NLP and Neuro-Semantic Trainer, then write to me privately and I'll send you the brochure on it and an application for that training. The prerequisites for the training is that you already have Certification as a NLP Practitioner, Master Practitioner, and a Meta-States Practitioner (APG training).

DR. PAUL EKMAN
AND META-STATES

I recently found a great description of meta-states. I was reading *Emotions Revealed: Recognizing faces and feelings to improve communication and emotional life* (2003/ 2007) by Paul Ekman. In the following quotation, Dr. Ekman describes a meta-state, he describes the structure of the *observing* meta-state that facilitates what Daniel Goleman and many others have popularize as emotional intelligence.

> "I have not been able to find a single term to describe this type of consciousness: the best I have been able to come up with is *attentively considering our emotional feelings.* (To avoid repeating the entire phrase I will sometimes abbreviate it by just using the term *attentive* or *attentiveness*, in italics.) When we are being *attentive*, as I mean it, we are able to observe ourselves during an emotional episode, ideally before more than a few seconds have passed. We recognize that we are being emotional and can consider whether or not our response is justified. We can reevaluate, reappraise, and if that is not successful, then direct what we say and do. This occurs while we are experiencing the emotion, as soon as we become conscious of our emotional feelings and actions.

Here he describes a "type of consciousness" that we know as a meta-cognition or meta-state. The specific meta-state is that of *attentively considering* one's feelings. And this meta-state enables you to move to choice point where you can evaluate your experience.

> "Most people are rarely so attentive to their emotional feelings, but such attentiveness is possible to achieve. I believe that we can develop the ability to be *attentive* so it will become a habit, a standard part of our lives. When that happens, we will feel more in touch, and better able to regulate our emotional life. There are many ways to develop this type of *attentiveness."* (p. 75)

Dr. Ekman here describes a habitual meta-state that enriches one's emotional life.

And why, you ask, was I reading Ekman's work on face recognition? For several reasons, I had it on my reading list for some years and because in December, while in Italy, Susana Eduini (a Meta-Coach from Sweden, 2009) brought the book to the training, turned to pages 69-70 and read the following:

> "Reevaluations are not the only way in which we may for a time bounce back and forth between different emotional responses. Tomkins [Ekman's mentor] pointed out that we often have affect-about-affect, emotional reactions to the emotion we initially feel. We may become angry that we were made afraid, or we may become afraid about having

become so angry. We could feel afraid of what we might do because we are feeling so sad. This linking of a second emotion with a first emotion can happen with any pair of emotions. Silvan Thomkins also suggested that one way of understanding the uniqueness of personality was to identify whether a person typically had a particular affect about another affect. He also suggested that sometimes we are not aware of our initial emotional reaction, we are aware only of our second emotion about the first emotion. We may not realize that we were afraid at first and be aware only of the anger that was aroused in response to the fear. Unfortunately, no one has done any research to determine the merit of these very interesting ideas."

Amazing, is that not? Dr. Ekman here speaks about meta-states and how they affect the uniqueness of personality. When I read that, Susana asked me if I knew about this. I did not. Later I asked Nicola to help me locate an email address for Paul Ekman, which he did! And with that I wrote and asked him if he was aware of my work in Meta-States and offered to send a copy of the book if he was interested. He wrote back and said that yes, he was interested. As of this date, the book has been sent.

The other word that he found for a meta-state was *mindfulness.* He defines such using a quotation from philosopher B. Alan Wallace, "the sense of being aware of what our mind is doing." Then he speaks about the ability to just observe an emotion like anger. He also quotes Georgia Nigro and Ulric Neisser [a key pioneer in the Cognitive movement] about remembering some memories — "one seems to have the position of an onlooker or observer, looking at the situation from an external vantage point and seeing oneself 'from the outside.'" He also mentions Ellen Langer's work on mindfulness (page 73). On the next page he quoted philosopher Peter Goldie on the term, *reflective consciousness*— being aware that one feels afraid (p. 74).

Ekman's work on emotions, on the subtle micro-expressions of emotions, and how they show up in the face, voice, physiology is now pretty much known worldwide. He has pioneered what we call in NLP "calibration to physiology" to a whole new level. And while he was influenced by Margaret Mead and Gregory Bateson *and* has lived in San Francisco for years— he shows no acquaintance with NLP; he certainly does not reference it at all (which actually is not all that surprising!).

In a chapter on anger,
> "When anger is intense, we may not initially know, or even want to know, that we have become angry. I am not referring to the failure to be *attentive to our emotional feelings.* It is not that we are unable to take a step back and consider whether we want to go along and act on our anger. Rather, we are not even aware of being angry, even though we are speaking angry words and engaging in angry actions." (p. 120)

Here Ekman describes meta-states as we do—stepping back so that we can choose our response. And that is one of the greatest benefits of knowing the Meta-States Model.

For Coaches

You think I detail things out! Well, read Paul Ekman and you'll see that I have a ways to go! To discover the facial expressions of sadness, for example, here's what he wrote, suggesting that you use a mirror.

> "Drop your mouth open. Pull the corners of your lips down. While you hold those lip corners down,, try now to raise your cheeks, as if you are squinting. This pulls against the lip corners. Maintain this tension between the raised cheeks and the lip corners pulling down. Let your eyes look downward and your upper eyelids droop." (P. 95)

Does this sound like the NLP idea of using and leading with physiology to induce state?

> "Our research shows that if you make these movements on your face, you will trigger changes in your physiology, both in your body and brain. If this happens to you, let the feelings grow as strongly as you can." (p. 96)

Fear

> "Imitate the facial movements of fear. Raise your upper eyelids as high as you can, and if you are able also slightly tense your lower eyelids; if tensing your lower eyelids interferes with raising your upper eyelids, then just focus on raising your upper eyelids. Let your jaw drop open, and stretch your lips horizontally back toward your ears; your mouth. If you can't do this after trying a few times, then just let your jaw hang open and don't try to stretch your lips horizontally. With your upper eyelids raised as high as you can; try to see if you can also pull your eyebrows together while you keep your brows raised." (p. 161)

APG IN EGYPT

This past week I have had a pretty unique experience as I delivered APG in Cairo Egypt. *Unique* because it was my first training in an Arab country and unique because of the sponsors of the training— three men of vision who see the need for bringing some high-quality NLP to Egypt. Two of the men that I spent time with in Egypt are now in the process of becoming Neuro-Semantic Trainers and the third is planning to do the same. Mohammad Tarek of *Lucid Trainings* and Mustafa El-Masy of *Applied NLP Academy* along with Mohammed Addul-Kawy of Alexandria.

In January I met Mustafa and Mohammad (of Alexandria) in Hong Kong for the first part of the Trainers Training and got acquainted first-hand with their passion and commitment to Egypt, to NLP, and to Neuro-Semantics. What I didn't know previously was the extent of the problems that NLP has suffered in Egypt at the hands of some inadequately trained trainers whose primary motive seems to be to use NLP for getting money and a sense of power over others.

This is really sad and is all around the world. This result in a lot of very low grade quality NLP so that already NLP does not have a good reputation in Egypt. Mohammad Tarek was telling me that as a computer programmer, when he taught at the University in Alexandria, he would teach the communication model of NLP but never, but never call it NLP. If they found out, they would have discredited his work; otherwise, they loved what he taught! I wish this was the exception, but sadly it occurs in every country I have visited.

Anyway, Mustafa was diligent and searched the field to find some high quality NLP. Eventually he found Neuro-Semantics and introduced it to the others. Then, delight of delight, he and Mohammad Tarek cooperated to put this training together. I love that.

We had a good group of people for the first training, 70-plus, eight or more trainers, many practitioners and a good group of new people interested mainly in self-development. Yet what I experienced was a real mixture—there was a big group of people totally passionate about NLP and Meta-States. They were so passionate in fact that I was literally inundated by questions and requests from the time we started each day to the ending so that I never got a break (which is fine, that's what I'm there for!). And they asked questions upon questions— and most very personal and intimate questions about applying the patterns to themselves, their families, and their work. Now strangely, at the same time there was a small group of "practitioners" who acted like they knew it all and never even bothered to do the processes! Ah the ones who have never studied a model about *self-reflexive consciousness* who already knows it all! I've met them before.

A TV camera group came to the training on the first day to get clips that they later used when I did a live appearance on the channel. This was set up by Ayman Mahmoud, a young man that I have corresponded with for years and who has translated many of my articles in Arabic on some websites. There were also other media interviews with radio and journalists for newspapers that he set up. It's always good to experience my "expertise" rising by leaps and bounds by the fantastic variable of distance— the farther from home, the more of an expert I become! I ought to write an article about it, who needs study and competence when all you need is geographical distance to become an "expert," or so it seems.

I had never been to Cairo before and while I have seen some wild traffic— Mexico City comes to mind, so does Moscow, Cairo takes the prize for being the craziest and worst and most dangerous. I was okay with and used to the fact that 3 lanes means 5 lanes of cars and 5 lanes means 7, that's the way it is many places. But I had not seen hundreds and hundreds of people stepping out into 5 and 6 lanes of traffic dodging cars as I saw in Cairo. I even saw women carrying babies across such lanes of cars dodging, turning, twisting, and aggressively fighting for every inch of space! And not only during the day when at least you could see human beings in the middle of the freeway, but at night!! Mohammad did all the driving and kept reassure me, "Don't *worry!*" he kept saying! So I did— worry that is.

And horns, I did not now that a person could drive a car with a horn. Or that you could send multiple messages with your horn, "I see you," "Get out of the way," "What the hell are you doing?" I was even more surprised to observe thousands upon thousands of cars driven by various tunes, messages, and melodies.

And Arab time — I thought the Mexicans, Spaniards, and Italians had the award for being "in time" and thinking time was a totally optional concept for being effective. No longer. I give the award to the Eygptians! "We will start at 9 am., right?" I asked Mustafa. "Yes, yes, sure. Well, maybe 9:10 to make sure everybody arrives." At 9:30 I asked again, "Yes, just ten minutes." At 10 am I asked, "Yes, just ten minutes." I think that I have learned that "ten minutes" to an Egyptian actually means 40 minutes or even 2 hours!

I had several interviews while there. And everywhere I find that reporters are a strange breed. I have been interviewed so often now that I can now tell precisely the very language that reporters will use, especially if they have not done their homework, but are just trying to get another quick "human interest" story. They always ask a very broad question and then was quantitative evidence.

> "So you in Neuro-Semantics work to help people succeed in weight management, emotional intelligence, leadership, relationships, the creation of wealth, self-actualization of companies, and everything else that you do in Neuro-Semantics, can you give our listeners one technique that can do all of that, keeping it really simple, in a minute or two? What is your best testimonies for that?"

Don't you love it?! Try to answer that one! I got that this past week. To narrow things a bit (!) I asked for a specific example that she would be interested in. "What results do you want?" She

said weight management, "I want to have lots of energy and be fit and thin. So what one technique will help me?" Of course, she was going too fast so I slowed her down and asked if I could have a "transformational conversation" with her. She wondered what that was. I said "a conversation that will be life-changing. Now it will be fierce, I will probe to get to the heart of things with what you want to change, are you sure you're ready for this?" She nodded.

So I began a conversation that she agreed was uncomfortable, thought-provoking, intense, personal, and very quickly at the heart of the variables of change. I found her pattern within 90 seconds, feed it back to her four times. She wanted to stop! It was too much. She wanted the results (slim body, fitness, energy), she wasn't ready to pay the price "so no to tempting foods, exercise regularly." And that's fine. That's great. Now she knows and has few excuses.

Then there were two participants who are in the process of making a movie. "We are making a movie that's an Egyptian version of 'The Secret,' and we want to interview you." Well, thanks but no thanks. I don't care to add to the illusion and cause of dis-illusion of that kind of shallow non-sense. "Well, it's not like that." "What about all the pseudo-science in 'The Secret?'" "No, no, we don't have that; and besides, you can say whatever you want to say." So I did. It will be interesting what they keep in it.

Sightseeing? Did I see any sights? Well, not many. One day Mohammad Addul and I enjoyed the traffic jam on the Sixth of October bridge for several hours! That allowed me to see the city; and we tried to get to the Pyramids, but they had been shut down for Diplomats from Italy. We did get to see the laser light show, which was great.

Here's to the heart, the passion, and the commitment of the men who made this possible, to their staff of people who are seeking to bring high-quality NLP and Neuro-Semantics to Egypt! I found them to be people of faith, of integrity, fun, and vision.

THE VISION OF
ACTUALIZING EXCELLENCE

The byline for Neuro-Semantics is *Actualizing Excellence*. The leadership team came up with those two words in January, two words that summarize our vision and our mission. And for us it provides a very succinct code that's full of meaning— and I'm speaking about meaning that generates a lot of energy, passion, and vitality for us. To discover that all you have to do is speak to a Neuro-Semanticist!

Actualizing

Actualizing is a special term for us because it lies at the heart of what we are seeking to do in Neuro-Semantics— actualize our highest and most valuable meanings into actual performance in everyday life. *Actualizing* speaks about making real what is only potential, it is making real to the point of embodying what we know in our minds conceptually so we can close the knowing-doing gap. And this comes from the Self-Actualization Psychology that informs what we are doing and our beliefs about human nature and human beings. In Neuro-Semantics we have found many, many ways to achieve peak performance and translate from mind to body. That's what we do because if we don't "apply to self" then it is just information, not reality.

Excellence

The goal of the actualizing is *excellence* and this is the very theme that initiated NLP in the beginning— when Richard and John began modeling the *excellence* that they found in three world-class communicators. And once they did that, that very process resulted in the Meta-Model of Language which gave them one of the central tools that allow us to then model more examples of excellence.

Neuro-Semantics started in a similar way with the modeling of resilience because out of that came the Meta-States Model, a model that took NLP to a whole new level. Whereas NLP modeled the basic structures of how we think and represent, Meta-States tapped into and modeled how our mind inherently is self-reflexive. So *Meta-States model the self-reflexivity of consciousness* and so mapped out, for the first time, the actual structure of the "logical levels" and the higher levels of consciousness.

Other modeling tools have emerged since then: the Matrix Model, the Self-Actualization Quadrants. And so, while modeling has mostly become a lost theme in the field of NLP, it is still

very much alive in Neuro-Semantics which explains the constant development of new models and patterns in Neuro-Semantics.

And with the Meta-States Model we are now able to model *excellence* in complex states such as resilience —long-term and intricate experiences that do not occur in just a single moment, but occurs over time— things like leadership, coaching, a solid sense of self, proactivity, responsibility, and a thousand other of the richest states we humans can experience.

Excellence also reflects the theme of "the bright-side of human nature" that Maslow and Rogers and the others of the first Human Potential Movement launched in the 1950s through the 1980s out of which NLP itself emerged. And now in Neuro-Semantics we have launched a second Human Potential Movement — one for the twenty-first century.

The Vision of Actualizing Excellence
Our vision is to not only use this upgraded version of NLP to enable people to "run their own brains" and manage their own states (that obviously is first, self-leadership), but our vision is much bigger. We want to empower people to access their finest and highest meaning-making skills so they can rise up to become everything they can become, to unleash all of their potentials. And when they do that, we want to take that to families, schools, companies, and countries. We want to facilitate the next level development of self-actualizing leaders, companies, politicians so that we change the very structures in our world.

It's a big vision and so we need lots and lots of visionary men and women who will help us to lead to this future. And that's what *Trainers' Training* (NSTT) is designed to facilitate— to enable those who share this vision to learn how to stand up and speak up in a way that they can empower others to actualize their excellence.

Neuro-Semantic Trainers' Training (NSTT) first focuses on platform skills— the competencies that enable you to stand up, engage a group of people and professionally communicate in such a way that you win their minds and hearts. Here we apply the principles and tools that enable you to actualize your excellence in public speaking. We then shift to another skill-set, that of designing trainings so that people are able to experience the learnings and make them theirs. And after that, since the Meta-States Model is the flagship of Neuro-Semantics, we do three days on The Psychology of APG. This provides a solid grounding in the psychology that governs these processes of excellence.

We then end NSTT with a focus on business skills— competencies that are required to be able to turn all of this into a commercially viable business. This touches on the theme of business excellence. I say touch on it because in the past years this has been one of my themes as I've been working with companies and businesses apply the principles of self-actualization to self-actualizing leaders and companies.

Now if you are one of those individuals who have read or experienced a bit of Neuro-Semantics and would like to step up into leadership — then consider *Neuro-Semantic Trainers' Training*

(NSTT). We are looking for more men and women who will share the vision with us and collaborate with the movement of Neuro-Semantics. If this is you, let us know!

SHOULD YOU REALLY LISTEN TO JOHN GRINDER?

To keep up with the field of NLP I read a 2008 book this past week on a flight home. The title? *Provocative Hypnosis.*   Sounds like it would be a book about hypnosis, but it wasn't really. The subtitle actually reveals more about the content, *The No Holds Barred Interventions of a Contrarian Change Artist.* So what is the book about? Therapeutic interventions in the style of Bandler with the theoretical assumptions of Grinder! I have to give it to Norway NLP trainer, JØrgen Rasmussen, for how he imitates the "in-your-face," "I'm not here to be your friend" Bandler-like style, although I wouldn't recommend that style.

Anyway, the book is mostly a tribute to John Grinder and so constantly quotes him and presents the old 1985 "new code" as if it was cutting-edge technology. And Grinder's *Preface* sings the praises of the book without any reservation (which given his mismatching is a major miracle) calling Rasmussen a genius.

But in reading the book, my first and last thoughts was one and the same: *Do not listen to John Grinder, his advice and ideas will not help you, but will in fact, make you less effective and less able to actualize your highest and best.* Severe? Over-stated? Too strong? Perhaps. You make up your mind from the evidence of the following facts.

1) Fact 1.
In the *Preface,* John Grinder writes the following:
> "We especially, rail against the type of professionalism that locks agents of change into tightly constrained boxes of conventional interventions like understanding, empathy, support for the client— all of these are choices but choices from a very large set. Yet, of course, there are clients that require precisely these transactions but they typically need one hell of lot more and what they need is not contained in the conventional descriptions typically available."

Hard to read?   Well, welcome to Grinder's typical way of writing. So read it again. Conventional interventions lock agents of change into tightly constrained boxes! Oh, that must be terrible! And what are these "conventional interventions" that do such terrible things? Why, *understanding, empathy, support for the client.* Yes, that's right. Reread the paragraph if you need to!

So go ahead and scream in horror! Get it out of your system. And shake your head as you consider just how bad *understanding, empathy, support for the client* is. "How and why would an agent of change do such a thing to a client!? Tisk, tisk."

Of course, we in Neuro-Semantics not only disagree with that, but we have this terrible idea— *everything should start with understanding, empathy, and support for the client.* That's just how bad we are. But then again, somehow I got that idea from the foundations of NLP itself. Wasn't "rapport" one of the first things modeled from Virginia?

And if you think I'm exaggerating, here's what Rasmussen writes in the book when speaking about some of his difficult clients:
> "The only problem is that I did feel contempt, disgust, and wanted to beat the snot out of some of these clients as if they were a red-headed stepchild. Yes, I admit it! Sometimes I have felt these 'bad' emotions when working with clients. At times I projected my own unresolved stuff onto them, and at other times I think that my so-called negative emotions were highly justified and very useful in help them change. If I pretended to be a machine with no emotion, then I wouldn't be doing justice to what happened in these sessions. Guess what, all that crap psychologists have told you about the client liking the therapist being the most important part of getting results ... sorry, but 'No'!" (p. 18)

I guess he doesn't think much of *understanding, empathy, and support for the client* if he wants to beat the snot out of them and thinks that projecting his own negative emotions might be very useful in helping them change! Well, JØrgen if you come to Meta-Coaching with that attitude you won't get you past Day 1. We start with the *Releasing all Judgment Pattern* and end Day1 with *The De-Contamination Pattern* to get the ego out of the way. A very different approach, wouldn't you say?

For the author, the choice is either-or. Either "a compassionate and touchy feeling approach" that is "grandma-style compassion" *or* it is getting results (p. 19). Could this either-or frame itself be the problem? He then speaks about ethics:
> "I think ethics is simple. Understand that your job is to get results and if you can get results, then do it. If you don't get results, then don't charge money." (58)

Hmmm.   So the end of the intervention— *the results* is the only ethical issue? And so does this mean that the means justifies the end? All that I read there leads me to this reflection: My recommendation is that you do *not* listen to John Grinder or Rasmussen!

2) Fact 2.
Grinder is quoted as saying that the "NLP modeling has absolutely nothing to do with eliciting strategies or finding someone's beliefs." (p. 79). It has nothing with asking questions about an expert's ideas, beliefs, understandings, decisions, etc. It only has to do with watching the expert in action and doing an "unconscious uptake" of his or her actions, repeating the micro-movements in your own body.

Hmmmm. So that makes sense when you are modeling an athlete or someone engaged in a physical activity, but what about someone who over a period of a decade creates abundant wealth? What about a person engaging in leadership that takes several years? What then? And what about modeling when the expertise in the area of the conceptual?

When I modeled wealth creators, first-generation rich millionaires, the object of the modeling was long-term processes that involved multiple stages occurring over many years. If I could only look for micro-muscle movements, that would have been useless. It would have provided nothing. So again, I say, Don't listen to John Grinder if you want to model complex states beyond drumming or rock climbing.

Fact 3.
Throughout the book the fuzzy wooly booly "the unconscious" is constantly referred to. The author says that John Grinder often states this:
> "The conscious mind is superb at organization, framing, and categorization, but lacks the power to do any significant change. The unconscious on the other hand has enormous capabilities for change, but little capacity for organization." (p. 194)
> "Grinder points out that the client's conscious mind is the part of the client least qualified to decide what the end state should be."   "Grinder's perspective is that which end state and resources to be used are decisions best left to the unconscious." (p. 255)

So let's see: Don't be aware or conscious of what you are doing because your conscious mind "lacks the power to do any significant change." It can't choose a valid objective, it can't decide on what to do, it can't help with motivation or creation or integration (to mention the four change mechanisms in the Axes of Change). So the best choice then is to trust what you don't know and aren't aware of. So does that mean "the unconscious mind" doesn't make mistakes? Doesn't create migraines, allergies, auto-immune system diseases? Later (see Fact 4) in the New Code Change format, step one recommends that the "client consciously select the context." Hmmmm. My recommendation, Don't listen to John or JØrgen—they are just too fuzzy and confused about all of this. I think they need to learn "The Newest Code" of Neuro-Semantics (see my article on this at www.neurosemantics.com).

Fact 4.
Then quoting "Grinder's New Code Change Format," Rasmussen does a meta-stating process, although he doesn't seem to realize this. In the following pattern he explains that he changes Grinder's term "high performance state" to "flow state." I have shorten the process so you can quickly see the basic steps that he presented. The things in [brackets] are my comments.

Step 1: From third position (observer) select some context where you find yourself stuck. See yourself over there in the context where you experience X the most. Have client consciously select the context (255-256). [So you start by taking a meta-state like the *observer state* to "select" or choose *a stuck state*.]

Step 2: Have the client physically walk over to the hallucinated context on the floor.

Step 3: Have the client step out of the context. Then have the client play a New Code Game (Alphabet or NASA game). Play the game until the client goes into a flow state (256-258). [Next, you use the meta-state process of *stepping back from* a primary state and then bring the meta-state of "flow" to *the stuck state,* a meta-stating process.]

Step 4: When client is in a flow state, have the client reenter the context that they stepped into (Step 2). Lead the client there (259). [Meta-state stuckness with flow.] Calibrate signals from the unconscious. Change should be obvious from step 2. Troubleshooting: If the change isn't there, you might want to re-do the game. Is client in the feeling stated connect to the context? Does client have a strong flow state? Do you have a strong bridge between state and context?

Step 5: Future pace. Challenge the client a bit.

Now if you know the meta-stating process, about bringing one state to another and putting one state in a higher position to the second so that the first state frames the second, then you will immediately see the invisible structure to this "New Code Format." Actually it is a meta-stating process— meta-stating stuckness with a high performance, flow, or genius state.

This same process occurred earlier in the book about emotions.
> "The whole idea is to have the person feel the emotion and just observe it with precision. This is a
> great way of releasing old pent-up emotions." (p. 248)

Observing with precision (one state) how you feel an emotion (a primary state) is what we do in Meta-States when we use the Meta-Stating Emotions pattern. For this one — *Do* what John Grinder is doing unconsciously, but doesn't understand. So follow what he *does*; but don't listen to what he says about it. That will only mess you up. To understand the process— find an APG course and let a Neuro-Semantic trainer show you the meta-state structure that governs the richest of human experiences!

JOIN THE REVOLUTION

The revolution began with a belief. It began with a new perspective. It began with a question. And the person asking the question was Abraham Maslow. "What about the healthy side ?" It was in his book, *Abnormal Psychology*, and this question was posed from time to time as he and his co-author, psychiatrist Bela Mittelmann, wrote an encyclopedia of human pathologies.[1] Maslow essentially asked:

> "Okay, that's the story with this particular pathology of how human nature can go wrong, but about how it can go right, how it can succeed, be healthy, and reach the heights of possibilities?"

The revolution began slowly. It began by modeling two incredibly healthy individuals (Ruth Benedict and Max Wertheimer) who were making a difference in their worlds. Afterwards that modeling of their self-actualizing characteristics was extended out to hundreds, and then thousands of other people, showing some of the same qualities. Eventually Maslow had a list of the characteristics of this "syndrome," this experience of a self-actualizing man or woman. (I put that list in both *Unleashed!* and in *Unleashing Leadership*).

The revolution began with a model of the inner needs that drive a person and how, developmentally, a self-actualizing person learns to meet those needs, even learn how to master their needs, and eventually move to the level of the highest needs— the needs to actualize one's highest and best.

The revolution then launched a movement, a human potential movement, and that movement then attracted Fritz Perls, Gregory Bateson, and Virginia Satir to Esalen to become a part of it. In fact, they became part of the second generation of leaders in that movement. Scores of other people that we now recognize as key voices in self-development were also drawn to Esalen in those earlier years (1963 to 1980). And while that first human potential movement failed to maintain its momentum as such and was dispersed into dozens of other groups and movements, the spark at the heart of the revolution continued.

NLP continued the revolution unconsciously. Given that NLP has direct roots in that revolution through Perls, Bateson, and Satir as well as the "presuppositions" that came mostly from Maslow and Rogers, NLP continued the revolution unconsciously. I discovered this "secret history of NLP" in 2005, and with that Neuro-Semantics launched a new *human potential movement* using the Self-Actualization Workshops.

When I recognized the potential in this— that we in NLP are inheriters of the revolution of Maslow's bright-side of psychology and that we now "stand on the shoulders of the giants" who launched and carried on this revolution— I began to direct our activities in Neuro-Semantics intentionally to use and apply *Self-Actualization Psychology*. My aim was to create lots of practical applications. And that's how the revolution that Maslow began is today finding expressions in Neuro-Semantics.

This means that the revolution of the bright-side of psychology now has some incredibly powerful tools for making the vision of self-actualizing individuals and organizations real in today's world. Central among these tools is the *Self-Actualization Quadrants* which is built on the Meaning and Performance axes. This tool highlights that actualizing excellence in any area involves making it richly and robustly meaningful and then developing the competence to perform it. This is true of athletic competition, business development, and personal relationships.

We now also have the *Self-Actualization Assessment Scale* (Hall and Goodenough) that uses Maslow's original research into human needs and gives us the ability to assess how you are doing (or not doing) in coping and mastering your basic human drives. And this is critical for each person individually as it is for any person within any organization.

Where is this revolution heading? What will be the direction of this revolution in the days and weeks and years to come? Ah, that's the mystery and excitement of Neuro-Semantics! We don't know. We only know that there is so much more to discover, so much more to develop. And this is where we are always looking for more men and women who share this vision to come and join the revolution.

So if you believe, as I do, that our highest drive as human beings is to tap within and liberate human potentials in yourself and others in order to create an incredibly better world, then come join this revolution. If you believe that there is within every person fascinating possibilities for becoming so much more, if you believe that we can facilitate the liberating of human potentials in organizations, businesses, families, politics, and a thousand other domains, then come join this revolution.

In a word, our vision is to *actualize excellence*. Our dream is to enrich the meanings (beliefs, ideas, understandings) of people so that they can perform so much more as they develop their levels of competency. And we do that through training, consulting, and coaching. We do that one-on-one as well as by working with groups. And when you're ready to move up to a leadership role in this, then NSTT (Neuro-Semantic Trainers' Training) is the apex of training along with Coaching Mastery.

1. Maslow, Abraham; Mittelmann, Bela (1941). *Principles of Abnormal Psychology: The Dynamics of Psychic Illness.*

WHY DO I TEASE
THE FOUNDERS SO MUCH?

Yes, I tease them. Yes, I provoke them. And yes, I do it intentionally. After the last post on Grinder, several asked about why I do this, what are my motives, what I'm seeking to do in it, whether it is divisive, and of course, all of that deserves an answer. So here goes.

Given that the field of NLP is not only without any kind of international standards, association, or journals, it is also a field that (in spite of the worldwide net) hardly has any forum for the leaders of NLP to communication. Imagine that! A field of *communication* that doesn't *communicate!* Well, not directly at least. There is, of course, the grapevine, gossip, notes in footnotes in books, and of course, websites.

So especially when a new book appears and it presents information about one of the "camps" in this field, as a way to stay current in the field, I read it. I want to know what's going on, what new developments are emerging, and how others are interpreting or re-interpreting the field of NLP. And when I see ideas and concepts that strike me as against the very spirit of NLP (as I did in the book I reviewed last week, against rapport for example), I figure that's something to write about.

The point here is that I'm focusing on *ideas, concepts, and patterns,* not personalities. Oh, yes, the ideas come through persons, and the personalities of those persons, but my critique is never about or against the person. It is always about *what* the person is saying in arguing for or against some position. It is always feedback about what the person has said or possibly done, and never against the person. Check it out, that's why in last week's post I quoted from the book, I quoted the facts of what the person's actually said. I do that for a specific reason. I want to quote accurately and precisely and to fairly represent what the person is saying.

Now one thing in this field, as with almost every self-development field, people in leadership roles so often take themselves so seriously that they present themselves as gurus. That is, as unquestionable authorities, as somehow having the divine right to not be held accountable. And, of course, that's the stuff of high comedy— stuff that I can hardly resist jumping into and exploiting with playful humor. Hence the teasing! After all, when human beings think and act as if they are infallible—that's when they are the most silly and the most ridiculous. And I think that's when it's time to take the mickey out of them.

Now true enough, most people know better than to claim infallibility directly. So they act that way by being closed to feedback. And, of course, that also provides wonderful moments of high comedy. Now I am of the opinion that there just hasn't been enough people breaking out in rackus laughter when the gurus imply such things. But then again, some are masters of ceremony. They set things up so as to create a hushed environment so that when they speak, you'd think it was a funeral, or a service in a church, temple, or mosque, or perhaps the moment with a high official of state is about to speak. And so whatever they say is then enshroud in somehow considered something to stand in awe of, to nod with a knowingness that this is sacred ground, the secret of life is about to be revealed.

Now they can say something like, "You can feel assured, fully and honestly, that what I'm saying you already fully know unconsciously, and as ... your unconscious ... knows this now, you can feel more confident than ever before now, can you not?" and everybody nods in unconscious agreement. How can you argue against that? Besides, who are you to contradict the expert? Besides, you better watch out, he or she may install something terrible in your unconscious mind when you aren't watching!

Now if you are not laughing out loud at all of that, you may already be too far gone ... or not. Many kings in olden times knew about this danger of over-seriousness and so appointed court jesters. Their job description was to create a jolly ole time for everyone by teasing and jesting and mocking all of the solemnity of the high court least the royal manners and ceremonies would deceive the dignities to talk and act as if they have a stiff board shoved all the way up their rare end.

Maybe that's what we need!   Perhaps we need some good ole fashion Court Jesters in the Halls of NLP especially when the gurus emerge with their minions doing homeage and bowing in reverential deference to whatever the gurus say! Actually, I have some colleagues I'd heartily recommend to play that role with amazing delightful fun.

So why do I tease and jest as I do? Maybe for these very reasons. Maybe because there's just too much seriousness in this field, too many people thinking that hypnosis is real, that the language of persuasion is beyond resistance, and that the gurus of NLP are dangerously powerful. Maybe it's time to let Toto loose so that he can pull the curtain open and expose the magician behind the curtain at the microphone making all the noise! Then, when we all see that he's just a plump little man wanting to be a *real* magician and that he's not the All-Knowing and Powerful Oz, we can enjoy the joke and get on with being real— with actualizing our highest and best as the fallible human beings that we are.

WORLD-CLASS TRAINERS
AND PRESENTERS

Want to be a Part of it?

Once upon a time many, many years ago, Richard Bandler invited me to attend his training of trainers program and to write the "notes" on that program. So I did. And the title of the book that resulted is, *Becoming More Ferocious as a Trainer* (1990). And given Mr. B's focus and style, being *ferocious* makes perfect sense(!). Years passed and so did the ninety-million-dollar lawsuit against the field of NLP and the beginning of Neuro-Semantics. A few more years and suddenly there were enough Neuro-Semanticists around the world clamoring for their own Training of Trainers program. And that's where this story begins.

Now I had been an NLP Trainer for many years, I had trained dozens of both NLP Practitioner Trainings, and Master Pracs. and hundreds of APG courses. I had also been around the community observing the best and brightest of NLP Trainers. Further, I had read the books available in this field, but even with all that, I knew that we really didn't have any "World-Class Trainers" in this field. Sure we have one world-class Entertainer, who even to this day still brings more people into NLP than anyone else, Anthony Robbins. But "World-Class Trainers?" I don't think so.

So, I began looking outside this field, observing at Conferences and workshops, reading, and interviewing. And from that beginning I began putting together Neuro-Semantic Trainers Training for NLP and Neuro-Semantic Trainers (NSTT). In the first trainings, I added what no other NLP Trainers' Training had—the Meta-States model and hence "the Genius Trainer State," Un-insultability, Presence of Mind under Pressure, Releasing of Judgment, etc. Yet even with that, I still knew that was not enough. Something else was needed if we were to develop highly effective trainers and from them would arise some truly world-class trainers.

I knew it wasn't enough because in the field of Training and Development, there was no real lack of *knowing the key competencies* for an effective trainer. The lack wasn't in identifying the skill-set of an effective public speaker, presenter, or trainer. The lack was in *how to measure the skills* and *how to use the measurements* to facilitate the development of the competencies. And because this was the same problem we faced when we began Meta-Coaching, it shouldn't be any surprise that we solved the problem of both by the Benchmarking Model.

What is the skill-set of an Effective Trainer, Presenter, and Public Speaker?
• Rapport with the group (group rapport).
• Engagement of the group participants' mind and heart (Engagement).
• Clarity, variation, and emphasis in one's voice (effective use of voice).
• Systematic use of non-verbal expressions, movements, gestures (spatial anchoring).
• The experiential presentation of the content (state induction).
• The framing of the content and learning processes (framing).
• The formatting of the presentation in different learning styles (4-matting).

While there are more, these are the basic seven for effectiveness (we have others for Mastery). We then identified *behavioral expressions* of these from the level of no-competency to little competence, some, average amount, lots, great amount, fantastic amount. Benchmarking the language, expressions, behaviors, and indicators of these core presentation skills allows us today to provide a feedback mirror to trainers so that they know precisely how they are doing, where they are in their skill development, and where next.

That's the key. When you know where you are, you also know *the next step for taking your skills to a higher level of excellence.* That's the power of benchmarking. It provides a way to shape behavior and provide an experiential basis for development.
• *Can you present and train with elegance, power, and charisma?*
• Do you have the inner knowing and confidence that your skills are effective? Would you like to?
• Would you like to be able to effectively influence the minds and hearts of people in a transformative way when you stand up?

NSTT begins with 5 days of these *Platform Skills* followed up by 3 more days of *Training Skills.* Then there are 3 days of *The Psychology of APG* followed by 3 more days of Business Skills. And there's more.

Beginning in 2004 I have been looking for the most skilled, most successful, and most effective trainers among Neuro-Semanticists that I could find. We even began the Master Trainer track to groom and develop higher skilled trainers. Why? I think it obvious. If you want to learn the highest Presentation and Training skills — you need to train with people who can actually demonstrate those skills. This year our first Master Trainer, Colin Cox along with Omar Salom will be co-training NSTT with me. We will also have several other highly effective Trainers at the training.

Now a warning. *This is not for the faint of heart!* You will be presenting everyday, and everyday you will be benchmarked on the skills that you demonstrate. And with every presentation, you will receive immediate sensory-based feedback on how you used your voice, gestures, movements, how you engaged the group, got or did not get rapport, and on the content you present! I only recommend this for those who have a robust sense of self, a commitment to self-development, and a passion to stretch to the highest limits of what's possible for you.

Are you that kind of person? If so, the NSTT may be the training for you. Mere attendance will not qualify you for certification; you have to develop and demonstrate competency! And if you don't make it in the two-weeks, you will be supported afterwards until you develop the required competency. That's our commitment to you. If you are already a NLP trainer, we have a special process for you as we recognize your previous trainings.

Interested?
      Write to L. Michael Hall at what else but *meta*   @acsol.net
      Dates: June 19 — July 3
      Place: Country Inn Conference Center — Grand Junction Colorado USA
            Western Slope of the Rocky Mountains
      Prerequisites: NLP Practitioner and Master Practitioner and APG
              Or: Coaching Essentials and Coaching Genius for the Coaching Track Trainers
      Investment: Write for Brochures
      Application Process: Write for Application form

JUST HOW REAL IS HYPNOSIS, ANYWAY?

You may have notice *a little comment* that I tucked away in the last Meta Reflection, many did. And quite a few wrote and asked me about it. What did I *really* mean by the comment that "too many people think that hypnosis is real"? How come you don't refer often to Milton Erickson since he was a key contributor to NLP? The one I liked best was: What does your unconscious mind think about hypnosis? :)

First a little historical trip down memory lane. At the beginning, NLP did not begin with Erickson, but Perls and Satir and as the co-founders attempted to model "the magic" that they were doing with their words in terms of effecting tremendous transformation in the lives of people. And they began their modeling by using two models from Cognitive Psychology. Did you know that? That, by the way, is *why and how* NLP is a Cognitive Psychology Model.

First they used Noam Chomsky's *Transformational Grammar* (TG). Actually, Mr. G. was looking for some way to popularize his understanding of TG. Just two years prior to "The Meta-Model of Language in Therapy" (today simply referred to as the Meta-Model) Mr. G. wrote with Suzette Haden *Guide to Transformational Grammar: History*, *Theory, Practice.*[1] Read that book and discover for yourself that in it are nearly all of the distinctions in the Meta-Model. So when John met Richard who was mimicking Perls and Satir, he found a great context for using and promoting TG.

The second source of NLP in Cognitive Psychology was the extensive use of George Miller's *Plan and Structure of Behavior* (1960) which is where B. & G. got the TOTE model. And both of these men, George Miller and Noam Chomsky are credited with founding the Cognitive Psychology Movement in 1956. From modeling how the original magicians did their magic came the two volumes of *The Structure of Magic* (1975, 1976).

It was only after these original formulations of the NLP Model that Bateson pointed B.&G. to Erickson as someone they should meet. And from this came the next two books, the two volumes of *Patterns of the Hypnotic Techniques of Milton H. Erickson* (1976, 1977). Now at first Mr. B. said that "everything is hypnosis" and Mr. G. said that "nothing is hypnosis." And they were both right.

So what is hypnosis and is it real? Hypnosis is simply a state of mind— a highly focused state of mind. That's why it is actually an everyday occurrence for everybody. Hypnosis is also an altered state, again, something that we all experience everyday. That's why a trance state of hypnosis

occurs when we drive on the highway, step into an elevator, wait for a traffic light, find a seat in a movie theater, etc.

Now for the tricky question, Is it real? Ah, "real!" Do you mean that it can be quantified by the same science that has brought us most of the technological marvels of the Industrial and Information Ages? Then no, it is not real. We can't even *prove* the existence of the "mind" by quantitative science let alone a focused or altered mind. Do you mean that the hypnotic state is a subjective phenomenon that you and I can experience and learn how to experience more fully to obtain various results? Then yes, it is real in that way.

But NLP is not hypnosis. NLP modeled hypnotic processes, language patterns, and numerous hypnotic states for healing, psychotherapy, wellness, sports excellence, and the genius state of flow. NLP as a Communication Model has used, and continues to use, various hypnotic linguistic and non-linguistic patterns. All of the 77 NLP Patterns that I put in *The Sourcebook of Magic Volume I* are essentially hypnotic processes, so are the 143 Meta-State patterns in *Volume II.*

Hypnosis mostly works by words, by language. Yes, there is pacing and leading using breath and movements and posture. Yet the most powerful hypnotic tool that you can learn and use lies in language. Now by words you can do all kinds of magical things. By words you can invite people on various kinds of inner journeys and that is the power of "hypnotic language patterns."

We can use words that carry ourselves and others away to wild and wonderful places— places of enchantment, places of excitement, possibility, wonder, value, meaning, and sadly, we can also take people to places of mediocrity, boredom, skepticism, irritation, anger, depression. We can induce all kinds of hypnotic states.

Yet none of these things or places are real— you can't call up your favorite travel agency and book a ticket on United or Lufthansa or Virgin or Singapore Air. Nor is there a train going there or a Cruise ship. Instead, they are entities of the mind— "the communication world" (to use Gregory Bateson's terminology).

While it is not externally real, hypnosis does describe the very real subjective states that can enhance or diminish our lives. In fact, given all of the unresourceful and sabotaging states we humans create and live in, this is why de-hypnotizing is ever bit as important as hypnotizing (probably more so). After all, it is by certain words and linguistic expressions that so many people today are living out various post-hypnotic suggestions that they heard or invented in 3childhood which is making their lives living hells: "You'll never amount to anything!" "What's wrong with you? You must be stupid or something!" "You don't deserve to succeed!"

How real is hypnosis? Empirically, not real at all. It doesn't exist. Subjectively, it is one description, one model, one theory, one way to map out how our minds-emotions work. It is not a panacea; it can't do everything. It is just a way of talking about our states and meta-states. And when you know that, you know about the power of meta-trance which also isn't real, but can be a powerful tool for actualizing your highest and best.

(1) Grinder, John T.; Elgin, Suzette Haden. (1973). *Guide to transformational grammar: History, theory, practice.* NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. "We had intended to call this book *The Demystification of Transformational Grammar."* (p. xi)

META-STATE TRANCES

While "hypnosis" is not real (Meta Reflection #14), not real externally, not an objective thing, it is subjectively compelling and can be transformative. Well, it can also be destructive and neurotizing. It all depends on *what suggestions* you are giving yourself. In other words, the *content* of *what* you are programming into yourself with your images, sounds, words, language, ideas, frames, and meanings determines the quality (or lack thereof) of the state you are inducing.

And the fact of the matter is that *you are always inducing yourself into states.* And every time you *alter* your state and go into an inward focus of attention on something that you are remembering or imagining that's not currently present— you are in a hypnotic state. There's really nothing mysterious about it, it is how "thinking" works. You can be present listening to someone or walking down the street or driving on a highway or working out in the gym, but on the inside *you are not there.* You are somewhere else!

Realizing and recognizing that such *state inductions* is a trance, de-mystifies hypnosis a bit. It also highlights the fact that you, and only you, can hypnotize you. That's why it is said in the literature on hypnosis that ultimately all hypnosis is self-hypnosis. You are doing it to yourself. Yes, someone may be leading the process, but it only works if *you* allow it to, if *you follow along and use the words* to go somewhere in your mind. You can always resist.

So all of the myths about a hypnotist "controlling" you and making you do things you don't want to do is just that—*myths.* Yes, it can make for fascinating Hollywood movies for those who don't know better: a hypnotist hypnotizes someone to murder someone and then gives a post-hypnotic suggestion that they won't remember it! But it does not work that way. Milton Erickson once said that if hypnosis had that kind of power, "there would be a whole lot of people healthier and more sane."

Do we use hypnosis in Neuro-Semantics? Do we induce states so that people *transition* from the state that they are in and access new and more resourceful states? Yes, of course. In fact, every pattern is actually a hypnotic pattern. That's because every "pattern" invites a person to go *up, up and away,* into the higher realms of the mind, to set new higher frames that will create more positive and resourceful states.

When we do this, we participate in accessing higher states of mind that we find enjoyable and effective. We move *upward* to our *frames of reference.* Now in writing this, I'm using the "up" metaphor for trance rather than the "down" metaphor. Both also are metaphors and so not real!

It's just a way of talking about things. The "down" metaphor is more traditional and in NLP history, it came from Transformational Grammar (TG) that talked about surface sentences and the "deep" structure.

Using the Meta-States Model, in Neuro-Semantics we have turned the metaphor upside down. We talk about going inside and then *up* to your *reference system* as your *frames of references* by which you create the *meanings* that you give to something. These higher frames establish the structure for how you are thinking about something. And whenever you set a frame, you are programming into your mind a *meaning* that contains suggestions and implications and these will induce you into a state.

What do you think about criticism? Wherever you go in your mind as you answer that question, you are inducing yourself into a hypnotic state. Do you know that? That's because "criticism" is not real. It does not exist in the real world. What you call "criticism" is a construct that you have created. If it means to you that someone is saying something that disagrees with you or your ideas, or saying something that attacks your behaviors, your person, your reputation, etc., then you probably have some movie playing in your mind about someone saying words in a certain way that you call "criticism." If I could peak into the movie of your mind, what would I see playing? What do you see? Or hear? Or sense?

Now given that movie, how much fun do you have playing that movie? Not much? How much fun would you like to have? And how could you create that fun, that humor, that silliness? Are you skilled at exaggerating your pictures? At editing the sounds so that you can alter the way the "criticism" is spoken so that sounds really different? What if it was sung by someone who can't carry a tune? What if it was spoken with a sexy voice? Or a lipse? By Yoda? Donald Duck?

Playfully entertaining those representations probably radically alters the suggestions and implications about criticism, do they not? Suppose you access a state of un-insultability and then entertain those representations and try really hard, as hard as you can try, to feel the hurt of the criticism. What happens then? What if you step into a state of unconditional love and appreciation for people, knowing that there's a little insecure child inside the person criticizing.

Now if you didn't notice, that last paragraph is full of hypnotic language inviting you into more resourceful trances. I invited you to go up to new frames linguistically. And it was so easy. I just used some modifiers (adverbs and adjectives).

    I qualified your "representations" by the word "entertaining" and that word by "playfully" — *playfully entertaining* your representations of criticism.
    I invited you to *access un-insultability* and *hard trying* to feel the hurt.
    I invited you to *step into unconditional love, knowing* there's a little child ...

None of these are externally real; but if you want them to be subjectively compelling to your way of being in the world, then you can *go into those higher states* about your primary experience and use the suggestions and implications of the frames to generate a more resourceful response.

THE ULTIMATE META-STATE TRANCE

If there is any hypnotic trance state that is the ultimate one for a Neuro-Semanticist, it is the *genius state.* But no, the use of the word *genius* does not mean it is a hypnotic state for increasing your I.Q., that's not the purpose of this particular trance. Instead this is the induction into a state of *being all there.* It is a state of absolute focus *on one thing.* Normally, when you experience it, you are in a powerful state of concentration and absorption. And when you are there people may think that you have really tranced out or they may think that you really have fabulous powers of focus and will power. The *genius state* is a state wherein you are in "flow" and even better, you can turn the flow state on and off at will.

Now while I never present *the genius state* as a hypnotic process and state, it absolutely is. When you experience this naturally occurring state (and everybody does at some time), it seems to happen to you, to come upon you, and when you look back on it, you typically remember it as a wonderful experience.

What induces it? Usually something that's very important to you, something that you actively engage with and when you do, you get lost in it. You become thrilled and absorbed in it. It could be reading a book, it could be walking in a Redwood forest, it could be gardening, it could be playing catch with your dogs, writing, watching a great movie, having a fantastic conversation with a friend, making love, climbing a rock wall, playing a video game, and on and on the list goes.

The key is *absorption* in something that you care about, an absorption that pulls you into it so much so that you can get lost in it. Then, in that moment when you are in that "flow" state, you are *not* multi-tracking. You have lost all of your meta-mind awarenesses about all of the other things you need to do and track and you have become *of one mind* about the absorption. Now in that moment, you won't realize this! If you were aware of it, you would be double-tracking. But you're not.

It is only later when you look back on the experience that you realize that you during that time *you were all there— fully and completely.* And during that time you realize that many of the central factors of your consciousness disappeared. *Time* disappeared and you were lost in *the now, this moment,* and your awareness of time just vanished. So did *the world* and *others* and even your *self* vanished. These facets of the matrix of your mind were still there, but you lost consciousness of them. You became self-forgetful, time forgetful, world forgetful. All you were aware of was *the subject of whatever the focus was about.*

Athletes experience this as when a gymnast disappears the audience and they are there alone with the high bars or the floor. A baseball pitcher similarly disappears a whole stadium. In their focus-flow-genius state all that is there is the ball and the batter. When an athlete goes into this special state, they typically call it *being in the zone.* And a couple years ago Tim Goodenough and Mike Cooper, two Meta-Coaches modeled out 13 distinctions from top South African athletes (Olympiads and national champions) in their Neuro-Semantic book, *In the Zone.*

In the field of NLP the first work on the prerequisites of the "personal genius state" was developed by John Grinder and Judith DeLozer (1983- 1987). The processes that they came up with were interesting, but quite convoluted and therefore ineffective. They were fooling around with meta-levels as they were trying to figure out how to utilize the guidance of Gregory Bateson and his principles of the higher levels. And they even wrote that they knew the secret would tie in somehow with managing the meta-levels. They got thta from Bateson, they just didn't know how to apply it. That came later after I created the Meta-States model (1994). One of my very first applications of Meta-States was to *the genius state prerequisites* and that brought about the *Accessing Your Personal Genius state* or induction (and hence the APG training).

What Meta-States was able to do as a process, and as the ultimate hypnotic state, was to set the required meta-levels (as meta-states or frames) over the primary state so that you can *let go of the meta-awarenesses and be fully present in the primary state.* Doing this commissions the higher meta-states to operate as an out-side of conscious awareness structure. It's paradoxical, as is many hypnotic states. To release the multi-tracking kind of consciousness, you learn how to embrace your meta-level states and use them so that you are freed for letting them go— from your immediate awareness.

Then you can be all there— with all of your resources available for the flow or in-the-zone state. Then when you read, you fully comprehend because *you* are there (and not elsewhere!). Then when you write, you don't suffer the dreaded "writer's block." Then when you are there with a client or loved one, you are there *and they can feel your full presence.* And now you know why we use the APG training to create your *genius coaching state, genius training state, genius writing state, wealth creation state,* etc. It is the ultimate Neuro-Semantic state for operating from your highest and best. So that makes it a self-actualizing state. And now you know why APG — Accessing Personal Genius— is the flagship training of Neuro-Semantics.

[For the schedule of APG trainings, see www.neurosemantics.com Click Trainings.]

MORE ABOUT
THE NEURO-SEMANTIC REVOLUTION
TO CHANGE THE WORLD

"Why all the focus on self-actualization?" That was the question that a caller asked me last week. "I see that the focus of Neuro-Semantics is now almost entirely about self-actualization. And yes, I have read the articles on the 'Secret History of NLP' going back to Maslow and the Human Potential movement, but I still don't understand why you are making it all about self-actualization. Can you tell me why?"

I loved that question and yes, I was pleased to provide an answer. The reason is two-fold, first our aim is to enable and facilitate people becoming the best people they can become. It's not only about empowering people so that they can "run their own brains" and manage their own states (the stated values and outcomes of basic NLP), it is more. Much more. It is about people learning to how get the very best from themselves in this adventure called life. It is about people learning how to be true to themselves— by becoming the best version of them. And when that happens— people become truly and joyfully happy, congruent, and authentic and that makes them healthier and wealthier. What a vision!

But there's more. As people become better, as we facilitate people developing so they become *better people,* we make the world itself better. This was the very heart of Abraham Maslow's original passion that explains why he devoted his entire life developing the foundations for *Self-Actualization Psychology.* About the cold war of the 1960s, 1970s, etc., he wrote:
> "That system will prevail which will ... turn out a better kind of person, more brotherly, more peaceable, less greedy, more lovable, more respect-worthy." (1971: 92)

And writing about the frustration and anger that arises when people don't have their basic survival and safety needs met, the frustration and anger that often turns into destructive aggression and violence, Maslow argued that what we need for our world to change is the ability to create better people from our families, schools, churches, and cultures.
> "Destructiveness may occur as one of the concomitant reactions to basic threat. Any threat of thwarting of the basic needs, any threat to the defensive or coping system, any threat to the general way of life is likely to be reacted to by anxiety-hostility..." (1954: 126)

To put it as succinctly as I can: *To have a better world, we have to have better people.* And how do we get *better people*? How can we cultivate, world-wide, more mature, peaceful, democratic, respectful, loving, and self-actualizing people? What can we do to eliminate people from growing

up to be greedy, hateful, ruthlessly competitive, prejudiced, narrow-minded, unreasoning, rigid, etc.?

The answer goes to all of the industries that are devoted to *developing individual persons to be the best they can be*—to parents, schools, therapists, trainers, consultants, coaches, etc. Yet that is not enough. The answer also goes to everybody who contributes and plays a role in developing and managing our systems—political systems, educational systems, religious and spiritual systems, economic systems, etc. In fact, all of the work done at *the individual level* can come to naught and negated *by the systems* that we create, endure, tolerate, and fail to transform.

Sometimes the problem is the system. In fact, the most persistent and complex problems we fact as a race is more often than not at the system level. And the problem with the systems are *the frames* that the system presents directly or indirectly, explicitly or implicitly. And today some of the sickest systems that subtly, implicitly, and covertly are "setting the frames" for people. These include the media of television, radio, and newspapers that focus so dominantly on the sensational pathological (what's going wrong, what's destructive, threatening, etc.), the Hollywood culture of sex and violence, betrayal, disloyalty, the sensational, the economic culture of greed, the corporate culture of short-term bottom lines, materialist goals, secrecy, the political systems of corruption, power *over* people, bureaucracy, etc.

In a word we can distinguish the systems that are conducive of self-actualization and those that are antagonistic and contrary to people becoming their highest and best. Merely having a psychology of self-actualization for the individual (which we have) is not enough. We have to develop self-actualizing psychology (sociology) for systems— self-actualizing families, leaders and managers, companies, communities, countries, politicians, media, movie writers and directors, etc.

To change the world we need to develop new ways of relating with each other at both the personal level and at the community, group, corporate, and national levels. Just as we need synergy at the individual and personal level to actualize our highest meanings with our best performances (The Self-Actualizing Quadrants model), we also need to create synergistic systems for our families, schools, communities, companies, and nations.

And to do that, we need trainers, consultants, and coaches who share this vision so that we —as a community—do that with ourselves (as an examplar model) and who can translate this in facilitating leaders at all of these systemic levels.

> "Human society as a whole can improve. It can be improved, and it *does* improve. ... Human society is improvable ... and the task is up to us, and we can learn how to accomplish this effectively." (1996: 97)

And that's one of the key reasons for NSTT— to develop a community of world-class trainers and consultants who will join hands with us to change the world. Are you up to be a world-changer with us?

From: L. Michael Hall
Meta Reflections 2010 – #19
April 21, 2010

THE LAUNCHING OF
META-COACHING BOOKS IN SPANISH

I landed in Mexico City recently and after a day of indepth Coach training for benchmarking with our Team Leaders — we spent that evening *launching the first two Meta-Coach books in Spanish.* This occurred on April 14th at the International Conference Center in a seminar room and all of this was created by Maru Eugenia Martinez.

So that evening we launched *Coaching Change* and *Winning the Inner Game.* Neuro-Semanticists *David Murphy* was the MC (master of ceremonies) at the event, *Maru Eugenia Martinez* introduced the first Meta-Coaching book, and *Omar Salom* spoke about the Frame Games book. I then had a chance to tell the "true" hidden story behind all of this!

It was eleven years ago that I made my first presentation of Neuro-Semantics in Mexico. That's when I first presented the Meta-States Model in the APG (Accessing Personal Genius) training at Monterrey Mexico with Maria Luisa Rodriguez. And at that time I began hearing voices from many, many people, "Are there any of your books in Spanish?" "We would like to have this material in Spanish." And that continued for more than a decade with the voices getting louder and more insistent as each year passed.

When I visited Chiapas Mexico where David Murphy is a licensed Neuro-Semantic Trainer (and now a Meta-Coach Trainer), the translator for me there, Bárbara Sierra, was so captivated by the Neuro-Semantic approach that she took it upon herself to begin translating *Coaching Change* in Spanish. And so for a year or two, we had the manuscript translated, but no publisher. That's when Maru entered the scene. As a self-confessed "doer," Maru got busy knocking on doors, making calls, and using her persuasion skills to find a publisher. Finally she found *Trillas* and more than a year ago, with Maru's tutelage, I made an agreement with Trillas to publish it. And so using Barbara's basic text, the translation was updated and finally last week published.

Now for a *doer*, seeing that it was taking a year to publish a manuscript, she considered that ridiculous especially given that the manuscript was already translated. So Maru, having watched the process and consulted with me about publishing, took it on herself to have *Winning the Inner Game* translated and published — which she achieved in 4 months—one-third of the time that it took for a professional publishing company! And as an aside, this is the spirit of Neuro-Semantics, the spirit that makes things happens! [Think mind-to-muscle, think actualizing best performances!] Maru hired Flor Montero, who has been our translator at the Meta-Coach

Trainings for four years, do the translation.

So following the Neuro-Semantic premise, *We can do so much more together than alone or apart,* it took a community to make this happen. And what has begun will now allow Meta-Coaching in Latin America and Spain to begin to grow exponentially as more and more people will have access to the foundational books. And in the meantime, a publishing company in Madrid Spain has translated *User's Manual of the Brain, Volume I* (which is the basic NLP Practitioner course) into Spanish!

Here's a great big *Meta-High Five* to Omar, David, Barbara, and especially Maru for their vision, their passion, and their practical commitment to Neuro-Semantics in Mexico and Latin America! Well done!

Want a copy?? Great — here is some contact information to reach Maru:
alvarezm@hotmail.com
marumtzv@hotmail.com
Phone: (52) 5556597342

For *User's Manual of the Brain* – Palmyra, Madrid: 91 296-0200
www.palmyralibros.com

From: L. Michael Hall
Meta Reflections 2010 – #20
April 28, 2010

CAN WE RAISE THE QUALITY OF NLP
OR IS IT ALREADY TOO LATE?

The Problem
I recently asked a number of NLP trainers in Hong Kong, Egypt, Tokyo, Malaysia, and Australia, "What is the biggest challenge that you face in your NLP practice and business?" And the answer was not only surprisingly similar, but it highlights a common theme that seems to be echoed around the world by so many people who care about the future of this field, "The low quality of NLP training and practice."

I then ask about the evidence. "What is the evidence that there is a low problem of low quality NLP knowledge and skill?" And that brought a wide range of problems. Most frequently the trainers spoke about people being certified as practitioners who never study the Meta-Model as a communication model (the first model in this field), who experience no training in strategies or modeling (the very heart of NLP), and who experience various new age practices that may be a lot of fun, but which has nothing to do with NLP and in fact, confuse them about what NLP really is.

My discussions with trainers and leaders also indicate that the low quality of NLP shows up in when people learn NLP from a correspondence course or in distance learning and have no follow up of intense personal supervision that assesses whether the person has any actual competency with such basic skills as state elicitation, anchoring, calibrating, pacing, precision questioning, strategy elicitation, meta-program detection, etc. This seems to be a growing problem in this field that is inherent *experiential* in nature.

The low quality of NLP also shows up in other ways. It shows up in the lack of congruency in the trainers who operate from scarcity and competition rather than abundance and cooperation, who put anyone in the field down who isn't part of their camp, who presents themselves as the only ones doing "real" NLP, and who don't live NLP in an authentic way. It shows up in those who present NLP and who are out-of-touch with the new developments during the past fifteen years, and who fail to give credit to sources. In this and many other ways, the quality of NLP training seems to be suffering everywhere in the world.

Without an commonly recognized international body governing the field and so without an international set of standards, NLP has been fragmenting over the past three decades and seems to

be increasing in the fragmentation rather than decreasing.

The Solution
So what are we to do? What can we who care about the quality of NLP in NLP practitioners, trainers, and leaders do?

First and foremost, we ourselves can practice and demonstrate higher quality NLP in our trainings and in our lives.
This is first and most critical. The best way to make all of the low quality NLP redundant is by contrasting it to NLP of high quality. And what does that mean? It means, beyond all the talk and hype, actually knowing the models and patterns and being skilled enough to effectively use them. Two things are required for quality NLP: a knowledge of the field that is both broad and thorough and a competency to be able to carry out the skills.

For the knowledge part, this means that trainers and leaders ought to be continually learning, reading, researching, and taking additional training. It should strike us as a complete contradiction of terms that a NLP trainer is not still learning and developing. And that means keeping current with the field, attending Conferences, reading journals, staying up with the books published in this field. To not do so implies a know-it-all arrogance that contradicts the true spirit of NLP.

In terms of the knowledge of thefield, trainers should know where NLP came from. They should know that it emerged in the early 1970s from two movements, the Cognitive Psychology movement and the Human Potential movement. The immediate models of NLP came from George Miller and his associates as they launched the Cognitive Psychology movement, dated 1956. This includes Noam Chomsky, Karl Pribram, etc. Out of this came the language model of NLP, the Meta-MOdel as a version of Transformational Grammar, thanks to John Grinder. Out of this developed the Strategy model from Miller's TOTE model.

It also developed from the Human Potential movement (HPM) of Abraham Maslow and Carl Rogers— as Bateson, Fritz Perls and Virginia Satir worked together at Esalen in the 1960s as key pioneers of the HPM. They took their revolutionary ideas from Maslow and Rogers — the very ideas that today we call "the NLP Presuppositions."[1] To not know our history and roots is to not know what we are about and to confuse the true heart and focus of NLP. If we do not know our history, we are doomed to repeat its worst mistakes.

The paradigm shift that Maslow made from "the dark side of human nature" that is sick, unhealthy, distorted, and wounded to the "bright side of human nature" —the side that is healthy, whole, and seeking its highest and best— that paradigm shift lies at the very heart of the HPM and hence NLP. The "theory" of NLP that Bandler and Grinder kept discounting and pooh-poohing is actually the theoretical foundations of both Cognitive Psychology and Self-Actualization Psychology. That's the uniqueness of NLP.

As trainers and practitioners of NLP develop a more thorough and comprehensive understanding

of what we have in our hands, the next task is learning to develop the skills that fall out from these models. Knowing without doing is a form of incompetence. Knowing can be deceptive. It can deceive a person into assuming skills he or she does not have. The test, of course, is reality. Can you actually *do* what you *know* to do? In this, we have to close the knowing-doing gap with true competence and skill. And today research has abundantly demonstrated that true competency is a ten-year process.[2]

Many so-called NLP Trainers and practitioners hate this. They want everything to be easy and quick. But everything is not easy and quick. With skills that have been developed to the level of expertise, this requires discipline and what Ericsson Anders' calls "deliberate practice."

Second, to raise the quality of NLP around the world we need to collaboratively practice what we are preaching.
If we believe in abundance, we have to stop practicing scarcity. If we believe in cooperation, we have to stop practicing competition. If we believe in positive intentions behind actions, we have to stop cutting others down and criticizing them. These are but a few of the "thought viruses" among us that we have to address. And these viruses have created within NLP so much incongruency that no wonder people question our motives and our competence.

As long as making money is the first and biggest, and sometimes only, motive for trainers and leaders— NLP will be seen as manipulative. We have to raise our motives and intentions above merely making money. And we have to get our ego out of the way in terms pride. There's too many striving to create a guru-kingdom or cult in NLP, building followers after them, instead of freeing people to discover and actualize their highest potentials.

As a child of the Human Potential Movement, NLP is part of "humanistic psychology" and as such we should proudly recognize this as our heritage —raising the awareness and skills of people everywhere so that they can reach their highest values and visions and actualize their best skills. Unless we do this we will not be able to get away from the current problems of competition and conflict.

Third, the quality of NLP practice and experience requires trainings that can build and measure true competence.
A problem that seems inherent in NLP is the idea of speed. It's the idea that we can do things quickly. And while this is true for some things, it is not true for everything. It is true of the Phobia Cure pattern that cut the time for healing a phobic response from six months to ten minutes. But there's a problem. The problem is that every "problem" is not like the stimulus-response structure of a phobia. In fact, the majority of problems are not. And because they are not, there won't be "ten minute cures."

Many NLP trainers and practitioners have jumped to the conclusion that because we have found the structure of one experience that allows us to radically shorten the time, everything in human nature is like this. This is the fallacious thinking that creates this delusion. Simple states and experiences that are stimulus–response in structure have be done quickly, but not so the complex

states and experiences. There will never be a "Ten Minute Health Cure," "Ten Minute Get-Rich-Quick Pattern," "Ten Minutes to Leadership Competency." Complex states and experience require time, learning, practice, deliberate focus over the long-term.

The Bottom Line
Can we raise the quality of NLP around the world? I believe we can and that we must! Yet it will not happen quickly or easily. It will take the concerted effort of a critical mass of NLP practitioners to turn the tide and make the negative P.R. about NLP redundant. Many are already working to do this —we need many, many more to catch this vision and join in the effort. Together we can do so much more than apart or alone.

From: L. Michael Hall
Neurons egroup — April 28, 2010
Announcements

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL
NEURO-SEMANTIC CONFERENCE

Beginning in 2011 we plan to launch an annual *International Neuro-Semantic Conference* and we will begin from Grand Junction Colorado where Dr. Hall conducted his original NLP Training Center and discovered the Meta-States Model.

Dates: July 1-3, 2011 — Country Inn Conference Center
Theme: Actualizing Excellence
Content: 15 workshops — two tracks: Personal Excellence — Business Excellence

     The Schedule of events and workshops will be sent out in the 4 to 6 weeks as we develop that. Immediately following the Conference will be a Module III training of Meta-Coaching for the ACMC credentials. Come and enjoy.

INSIDE-OUT WEALTH
Holistic Wealth Creation

I had the privilege last weekend to present the *Wealth Creation workshop* again, this time in Montreal Canada. This is one of my favor trainings because I have a particular passion and commitment— I want NLP people to become financially independent! Actually, *I want them rich!* Why in the world would I want such a thing? So that more of them operate from *abundance* instead of *scarcity.* And so that more of them devote themselves to making more and more available the richness in the NLP model. And I want the same for Neuro-Semanticists world wide— to be rich enough to stop worrying about money and rich enough to richly contribute and make a difference.

I want that because I know what it is like to live from paycheck to paycheck and to constantly worry if you have enough to cover the expenses for the month. I used to live that way. That was my story for many, many years. Then I got over my semantic distorted non-sense about money, wrote my first 10-year wealth creation plan and began implementing it. Seven years later I reached my first goal— to be financially independent and make decisions based on what I want to do rather than what my financial condition required.

Now mention the word *wealth* and most people assume you are talking about money. Silly people! Wealth is about so much more than just finances. Wealth is much wealthier than that! *Wealth, in its fullness, is about your quality of life, mind, and experience.* It is about *you* living a life of abundance and enrichment inside and out. And paradoxically, wealth involves things that money can't buy—love, vitality, health, relationships, peace of mind, compassion, meaning, etc. As an inside-out phenomenon, wealth has four key dimensions: being – doing – having – and giving.

Now for years I've been meaning to put the secrets and the process of how to create inside-out wealth in book form. And now I have. Now there's a book. And the title? *Inside-Out Wealth.* So now, for the first time ever, *Inside-Out Wealth* is available in book form. What has been presented at the workshop in more than a dozen countries is now something you can get. And in this book you will find all the secrets you will need for creating a solid financial foundation for yourself.

In *Inside-Out Wealth* you will discover secrets of wealth creation—personal, behavioral, interpersonal, and financial secrets for becoming truly rich in every area of life—in your mind, emotions, relationships, career, finances, creativity, etc. Discover how to become financially

stable, financially independent, and then financially free. Discover how to tap into the heart of wealth so that your inner wealth becomes an ever-flowing spring for external wealth. I also designed the book so that if you want some personalized Wealth Coaching, you can receive at the end of each chapter and begin creating and actualizing your own customized Wealth Creation Plan. I want you rich—but do you want you rich? Do you want it enough to do something about it?

To your Inside-Out Wealth!

The book will be available to be mailed out — on May 18.
To get an early copy, you can order through in the following ways:

1) Send money orders or checks to —

> **NSP: Neuro-Semantic Publications**
> P.O. Box 8
> Clifton Colorado USA   81520— 0008
> > 280 pages
> > $25 (Shipping $5 in the USA; $13 outside the USA)

2) Use Paypal via the website, www.neurosemantics.com.

UNLEASHING VITALITY

How is your vitality level?
> If you were to gauge your everyday vitality— your energy, passion, commitment, and excitement— where would you put it (0 to 10)?
> Do you experience your vitality as a resource or as an objective?

The other day I got into a conversation with a guy at Starbuck's Coffee Shop when I was back in Colorado. He saw me with layers of papers stretched out on a table and was curious what I was working on. So he did something outrageous, he asked me.

I told him I was working on a new Self-Actualization workshop, *Unleashing Vitality.* Well, if he was curious before, that really jacked up his curiosity. Maybe he was suffering from de-vitalization, de-motivated, or just finding life empty and dull, whatever it was, his tone of voice shifted, as did the sparkle in his eyes and his engagement as he sat down at my table and inquired how does the unleashing of vitality works.
> "Well, it's begins with your energies— the energy that gets you out of bed in the morning... your mental energies by which you give such rich and robust meaning to what you are doing that you can't wait to get to it ... which you feel in your emotions — moving and motivating your behavioral and linguistic responses."

At that he said that was his problem; he didn't have any energy left. Not like he used to. So what could he do? That's what he wanted to know.
> "Ah, so something is blocking or dampening your energies! Do you know how you are throwing cold water on your inner energies?"

And so began a great conversation— one of those conversations that I long to have— anywhere, with anyone— if they open up, have a willingness to explore. And he did. I ended up sharing a lot about *Self-Actualization Psychology* and essentially gave him a very short version of the new workshop as well as some practical how-to steps about reclaiming his natural vitality.

So if you ask me, "Why in the world another Self-Actualization Workshop? After all, you already have three, why yet another one?" Well, there's several reasons. One reason is that some people are not ready for all of the *unleashing processes* which is what we do in *Unleashing Potentials* (Workshop I). In that "Ultimate Self-Actualization Workshop" we take people through 3-part drama. It is the drama of self-actualizing in 3-acts: the Construct, the Crucible, and the Zone (similar to what you find in the book, *Unleashed!*). The whole design is to facilitate the

unleashing of one thing— just one— because if you can, in 3 days, unleash one potential, then you will know how and have the experience for unleashing many more things.

But everybody isn't ready for that. And some don't have the energy to do that or the persistence, patience, or commitment. They don't have the inner *vitality* to go through the unleashing processes. So we need to go back to basics and especially the basics of human functioning. So in Workshop II, instead of using the Self-Actualization Quadrants, we use the Matrix-Embedded-Pyramid-turned-Volcano model of Neuro-Semantics. This is this model that transforms the static pyramid and hierarchy of the levels of needs into a dynamic model where your meaning-making encounters your neurological needs all the way up the levels. The Matrix-Embedded-Volcano explains and exposes your needs to your style of meeting your needs so you can evaluate if you are successful or not. And *vitality* is the telling indicator.

If you are adequately, accurately, and effectively *meeting your true human needs and wants, you experience a rush of vitality.* If you are not, then you will be exhausting your energy, wasting your time and effort, feeling unfulfilled and perhaps feeling frustrated and futile about trying to figure out how to get what you truly want or need. And to create some powerful measurements, in Workshop II *Unleashing Vitality* we use the *Self-Actualization Assessment Scale* that Tim Goodenough and I designed for getting a reading on how you are doing with gratifying your lower needs and higher needs.

The levels of needs—wants (the pushes and pulls of human energy and motivation) have requirements. There are certain conditions to adequately satisfying them. And you can fulfill them accurately and adequately or you can not. Do it and you have *vitality,* fail to do it, and you don't. That's why the *rush of vitality* provides both the reward for success and the indicator of where you are living your life.

Where are you living your life? Are you living at the survival level, the safety and security level, the love and affection (social, belonging, connecting) level, the ego-level of self-value and respect level? If you are, that's fine. Do you know how to gratify that level and move on up? Or are you somehow stuck at that level? Do you need to understand and find better ways to meet your needs? In *Unleashing Vitality* we first check to determine your understanding and gratifying of your needs. Do that right, and you'll unleash all kinds of physical and emotional energy— vitality for living.

Are you living at the *being*-level of the self-actualization needs and wants? That's the goal of the human experience and what this new *Unleashing Vitality* workshop is designed to enable you to achieve. The goal is to understand your neurological drives and how they interface with your psychological drives of meaning-making and how to use both for experiencing an energetic lifestyle. Then comes the rush of vitality and you'll experience it as peak experiences, magical moments, pure joy, and falling in love with life itself.

Now would that be worthwhile to you? If so, check it out. I will run the proto-type in Pretoria South Africa in Sept. and the second later in Imola Italy.

GETTING
YOUR RUSH OF VITALITY

I began thinking about vitality after presenting the *Unleashing Leadership* training last year in South Africa. It began with a question from Tim Goodenough and then that question led Time and myself to create the *Self-Actualization Assessment Scale.* What question does that scale answer? The question that Tim posed:

> "How do you actually *use* the hierarchy of needs to facilitate your own self-actualization?"

The answer is actually simple enough—Find out how well you are doing on each need, how well are you gratifying each need, how free you are from each need so that you can move up to the next higher level of need, and how much you are free from the lower needs to focus on the higher needs? That is, how much do the lower needs create a foundation for self-actualizing for you?

Your *vitality* goes back to your *needs.* And the matter of the fact is that neither you nor I ever get away from our "lower" animal needs. In fact, every single day we wake up and start there again. I did this morning. How about you? Not only that, but every day and every hour of every day we still require the most basic needs of life— air, water, food, sleep, etc. Our physiological and basic neurological needs never go away for good. We revisit them constantly and yet, here's the mystery and wonder, if you are adequately gratifying them, then the revisits are short, temporary, and not turned into "the meaning of life."

And if that's the case, then you have a foundation for living a self-actualizing life. If that's the case for you, then you are free to move beyond the animal needs to the truly human needs. Maslow called these truly human needs the *being* needs, the growth needs, and the self-actualization needs. These are the highest needs—the *expressive* needs to *be* fully and uniquely you as a human being. These are the needs to understand, to know, to contribute, to make a difference, to create beauty, order, to embrace truth, to create fairness, to give love, etc. And in terms of vitality—these are the needs that enable you to truly *unleash the vitality of your life.*

> Is that your life?
> Does your life have that kind of energy, passion, and vitality?
> Would you like it to?

You can. You have that potential within you. And that's what Neuro-Semantics as a discipline for actualizing excellence is designed to facilitate and that's especially true for the new workshop: *Unleashing Vitality.*

How? First and foremost, develop your base vitality and identity. That's the theme of **Day 1** of the *Unleashing Vitality* workshop. We start at the base with our drives—with the needs that drive our energy and motivation. The four levels of these lower needs address the needs that we share with the higher intelligent animals. And when we "truly satisfy" the need (Maslow's terminology), the drive of the need is gratified and with that, the next level of need emerges into awareness. It is in this way, that we move up the level of our needs and move to live and operate at the higher levels.

So what can mess this up? Lots of things: satisfiers that do not work, that do not actually gratify the need, cognitive distortions in our thinking patterns about our needs, distorted meanings, semantically over-loading the meanings so that we are trying to make a lower need "the meaning of life." Any of these things can interfere with a basic need and its requirements and cause us to become stuck at an animal level of living, which is not a good thing for a human being!

Achieving a base vitality, **Day 2** moves into the Self-Actualization needs— "Seeking your Peak Vitality and Identity." We now explore the 7 meta-drives or needs, the seven *being* needs of the human expressive motivation and use the Self-Actualization Assessment Scale for that as well. Human vitality transcends the animal needs and moves you up into those needs that no longer operate from lack, scarcity, or deficiency. You don't need these in the same way as the lower needs. And when you gratify them, they do not go away. They grow. They expand. They make you richer and fuller and more desirous, more ambitious. Move here and you will begin to experience the vitality of marvelous little peak experiences throughout your days and weeks. These are the rushes of vitality that we experience as joy, happiness, thrill, engagement, commitment, passion, and living for something bigger than yourself.

Where from there? The theme of **Day 3** is "Living the Vitality." Now it's time to fully experience the organisms of the peaks of the higher live. And Maslow has wonderfully provided some hands-on processes for doing that. By taking his characteristics of self-actualizing people which he identified in his modeling, I have identified several *peaking skills* and that makes up most of Day 3.

Vitality —the purpose of a fully alive/ fully human person! Well, at least in Self-Actualization Psychology. This is the psychology of human possibilities, of studying and viewing man as his and her best, under conditions of psychological health. You are not made to just get by, to endure, to survive. You were made for much greater possibilities than that! All this also comes back to the charge that Maslow began making from his original studies, "We have sold human nature short; there is a higher nature in man."

Maslow also added to that several other ideas: That higher nature that's within you and within me is ever-present and always calling out to us— if we can quiet ourselves and learn to listen to our inner voice. That higher nature is also asking you to become your Real Self. And that's part of the *Unleashing Vitality* workshop. I'll describe that in the next Meta Reflection.

From: L. Michael Hall

THE VITALITY
OF DISCOVERING AND BECOMING
YOURSELF

How real are you? Are you your *real* self? How much do you live your life to express your authentic self with your highest possibilities and actualizing your best potentials? That's what the self-actualizing life is all about— creating and living the best version of you so that you can contribute and make a difference. You were made for that. And your potentials clamor within for that. And if you try to shut all of that down, you only doom yourself to being unhappy for the rest of your life.

What this means is that your vitality is related to, and dependent upon, you discovering and being your best self— your real self. The wisdom within this actually goes far, far beyond Maslow to the ancient Greeks who made this one of the points of wisdom: "Know thyself."
And to others who said, "To thy own self be true." "Love your neighbor as you love yourself."

In *Self-Actualization Psychology* Maslow forged the way beyond the "empty slate" idea to the realization that each of us are born with unique features and possibilities— potentials of our disposition and uniqueness. And just as we are not born human (we become human, we learn how to become human), so we are not born fully ourselves— we *become.* We don't arrive on the scene with "instincts." We don't come out of the womb and can run and jump. We develop. Hence, Developmental Psychology arose in the twentieth century to map out how we develop physically, socially, sexually, mentally, emotionally, etc. And all of that resulted in Lifespan studies of the developmental stages.

All this relates directly to your sense of vitality in life. If you want to dampen your energies, reduce the quality of your vitality— try to be someone else! Try to conform to a mold that's established at school, in the media, by your culture, by Hollywood, or by any group. If you succeed, you will *fail at being you.* You will fail at being authentic and knowing yourself and with that, you won't know your best gifts and contributions. So you'll feel like a fraud, you'll evaluate yourself as up or down depending on local circumstances, you'll suffer identity crisis, you won't know what you like, your values, your unique potentials. And in the long run that will undermine your joy of life and basic vitality.

Another way to dampen your energies, reduce your vitality, and diminish yourself as a person— try to be what you are not. Try to be perfect! Ha, that's a great way to ruin a perfectly good fallible human being! At first you'll have lots of energy and effort but then you'll over-prepare

and begin to procrastinate and hyper-worry about flaws and fill your mind-body with anxiety and ... yes will make life a party!

Or try to be totally positive and never negative! Yes, at first it will seem like a great strategy— you, the positive thinker. But then whenever you have an experience that doesn't fit that mental box of "positive" you have to distort your experience and so begins the pretend-life. And the more you refuse to welcome (a very un-positive thing) the so-called "negative" emotions and experiences, you begin to defend yourself against reality. And in the long-run that distortion will undermine your ability to accept reality for what it *is*.

When your life energies seem down, depressed, empty, or diminished, you may be wasting your energies. You could be wasting them fighting some phantom in your mind like the need to be perfect or positive or never fallible, vulnerable, or mortal. The paradox is that your vitality for life comes more alive with more energy when you fully embrace your true nature as a weak, fallible, and mortal person! Look at any young child— weak, fallible, vulnerable *and fully alive to the mystery, excitement, and fascination of life!*

Vitality emerges from your needs, not in spite of them. So what do you need? What are the requirements of life that activates your full mind-body-emotions? People become experientially empty and out-of-touch with themselves when they don't know their true needs and try to live in some synthetic life that Wall Street or Hollywood or some Cultural Bureau of Standards impose on their lives. Then they live by external values, by the clock, by brand names, by what others are telling them they should think, feel, and experience.

Because we come without "instinct," and because we have to learn how to be human— we are so open to information outside of ourselves. This is our glory and our agony. Maslow said that for the human species is it hard to be the species we are (1971: 179). That's why we have to discover ourselves, to "know ourselves."

If your tired of being diminished, devitalized, and living like a zombie, then I'd recommend *Unleashing Vitality* so you can discover who you are in your lower-level needs and drives and find out how to gratify them adequately and accurately for yourself. Achieving that you can then move on to discovering who you are given your higher-level needs— your *being* needs and, again, how to gratify them so that it brings out your best and fulfills your nature.

BECOME A PROFESSIONAL

Just because a person has the ability to open his or her mouth and say words does not mean that they can communicate effectively, precisely, or persuasively. To become a professional communicator requires a lot more than that. Yes, *talking* is easy. To do that all that's required is a mouth and vocal chords and the ability to shout air through those vocal chords.

Communicating is an entirely different story. That requires a communion (co-union) of understanding between two people, not necessarily agreement, but at least understanding. And to achieve that, the persons exchange messages of their meanings. They listen, they speak, and they listen some more and they keep checking out what they heard until they are able to present their understanding of the other person's message (and meaning) to that person's satisfaction. Then, when message-sent and message-received is the same, the process begins anew.

To be truly professional as a communicator (as a leader, manager, parent, lover, collaborator, etc.) you have to patiently and persistently listen and support, question for precision and question for meaning frames, receive and give feedback, and induce state. And these seven skills are the *seven core skills that are training and benchmarked in Meta-Coaching,* which also explains why you can receive either a Meta-Coach ACMC Certificate or a Professional Communicator Certificate.

The fact is that few people are able to effectively communicate at a professional level. Communicationally, they are lazy and sloppy. They listen passively and defensively. They either do not know how to listen actively, deeply, or supportively, or are just not able or willing to put in the effort to do so. After all, it does take effort. Lots of it! That's because if you truly seek to understand a person and what that person is attempting to communicate, there are *so many things to listen for and sort through.* And there are many levels that you can learn to listen for.

So with questioning. When it comes to exploring with another person, most people do not have a clue as to how to effectively question and have horrible habits of asking leading questions, unuseful questions, and accusatory questions. Asking grounding questions that index for precision is an art that even many NLP-ers who know the Meta-Model don't know how to actually do in practice. They know it intellectually, but when it comes to doing it in an actual conversation, the theory doesn't inform the words coming out of their mouths.

And then there are the self-reflexive questions that enable a person to probe into the back of a person's mind, into their Matrix-world of ideas and premises that govern their thinking, understanding, and believing. These meta-questions are questions that enable and facilitate depth

and intimacy and asking them involves several sub-skills. They involve recognizing frames, inquiring about the meta-levels, holding them to make a jump to the next meta-level, etc. Professional communicators can do that and know that what they are doing, those who are not professional cannot.

Then there are the mirroring-skills of receiving and giving feedback in real time in the conversation. Again, not easy for the untrained. That's because to receive such is to calibrate to a person *while he or she is speaking* and not preparing your response. It requires total and completely presence to that person and understanding of what you are seeing and hearing while they are speaking. Such calibration skills, as Paul Ekman has demonstrated and as is taught in quality NLP courses, are clearly learnable. But they are not learned in a day or even a week; they require practice over time with many different people.

Now while we use these core communication skills in *Coaching Mastery* (Module III of Meta-Coaching) as the core coaching skills, they are equally the core communication skills for selling, for leading, for managing, for parenting, for loving, for mediating conflict, for negotiating, and any other communication discipline. So the behavioral benchmarks for these core communication skills are at the same time *the behavioral benchmarks for leadership, persuasion, management, etc.*

If you are now ready to *become a professional* in any of these disciplines, the next *Coaching Mastery* programs are in the following places at the following dates:
• Hong Kong is July 31— August 7. Team Leaders: July 30. Mandy Chai
• Auckland New Zealand — August 14—21. Team Leaders: August 13. Lena Gray
• Pretoria South Africa — Sept. 00 Team Leaders: Sept. Cheryl Lucas, Carey Jooste.
• Stockholm, Sweden — Oct. 7— 14. Team Leaders: Oct. 6. Sara Lee.

From: L. Michael Hall
Re: NSTT in 2010

DOUBLING THE RANKS

It is not often that we *double the ranks* but this June we will double the number of licensed Neuro-Semantic Trainers. With 45 in the Hong Kong Training and 30 in the Colorado training, we will be graduating and licensing 75 brand new *Neuro-Semantic Trainers* within the same month. We have never done that before so this is a first.

Now more than 200 people have been through NSTT training over the years, yet many took that training primarily for the public speaking and leadership skills not to become a Trainer. So in terms of those who are active as NLP and Neuro-Semantic trainers, those who have been keeping up their license as Neuro-Semantic Trainers, with these two classes we are doubling the ranks. We have never done anything like this before. (The list of licensed Neuro-Semantic Trainers is on www.neurosemantics.com.)

And yet we need more, a whole lot more! That fact is, we have just barely started to scratch the surface. With billions of people on the planet needing the communication and self-actualization skills that we facilitate— we need thousands of men and women of vision and skill— *vision* to see the possibilities of facilitating self-actualization in individuals and organizations and *skill* to make that happen. And that's a very special combination.

NSTT will finish in Hong Kong June 10 and NSTT Colorado will begin June 19. We have people coming from all over the planet — from the USA, Mexico, Canada, Europe, Africa, and Australia. With only 4 weeks to go — if you are interested, let me know.

NEEDS AND NEEDINESS

We humans are a needy bunch! We are born needy and we die needy. As a species, our life is conditional and the conditions of life, both to just survive and get by and to thrive and reach the peak of what's possible– puts within us drives and impulses urging us to move and to act to fulfill our needs. And what are these needs? What are these inherent drives motivating you and me?

They are the basic and meta-needs and it was Abraham Maslow who mapped out these levels of needs during the 1930s and 1940s. Today you know these levels as those of survival, safety, belonging, self, and "growth" (self-actualization) for *being* needs. Maslow documented this in his classic *Motivation and Personality* (1954) which contains his hierarchy of needs that he had first presented in 1943. In 2006 I updated Maslow's hierarchy with the models of Neuro-Semantics. That's when I introduced *the Matrix-Embedded Pyramid of Needs*. My first book on self-actualization (*Unleashed,* 2007) briefly discussed the human Base Needs as did *Self-Actualization Psychology* (2008).

Then in 2009, while in South Africa presenting one of the *Unleashing Self-Actualizing Leaders* workshop, Tim Goodenough asked a rivoting question that stopped me in my tracks:
>How do we use the Hierarchy of Needs for facilitating the self-actualization of clients?
>How can we use that to determine where a person is in terms of their need gratification?

That's when I asked Tim to work with me on answering those questions; and he did. Tim and I immediately began mapping out a process for using the Hierarchy of Needs for precisely that purpose. After several false starts, we eventually came up with the proto-type in January of 2010 while at the Leadership Summit. And after another one or two refinements, we presented *The Self-Actualization Assessment Scale.*

With that Scale we can now assess where you live your life—that is, at what level? Do you live your life at the base of the hierarchy, mid-way up the hierarchy, or at the peak? Depending on how well you have learned to meet your needs, you can live a low level life in terms of need gratification or a high level life. You can live your life in a self-actualizing society or in the jungle at the survival or safety levels. Do you know where you live your life and the specific needs that drive you?

You can also live in *the Red Zone* of any need— in the realm of deficiency and lack — not getting your needs met, not gratifying the drives that clamor within you. Or you can live in *the Green*

Zone of growth and development, adequately gratifying the driving needs so that the next level of development keeps emerging.

The Self-Actualization Assessment Scale now gives you a way to evaluate the level that you are living, where you are, what's your next level, the extent to which you might not be handling your base or meta-needs effectively, where you might be stuck, and how you can get leverage on yourself to more adequately meet your needs. And because you can assess your level and the quality of your need gratification, you can also now zoom in on the very places in your life where your needs may be keeping you stuck.

Now when I say *stuck*, this stuckness may have nothing to do with any trauma or need for therapy. You and I can get *stuck* by simply using an old coping style that no longer works. We can get stuck by accidently giving a need some meaning that does not fully and adequately represent the full truth. We can get stuck by semantically over-loading a need or a coping mechanism. And yes, we can also get stuck by giving distorted understandings about the need and ways to gratify it. That's what usually involves the discipline that we call therapy.

Needs — you and I are *needy* in our very nature. We are *not* self-sufficient, we are not invulnerable, we are not omniscient, omnipotent, and we are not infallible. Reading that line, do you feel like throwing a party or checking in at your local psychiatric clinic? If the latter, what expectations have you set about yourself and human life? What non-sense have you inherited about human nature? How long are you going to keep the insanity of thinking you are God? If the former, then congratulations for having fully joined the human race!

Being *needy* is our heritage, our nature, and our life. It is also *the basis for growth, learning, development and self-actualization.* After all, if you were omniscient, omnipotent, and infallible you wouldn't need anything, couldn't develop, and would not have more potentials to unleash. Being *needy* at your essence — needing to become fully alive, fully human, fully open, fully developing, fully curious, fully fascinated, fully enjoying life —drives your vitality and energy for the next-level!

Either way—if you are a trying-to-be-God-frustrated-and-deceived human or if you are a fully-alive-and-seeking-to-be-self-actualizing human —there's hope, there's solutions, and there's a self-actualizing future for you. For the first, there's a Crucible awaiting ready to help you melt now the non-sense of perfectionism and your God-trip so you can be human. For the latter, there's the adventure of moving to the next-level.

"HIGHER BUT SO WHAT?"

That's what he said to me. I was in Hong Kong and we were doing a promotional workshop on *Meta-Coaching and Mediation.* And we had several guys from various NLP Schools, several who had read some of my books and several who were "interested, but unconvinced." They were unconvinced that Neuro-Semantics had "anything" to offer that was actually different from NLP. At least that's what they said. So they wanted to know.

> "What's new and what different in Neuro-Semantics? And you can't say that it is higher because NLP has higher or meta-levels and positions."

"You're right!" I immediately acknowledged. "Dilts has introduced four meta-levels in his Neuro-Logical Levels pattern and even Bandler and Grinder had the 'meta-position' in their original model as well as they acknowledged that language is a 'meta-representational system,' and so developed a 'Meta-Model of Language in Therapy' as they called it to address that higher level. So in all of that, you are right on. NLP modeled higher levels."

"But while NLP has that, there's one thing that NLP did not have, not until I introduced the Meta-States Model. Only then did NLP obtained a model of the very special and unique kind of mind that man has, well, women also."

> "And what is that?"

I threw in the humor bit and paused, all designed to facilitate some "response potential" as Milton Erickson would have said. "Okay, so do you want to know what *it* is?" I said that in the tone and tempo that Morpheus uttered the same line to Neo in *The Matrix* movie, knowing that they would like that. One of them had read my book on *The Matrix Model* and had spoken about that when we began.

"What NLP does not have, apart from the Meta-States Model, even to this day, is a model of the self-reflexiveness of the human mind, and that's the most unique feature of human consciousness. NLP began as a modeling of consciousness, of how our brains operate and of how to effectively run your own brain, and yet NLP from 1975 to 1994 completely ignored the self-reflexivity of our minds. And that's what the Meta-States Model added to the NLP Communication Model that was so revolutionary."

I paused for a moment ... there was an awkward silence, so I added. "Where in NLP is there anything, one comment, one note, one pattern, one anything about the self-reflexivity of the human mind *except in the Meta-States Model*? Do you know? Have you ever seen it? Has any

NLP trainer ever even mention the fact that there is structure to our meta-cognitive skills and that our meta-cognitive abilities, processes, and competencies is what enables us to not only think, but think-about-our-thinking?”

> “That’s a good point that you’re making.” one of them said. And when he did, another looked at him as if he had just betrayed their alliance! That’s when he said in a challenging way, “So it’s all about thinking, conscious thinking, and that’s the biggest problem with Meta-States!”

“Well, I hate to disappoint you, but because a meta-state is first and foremost and ultimately a *state,* yes it is a mental state, yet it is also an *emotional* state and a *somatic* state. And that’s why when you meta-state, you not only bring one thought-to-another-thought, *you also bring one feeling, one emotion, one physiological state to another.* And that’s why meta-stating has nothing to do with the so-called ‘dissociation,’ and everything to do with creating the more complex and riches emotional states possible to human beings.”

> “But I heard that a Meta-State is a dissociated, non-feeling state and that that is why you are so academic and non-emotional.”

“And who did you hear that one from?” Well, he couldn’t say. “Do you mean you *cannot* or that you don’t want to say?” He didn’t want to. “And why would you not acknowledge the source of that rumor? Why hide what someone has obviously communicated to you and probably to others? They made it public, so why protect them against the truth?”

“So tell me, if you love learning, does that make the state of learning more or less emotional? What about joy of learning, passion about the joy of learning? And what about such meta-states as gloriously fallible, uninsultability, robustly resilient? Do those sound like academic and non-emotional states?”

“And do you think that the ‘higher’ states in Dilts’ list— mission, purpose, identity, spirit are less emotional, do you think they are dissociated states?” Well he didn’t.

“So now you know the difference! And *knowing* this difference, and *realizing* that to step back in your self-reflexive awareness can enrich your knowing with *appreciation* or *joy* or *wonder*, how do these *delightful* and *playful* states now transforms what you use to know and give you that broader and more comprehensive competency to explain to anyone who asks you about the revolutionary difference in Neuro-Semantics, and I’m wondering, just wondering if you were able to track all of the levels in this statement?”

Ah, now he knows about the “so what” of the higher states! I hope you do too.

THE MIS-NAMING OF
"MASTER PRAC."

Yes they mis-named it! And what a tragedy that mis-naming has created. Yet as with most things human, they undoubtedly were doing their best and simply didn't imagine, didn't think, didn't project themselves into the future to consider what consequences that name would have.

How could they have known that 35 years later people with just a month of training in this field would use the title, "Master Practitioner," stress the *Master* part, and consider that they have arrived, they know-it-all, they don't need to study anymore, they have arrived at Guru-dom?!

The history of NLP "Practitioner" and "Master Practitioner" is itself an interesting one. Since 1978 when Leslie Cameron Bandler put together the first "Practitioner" that was some 36 days long, the *Prac.* course of NLP was designed to introduce the basic NLP models and give people the essential competencies to use the models and patterns and to begin to think in terms of these models.

And that means what? That means understanding the basic *Communication Model of NLP.* That's why NLP *is*— a model of how human beings communicate, first to themselves (also called "thinking," "awareness," "being conscious") and then to others (also called "talking"). Modeled from three experts in communication, three "world-class professional communicators" NLP presented itself as being able to identify the essential structure of communication verbally and non-verbally.

The verbal part predominated at first. Using the dominating linguistic model at that time, Transformational Grammar (TG), Grinder introduced the majority of the jargon of NLP by sticking in all of the TG language: transderivational search to your referential index, selective restriction violation, nominalizations, etc. In *The Structure of Magic,* the language part was recognized as the "meta-representational system."

None of that was new, nor was the *sensory representational systems* (seeing, hearing, sensing, smelling, tasting). That had been around for a hundred years in the field of Psychology, from the very beginning of Psychology as a field separate from Philosophy. But there was something new, and radical— *Using the sensory representational systems as the languages of the mind.* That was new. And Bateson noted this in his Preface to *The Structure of Magic* commenting that he and his colleagues had been search for that for decades.

So first came the Meta-Model, then the Representational Systems, which includes calibrating to a person for recognizing representational systems (eye accessing cues and the like), then the TOTE model for Strategies, the Milton Model (and reversing the Meta-Model to use it for trance), the Sub-Modality distinctions, and the basic Time-Line model, and with these models, lots of patterns, processes, and exercises. And at first *Prac.* took a long, long time. But eventually, the process was streamlined to 21 days of 8 hours or so of training each day, and this still remains that in many places. We increase the hours to 12 hour days, require extensive reading and preparation ahead of time and can get through the content in a minimum of 7 days when we really push it. And what accelerates the learning of NLP in Neuro-Semantics is half a day on Meta-States since that's what explains the "magic" of NLP.

Then there's *Master Prac.* It really has nothing to do with mastery, it is mostly *more stuff.* More of the NLP model: Meta-Programs, Advance Modeling, Extensive Reframing using the old "sleight of mouth" patterns (or Mind-Lines), Meta-States, Advanced Trance, Advanced Time-Lines, and again, lots and lots patterns, processes, and applications to personal development, therapy, business, selling, leadership, etc.

Many years ago I asked Wyatt Woodsmall,
> "Why was Meta-Programs put in Master Prac. rather than in Prac.? After all, a person really needs to know about meta-programs from the beginning?"

His answer was simple and succinct: "Because they were not invented when Prac. was invented!" "Oh, so that's why!" (Of course, the story of their invention is in *Figuring Out People,* 2007).

When I first began training Master Prac. I tossed some things in about "mastery," what it is, how long it takes (the "ten year rule"), the attitude required, etc. and we ended Master Prac. With a "pathway to mastery" celebration. Today I think that's a mistake. While the 15 to 24 days of Master Prac. does take basic NLP further, and provides a more indepth understanding, if we're honest, it really has nothing to do with mastery and it actually is perpetuating the "get rich quick," "get smart quick," "get instant expertise" myth that's clings to NLP like a leach sucking its blood.

> *No one is a "master" of NLP after a two or three week intensive course or after a year if you stretch it out to 6 or 8 weekends.*

That's not how mastery works. Even I knew that after my first experience of Master Prac. At my first Master Prac. I wrote the notes that is now the book, *The Spirit of NLP* (1996). And in that book, the idea of *the spirit* of NLP is the idea of continuous learning, an unending, ongoing attitude of exploring, discovering, and ferocious curiosity.

In an interview in Moscow recently, I was asked about *Master* Practitioners/ Trainers who consider that they have arrived, who segregate themselves from everybody else and present themselves as having reached the pinnacle of the field. "What about them? What would you say to them?"
> "I'd say that 'You have missed the whole point! You do not understand the basics of NLP if that's your attitude! Your license to train ought to be revoked and you ought to go study it afresh and learn to develop the spirit of NLP. Your journey to mastery has

hardly begun— there are many new developments in the field and unless you are staying involved, collaborating with those who are doing things in this field, every day you are falling further and further behind!'"

THE ~~AMERICAN~~ HUMAN DREAM

What Are You Dreaming About for Your World?

You have a higher nature! What you are in your essence—*in your human essence*—is more than just an animal. Yes, you have the lower animal needs to survival, to feel safe and secure, to belong to a family, a group, and to have a place in that group so that you know your place and have a sense of importance and status. All of that is important. But none of that is sufficient if you want to live human life fully and experience everything that's available to you. You need more.

You and I also, in the very essence of our human nature, we have higher needs—we have meta-needs. Among these meta-needs is the need to grow, to learn, to think, to actualize our self, to become all that you can become. Maslow called these meta-needs and self-actualization needs.

To strive *nly* to fulfill the lower needs will actually undermine you and diminish your life as a human being. It works fine for animals, but when a human does that, it neuroticizes life and values. It makes you neurotic so that you and your lifestyle becomes sick.

Maslow addressed this once in an article in which he challenged "the American Dream." Today these words apply far beyond the borders of the US. Today I'm writing to a much broader audience, an international community, so this applies not only to the people of one nation and what they might envision, but the dream that transcends every nation and yet includes all of them— so, to an International Human Dream!

> "The American dream is typically expressed in *lower-need* terms (e.g., in terms of income) and almost entirely in materialistic terms. That is, personal success is generally defined in terms of the amount of money one receives, and along with it, the number of symbolic, status objects that one has attained in life, such as a fancy automobile, a boat, a big house in an upscale neighborhood, lavish vacations, and fine clothes.

> "But to enjoy a good life, *all* of these status objects are expendable. *Not one of them is actually necessary for true fulfillment.* [italics added] Psychologists know that what *is* necessary for human nature is that, as our material gratifications are satisfied, we move upward in our needs through belongingness (community, brotherhood/ sisterhood, friendliness), to love and affection, to achievement and competence with ensuring dignity and self-respect, and then on up to freedom for self-actualization and for expressing and resolving our unique idiosyncrasies. And then upward, still higher, to our *meta-needs* (the Being-values).

"But where has this conception been at all meaningfully articulated? ... No governmental official is speaking in these crucial terms. There is no official track toward the attainment of these goals. . . .

"In other words, the young adults today who are confronting American society are not being offered the *meta-values* of a formal goal. For them, the higher values are therefore, not part of the formal U.S. value system. Consequently, these youth perceive the United States as a limited system of lower motivation, lower needs, lower aspirations, and lower goals that any self-respecting, mature human being would despise and reject. Anyway, the whole American dream thing today is phrased materialistically.

"Moreover, there is no clear track in our society upward to the *B-values*. ... There is not even a language yet to deal with it meaningfully." (1996: 141-143)

This sad critique is just as true in 2010 as it was back in 1965—probably more so, and not only in America, but most everywhere in the world. Limiting life to just the material satisfactions of the lower needs keeps you at the animal level of existence. The higher intelligent animals needs these things. That does not differentiate you from them! There is so much more within you seeking —clamoring—for self-actualization. Maslow called these higher needs the *being*-needs and the *being*-values because they are about using all of your doing and achieving so that you can move up to the meta-levels where you can *be* all that you are— to be fully alive/ fully human.

And just as it was true in 1965, so it is today. There are no government officials or departments speaking in terms of self-actualizing. There is still no official track in most companies that enables people to reach their highest and best. Here then is a real and definite need, one built into our nature, and one that will increasingly emerge as the standard of life rises around the planet. And it is a biological need that cannot be covered up with more material comforts. Try as you may, you cannot meet your high *being-needs* via shopping.

What are we to do? First we can raise our perspective to envision a new dream about what it means to be human, and to be fully alive as a human being. Then we can use the Self-Actualization Quadrants to diagnose where we are and the direction where the pathway to self-actualizing lies. In Neuro-Semantics we are committed to changing all of this ... to creating self-actualizing lives, companies, leaders, and countries. Come join us!

Neuro-Semantic News — June 14, 2010

June 10, 2010 was the Graduation Ceremony in Hong Kong for 45 new Neuro-Semantic/ NLP Trainers. Most (37) are from Hong Kong and are part of the *Institute of Neuro-Semantics—Hong Kong.* We also have 2 from Egypt, 2 from Indonesia, 1 from the Netherlands, 1 from Japan, 1 from Malaysia.

Mandy Chan, the organizer, made this happen from her vision at NSTT in 2005 in South Africa. As a Trainer herself, she has sponsored Self-Actualization trainings, she negotiated the sponsoring of Meta-Coaching in China, and has demonstrated the

leadership criteria of collaborating, contributing and communicating (the "doing" criteria of a Neuro-Semantic Leader) and because she also is real (authentic), congruent, and operates with integrity, *she has become the newest member of the Leadership Team of Neuro-Semantics.*

From: L. Michael Hall
Meta Reflections 2010 – #30
June 21, 2010

MYTHS ABOUT SELF-ACTUALIZATION

Several readers of *Neurons* have recently informed me that "Self-actualization is going around the NLP community, and I think they are stealing your stuff!" And I always say that while I could wish that they would give credit, I'm pleased to hear that and that I'm honored that they steal from my books on Self-Actualization (*Unleashed,* 2007, *Self-Actualization Psychology,* 2008, and *Unleashing Leadership*, 2009). The main thing is that self-actualization is coming to the field of NLP and informing it. And that's really good since this is the secret history of NLP and so enables the field to discover itself!

What I'm not too pleased about, however, are some of the mis-quotes and the mis-representations about self-actualization and some of the myths that are perpetuated.

Myth 1: Maslow changed his mind.
I have heard this several times and places. While in Moscow in May of this year, someone brought it up in the *Unleashing Leadership* workshop. They said that they had heard that Maslow changed his mind about the Hierarchy of Needs just before his death. That is as wrong as the newsstand magazines about Michael Jackson living somewhere in hiding with Elvis. And what is my evidence? In 1970 Maslow completely re-edited his classic work 1954 book, *Motivation and Personality.* And in that 1970 edition, he not only kept the Hierarchy of Needs but provided more evidence of the validity of that model that he first published in 1943. So, no Maslow never changed his mind about that!

Myth 2: Bandler is a self-actualized person.
Recently someone nominated Richard Bandler as a self-actualized person! I broke into laughter when I heard that one! Of the 15 traits of self-actualizing people that Maslow identified and that he and Everett Shostrum used to create the POI (Personal Orientation Inventory) that measures self-actualization, Richard, at best only meets a quarter of them. The quote that I was sent read: "self actualized people like Bandler and Maslow are less than 1% of the population." Talk about a way to put people off from self-actualization!

Myth 3: Self-Actualization leads to Self-Indulgence, Aggrandizement, Involvement, etc.
This is a criticism often presented against self-actualization. The fear is that if we focus on ourselves, we will get lost in "self," and that will mean selfishness, egoism, self-obsession, self-inflation, self-preoccupation, self-serving, etc. The list of words used to attack the process of self-actualizing seems unlimited!

The problem is that the evidence in history and in the lives of self-actualizing people completely contradicts this. When a person actualizes his or her highest meanings and best performances, *they get beyond themselves.* They forget themselves (they become self-forgetful), they get the ego out of the way because the purpose and direction of their actualization is not about themselves, but what they can contribute. That's why "self-actualization" is not about you! (Article, Meta Reflection 2009, #35 *Self-Actualization is Not about You!*)

Meeting your lower needs (survival, safety, love, self value) is about you. But when you move beyond the lower needs to the higher needs, you actualize your meanings and performances for a project or vision that is bigger, and other than, yourself. That's what self-actualization means. It means living to make a difference, living to contribute, to give. That's why self-actualization is not an end in itself.

Myth #4: Self-Actualization Psychology is shallow and naive.
With his focus on the bright side of human nature, some have charged that Maslow and self-actualization is naive about human nature. Of course, what this really means is that the person who makes that charge has never read what Maslow himself wrote. If there was anyone who wrote a lot about "evil," and the dark side and how human nature can go wrong, it was Maslow! Further, it was Maslow himself who criticized Esalen and the first Human Potential Movement on this very thing— they didn't take seriously that human nature can be just as creatively destructive as it can be creatively constructive.

Myth #5: Self-Actualization leads to irresponsibility and blaming.
I don't know where anyone would get this charge until they also are seduced by Myth #1. The truth is that self-actualizing people care about being responsible and they actually seek to be held accountable. They know their inner powers and do not discharge them through blaming. And if you read Maslow, Rogers, Rollo May, Fromm, Frankl, and other key leaders in the first movement, they strongly emphasized responsibility.

Myth #6: Human potential is unlimited.
This is a myth on the other side of things— from those who see no limitations and no constraints. The danger on this side is turning human nature into infinite and god-like and therefore having no limits. Yet the truth is that there are limits to potentials and possibilities. Every power of a human being is fallible— "liable to error," and limited. Often when we speak about the "unlimited potentials" within human nature or a particular person, we are not speaking literally but speaking for the purpose of inspiration.

Self-actualization is enabling people to become fully *human.* To awaken to the possibilities within each person and facilitating the unleashing process so that each becomes the best version of themselves. It is living meaningfully (your semantics) in your body (your neurology)! To your full development!

MODELING INTUITIONS

Like any good nominalization, *intuition,* is vague, fluffy, and muddled even meta-muddled. It means and can mean so many things. And because of that it can mean just about anything. So, what does it really mean? Well, that's the whole point. It means whatever the speaker intends for it to mean. And, of course, sometimes we learn to use a word when we don't know what we mean by it and so use it as a word to cover-up our ignorance.

Given that, the word intuition literally refers to *in-knowing.* And again, what do we know inside ourselves? And are we referring to conscious knowing and/or unconscious knowing? How else is the term used?

NLP Intuitions
When NLP began, the co-founders used the word *intuition* as referring to what they had learned but no longer knew, what they now "knew" unconsciously. Read *Structure of Magic* and you'll see that they frequently spoke about "modeling the intuitions of Virginia and Fritz." The *intuitions* they were referring to were *their therapeutic intuitions* regarding what to do with a person in order to bring about change— transformative change, magical change. They commented that Virginia and Fritz seemed *just to know* what to do with people. It was *intuitive.*

Of course, both Perls and Satir had ideas, theories, understandings about human nature and human psychology that they had studied for decades. Both also had a life-time of experiences with people, trying this and that and then over time, finding what works and developing their own style with such methodologies.

So what the modelers wanted was a *model of the intuitions of these two wizards of change.* And that's what NLP is at its heart. The basic NLP Communication Model is a model of the intuitions of Virginia Satir of *Family Systems* and Fritz Perls of *Gestalt Therapy* crystalized using the formulations of transformational grammar.

When I first entered the field of NLP, I went back to the books of Fritz and Virginia and read everything each of them had written. And lo, and behold, most of the Meta-Model was everywhere in those writings, as well as many of the original NLP processes! But they were not formalized as such. They were not structured. There was no sense of how they come together and work. Yet they are there. Richard and John ordered them, put them together as a model of what works, and *presto!* Suddenly we have "NLP" — the structured intuitions of two top

communicators.

Knowledgeable and Skillful Intuitions

This is *the intuition* that we also see in most world-class athletes. They have a strong and effective intuition about the game and know how to play it at that level, know how to be where a ball will be, etc. And they have spent years developing that sense. Is this genetic or is it learned? To what extent is it a combination of both?   A basic disposition and a strong aptitude is given a person which he or she then develops through learning and training, and so it eventually becomes intuitive.

> Given that, what aptitudes do you have naturally as a talent that you have developed into a skill and that now has become a competency of high value?
> Can you now say that you have an in-knowing and are intuitive about that competency?

That is one meaning of the word intuition. Another refers to our *in-knowing* about our basic human needs, drives, and values. We intuitively move forward to gratify the survival needs, the safety and security needs (order, structure, control), the social needs (love and affection, connection, belonging) and the self-regard needs. That's another use of the term intuition.

What are other uses of the term? Well, some people use it to speak about "a mother's intuition," or intuition as a sixth sense, almost an ESP (extra sensory perception). Yet if a person makes these genetic, then we are hard pressed to explain how, at times, a biological mother here or there, abandons her children or even kills them. In this, if you attempt to use "intuition" as if it was a synonym of "instinct," you quickly run into lots of problems.

Intuitions for Modeling

In the field of NLP and Neuro-Semantics it is the lightning fast response of a talent-turned-into-a-skill with experiential knowledge that now makes *intuitive* something to model. So one facet of modeling is to model the intuitions of an expert. It is to find someone who over many years now has well-trained knowledge and sensitivities that allows him or her to do something with excellence.

In the area of coaching, Meta-Coaching arose, in part, from modeling the intuition of expert coaches. I had been modeling coaches since the early 1990s, finally in 2001 got serious about modeling coaches, modeled several in Sydney Australia, and that led to the first Meta-Coach Training in 2002. Today we are now able to cultivate, develop, and facilitate in those who want those expert intuitions.

Neuro-Semantic News

> We are currently in our final week of NSTT here in Colorado with 29 people from 9 countries who will soon be graduating as *Neuro-Semantic NLP Trainers.*
> The next *Meta-Coach* trainings will be in Hong Kong (July 31 to August 7) and then in New Zealand (August 13-21). Details are on www.meta-coaching.org

THE BEST EVER NSTT

A few days ago the latest class of Neuro-Semanticists graduated as licensed Trainers, adding 73 more trainers to our ranks in the month of June (45 from Hong Kong and 28 from Colorado). The Colorado Training was the first time that NSTT had returned to my hometown since 2004 and in returning, it was the largest one conducted in the United States. We had 28 participants from 10 countries and 7 language groups: United States, Canada, Mexico, Netherlands, Sweden, France, Kenya, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand. This training I co-trained with Colin Cox and Omar Salom which was supported by Lena Gray and Jim Walsh. Both Omar and Lena are in the Master Trainer track— missing from that track was Cheryl Lucas, Lene Fjellheim, and Alan Fayter.

The Best One Ever
In terms of quality, the leadership team all agreed that this was *the best one ever*. And why? A key to that is the fact that the program itself keeps evolving. It keeps evolving due to the feed back we get and search for from participants and the feedback we give to each other every day of the training. It evolves from the things that we keep learning about what works and what does not. Today the core competencies of presentation and training are developed by presentation, practice, benchmarking presentations, flexibility drills (presentation games), and the psychology that supports the processes and patterns.

This was also the first time ever we actually covered all of the materials in the program. Part of the reason that we were able to do that in Colorado was the quality of knowledge and skill that the participants came with and demonstrated. Overall, it was much higher than in previous groups and that allowed us to move on quickly beyond the elementary factors.

What we heard over and over, what was written on the feedback repeatedly was that the training was so *transformative* it was two trainings in one, one for Training and Platform skills, the other for Transforming Personality. From the practice in Hong Kong, we immediately tightened up the benchmarks ... thereby providing the highest standard and the most rigorous discipline yet. And many of the people who had previously graduated from various NLP Trainers' Training programs said that this far exceeded their expectations and anything they had previously experienced. A few said that received more by the end of Day 2 than their entire Trainers' Training.

From this NSTT, 4 new Institutes of Neuro-Semantics was launched on the last day— an Institute in Canada, United States, Sweden and the Netherlands.

The first 5 days were video-taped and, in fact, each trainer was recorded and received a CD of all of the presentations. This was done by Jason Focht and John from Austin Texas. Then on Days 6 and 7 they video-taped *The Psychology of APG* which will soon be a video product, the first time this has ever been recorded.

For the last several months, numerous people have already been asking, "Where will be the next NSTT? And when?" We are now in conversation about taking it to Europe in 2011. Given this we want to ask the readers on Neurons the following questions:
> *Would you be interested in NSTT in Europe at the end of July– first of August, 2011?*
> *Would you prefer Paris France or Brussels Belgium?*

If you are interested in NSTT— send me an email (privately to [meta@acsol.net)](meta@acsol.net). We want to get a sense of who and how many are interested in that.

For the first time ever also — we had 5 participants who came directly from the *Meta-Coach Pathway (Coaching Essentials, Coaching Genius, Coaching Mastery - ACMC)* and who experienced the 15 days of NSTT so that they can become *Coach Entry Trainers* (able to train Modules I and II) of the pathway. Those in this process are: Irena O'Brien, Ph.D., Henrik Schalen, M.D., Dan Ellappa, Maria Jagerwall.

Below I have attached a list of all of the new Trainers ... so that you can contact them for trainings in Neuro-Semantics. We will have their names and emails permanently on the List of Official Neuro-Semantic Trainers on the primary website soon (www.neurosemantics.com).

IF I WERE UNEMPLOYED

Lots of people are unemployed. Statistics for most of this year (2010) has put employment in the United States at about 10 percent. That's millions and millions of people. And if we include those who have given up looking, there are millions more which probably makes the actual unemployment rate closer to 14% or more. And in Spain and other places, unemployment statistics are even much higher.

During the recession in the early 1980s when there was also a high unemployment rate, I was unemployed from time to time, but kept picking up various jobs, usually minimum wage and typically hard physical work. One temporary job I took in 1983 was as a typist for Kelly Girl (now Kelly Services). (I was also paid the highest rate of all the Kelly Girls because I was the fastest "girl" on the keyboard!) Back in the early 1980s I didn't know NLP, but I did get a mischievous enjoyment out of being sent to some business as a "Kelly Girl" and watch the facial expressions on people as I walked in!

Today, as a Neuro-Semanticist, if I were unemployed, I would be unemployed for a day or two at best. That's because with the language skills of NLP, the coaching skills of Neuro-Semantics, along with the framing skills, the relational and social skills, and the negotiating skills, I would head right to McDonalds or Burger King or any fast food place, or any other place that needs front-line people, and be hired on by the afternoon. My strategy would be as follows.

I would offer to work for one week without any pay *to prove myself* and I would position the hiring as *only if I am worth at least twice and probably three and four times as much as you pay for entry.* I would propose to the owner or the person hiring that *I would make you look great* by meeting every number that you as a supervisor or manager are measured by. I would *work harder* than anyone on staff, I would *set the pace for adding massive value to every customer, whether an internal or external customer.*

If I were unemployed today I would then make it my purpose to enable every person I'd work with to enjoy their job, awaken to their possibilities, and become more effective. I would use my coaching skills to create a connection through listening and supporting them. I would be their personal coach at work. I would access the very best states for serving customers and meet not only their expectations, but also their hopes and desires as best as I could, and if at all possible, their unknown needs and desires (I'd be thinking of their hierarchy of needs and meeting them all the way up if possible).

If I were unemployed today I'd be accessing my best states to make those overseeing my work

informed about what's happening at the ground level, giving them ideas for improving morale, productivity, and motivation — letting them take all the credit for the ideas. It would be my conspiracy for getting them some raises and recognition, and only they and me would know about it.

If I were unemployed today I'd be using my framing skills with fellow employees, managers, and customers to enable all to create the very best meanings in that work environment —meanings that would enrich their everyday experience. I'd use my induction skills to invite all to access ever increasingly rich resourceful states and do so subtly so that they wouldn't recognize what I was doing, but only have good feelings when they walk away from our brief encounters. And that would condition them unconsciously to keep coming around to get some more!

If I were unemployed today I would think in terms of the overall business success, the leadership, the management, and the culture, and subtly plant ideas with people at all levels about new possibilities and again, let them take on the ideas as if it were their own so that they would begin to create cultural change from the ground up. I would do an assessment of the level of engagement in people at the work and also as assessment of their basic and higher needs (using the Self-Actualization Assessment Scale) and focus on enabling each person's coping and mastery skills.

But sadly I'm not unemployed. Actually, I am also not employed at all! I just work for myself and play around with the things that I'm interested which just so happens to provide the financial resources that I need to be financially stable and independent. So I don't even need a job, I have a mission. But if you need a job, and if you are unemployed, and you have some NLP and/or Neuro-Semantic skills ... then perhaps you'd like to adopt this strategy for your own. If not, I'd encourage you by all means to *learn the skills of NLP and Neuro-Semantics.* They'll change your life as they did mine and millions of others around the planet.

To your ever-increasing Resourcefulness for handling the Challenges of Everyday Life with power and joy!

IF I WERE UNEMPLOYED
PART II

Since the beginning of this year, the wage-earners within four of the families who live in some of my properties have been unemployed, two still are. So I've had the privilege of talking to them about their time of unemployment. I say privilege because I've been amazed at how the conversations get to the heart of things very quickly. What typically would take a lot of pacing, a lot of getting through the roles and personas that people normally put up and hide behind. But with unemployment, things quickly go back to fundamentals— money for food and shelter. And so frustration is right there on the surface, and immediately behind it are all kinds of other strong feelings and thoughts— anger, injustice, blame, fear, confusion, etc.

One young guy lost his job and he defined it immediately and entirely the fault of his manager. "If she was a decent person she would not have done that; she plays politics and never did like me; she increased my hours without increasing my pay; she was out for me from the beginning." After a dozen of those "reasons" which he offered as why he lost his job and didn't have his rent money, I said, "So you take no responsibility for losing your job?" He immediately agreed. So I slowed the tempo of my words and asked the question again,
> "So you take absolutely not even one percent of the responsibility ... you are a complete victim of your manager's actions? Really?"

He still would not step up to his personal powers and responses and instead tried to give me a psychological profile of "that bitch." When he finished his dark description, I said,
> "This is great. What's her name? I have to go study this totally depraved and pathological manager. I've met some incompetent ones, some that were over their heads, some others that brought lots of personal problems to work, but never in my life someone with that much pathology. There's always a way to manage up inside an organization, but this may be the exception. What's her name?"

That shook him a bit, perhaps knowing that I was a psychologist made him think I'd actually go talk to her. "Well, she's not that bad."
> "Oh, okay. So what did you do to make friends with her, build a relationship of rapport and exercise your influence so that you managed upward?"

Silence. "Don't tell me that you just reacted in fear and anger and frustration to her? Don't tell me that you let her set the atmosphere at work and you just lived inside that atmosphere without bringing your influence in? Don't tell me that you let her set the frame for the games there?"

"Well, yeah, I guess so."

    "So you played the game that you were a victim of her meanness and nastiness! That's what you did? That's how you gave your power away to her and let her control your emotions and thoughts? You handed her the strings to your inner responses as if you were a puppet in her hands? Is that what you're telling me?"

"Yeah, but there was nothing else I could do."

    "Yes, I know —that's the song you sing and the dance you dance."

"What song? What dance?"

    "The victim song and dance, of course. Just as you are doing with me this very moment, you played the victim. You set the frame in your mind in that whiny tone — 'There's nothing else I can do.' And so with that frame in your mind, you have to play that game, the Victim Game. And it sounds like you did a good job, and are still dancing to that tune."

That finally got his attention and from there he began to come out from behind himself and that false identity (of being a victim) and the conversation began to became real. Eventually he asked me what I would do with such a mean and nasty boss. "I would manage her." He wanted to know how.

    "If you have a *relationship* with someone then *you have a role that you play in that relationship and that gives you power.* The other can only make the responses that he or she makes. You have the power to make your responses—to set frames. And that's what I would do. I'd manage her with my responses— I'd set a high intention to win her as my internal champion in the company by creating a deep rapport with her, by letting her know that I wanted to be on her "A List" of valued employees, by bringing out the best in her, and so on."

"But I don't like her enough to do that. I could never do that."

    "Ah, so is that your choice— to not like her and refuse to do that? [Yeah.] And if she was the warden in a prison with life and death in her hands would you still do that? [Well, no.] Ah, so you do have a price! That's good. If you have a big enough intention, you'd stop being a slave to your emotions, and take the effective actions. Good. Now you know where to start."

While he was processing through all of that, I said,

    "Do you know what's one of the worst things about being unemployed? It is having *an attitude of being helpless.* It is acting as if you are without your own powers of influence. If I was unemployed, I'd make sure to super-charge my attitude to keep it robust and resilient. That's what I would do."

NLP HISTORY
AND SELF-ACTUALIZATION

As you probably know, I began exploring some of the pre-history of NLP a few years ago and discovered *The Secret History of NLP* in 2005. And at various conferences I have playfully said, "It is a secret history that Richard Bandler and John Grinder don't want you to know about." At other times I teased saying, "And they don't even know about this secret history." What I didn't know was how true that has turned out to be.

Recently I went back to re-read John Grinder's *Whispering in the Wind* to look for any indication that he knew or had any awareness of the relationship between Maslow, Rogers, the Human Potential Movement, Esalen, etc. to NLP. And what I found not only confirmed what I've been saying, but goes further. Even today John Grinder does not know about this history! Apparently he hasn't been reading my books!

What is the evidence? From his own words, here is some:
> On page 2 of *Whispering* he makes a list of therapies and he lists "self-actualization" which he keeps separate from what he and Bandler were doing in NLP. He also mentioned Aldous Huxley (p. 26) without indicating that he had any awareness of his role in the Human Potential Movement (HPM). He mentioned that Bateson was at Esalen and refers to "a lecture taped at Esalen Institute just before Bateson's death, available through Esalen" (p. 115)

Then he distanced himself from Maslow, the HPM, and Self-Actualization Psychology when he wrote the following which like his jabs about myself and Robert Dilts, he here does to Maslow:
> "Relax, Maslow, there is no full realization of human potential, only an ascending spiral of differences and change." (315)

So while Grinder knows about Esalen and Maslow and Self-Actualization, and even that Bateson was at Esalen, and speaks about them in a general wa, he does not, even to this day, demonstrates any awareness of their historical significance to NLP. He does not seem to know that Bateson, Perls, and Satir worked together at Esalen and that it was from the context of the Human Potential Movement that NLP arose. Perhaps he was, and is, too close to things to have that expanded historical perspective.

In fact, here's my analysis of all of this. I think that at the beginning Bandler and Grinder was so close to the idea of picking up the linguistic distinctions of Perls and Satir (and later Erickson)

that they never really stepped back to ask, "What's this all about? What is the larger frame? What unites Perls and Satir?"

Historically they simply stumbled upon the strange "effectiveness" that resulted when Richard was mimicking Perls in his "Gestalt Class," which surprisingly led people in the class to change and transform. Richard simply thought it was funny getting people to hallucinate a mom or dad into a chair and yell at them. So they began trying to figure out what was the structure of this "magic." Their focus was on the details, and since both were reductionists, or as Grinder admits, "minimalists," they looked down to the tiniest of distinctions like eye-accessing cues and sensory-specific linguistic distinctions. They never looked up.

And without looking up, they didn't even ask "What is Perls and Satir doing that's similar?" They only asked for differences, "What are they doing that's different from everyone else?" This was their original genius— *mismatching for differences.* And by focusing on such, they found some very unique distinctions that now make up the foundations of NLP. Yet without the balance, they also missed something that was right in their face— the Human Potential Movement which could have given them a *big why* and tie them (and hence NLP) to the HPM.

Yet the result of their mismatching was that they pushed away from everything and everybody else working in the field of psychology and psychotherapy as this sought to create their own unique field. You can see this *pushing away from everyone else* in all of the original NLP books. And it is still starkly evident in *Whispering* where John has to mismatch his earlier self, Bandler, and a great many leading NLP trainers in the field today.   Several unfortunate things resulted from this— one being the inability to define what NLP is. Of course, it is most fundamentally a Communication Model, yet it is also a form of psychology, and a field of modeling.

Yet because Bandler and Grinder were so driven by mismatching for differences, they could not, and would not, connect with all of the sources that define and position NLP: Gestalt (Perls), Family Systems (Satir), Cognitive (George Miller, Noam Chomsky), General Semantics (Alfred Korzybski), Anthropology (Bateson) or the Human Potential Movement (Maslow, Rogers, Huxley). So that left NLP out in the cold, alone, disconnected, and without a history.

Yet NLP does have a history— a history that goes back many, many years prior to Bandler and Grinder. As with every movement, it grew out of the ideas and passions of the time and "on the people on whose shoulders they stand" (even if Grinder has expressed dislike for that phrase!). NLP's history goes back to the very fields and people listed above and most of all, it goes to the movement that Maslow initiated as he pioneered a paradigm shift in psychology from the sick side to the healthy side. And that's why we have made Self-Actualization Psychology the foundation of Neuro-Semantics and to that extent, re-discovered the fuller history of NLP.

> [If you were there at the beginning, 1972-5 or in the 1970s or early 1980s and have some NLP history to share, send to me at meta@acsol.net.]

THE HISTORY OF THE BEGINNING

If you have been a long-term reader of Neurons, you know that one of my interests for some time has been the History of NLP. My interest is to understand the sources of this field and model and the giants upon whose shoulders we stand. Understanding our roots also allows us to acknowledge sources as any professional would do as well as to be able to see the strengths and weaknesses of the models that we have inherited.

Two years ago I wrote some of the history of NLP in *Self-Actualization Psychology* (2008). Prior to that, I published that same content as articles in various publications (i.e., *Resource,* London) and in an NLP Book published in India (*Neuro-Linguistic Programming: Concepts and Applications,* edited by Kunal Gaurav, 2008).

To know your history enables to know yourself— the narrative of the stories that define how a group started, why, the antecedents that set up the original direction, and how things evolved in the intervening years. This is also one of the things we do in NSTT as we prepare people to become trainers and leaders in Neuro-Semantics. Our aim is to provide *a historical perspective of NLP and Neuro-Semantics.* We also do that for a specific purpose— to equip those who are becoming trainers to know our history and understand the forces that have led to the experiences and conditions that they will find in this field. We do that to understand the people, ideas, and influences that have contributed to creating the field as we know it today.

So how did it all get started? By accident. It was all a combination of some strange coincidences. A young student at KresgeCollege at the University of California in Santa Cruz needed some extra money and so worked in the stockroom for *Science and Behavior Books.* And then somewhere after 1970 that led to him being asked to transcribe tapes of Fritz Perls. Now the gift that Richard Bandler had at that time was that of hearing, as a rock-star-wanta-be, he played the guitar and could hear with precision and then he found that he could mimic what he heard.

So later Dr. Robert Spitzer would write that he would go into the room where Richard was transcribing the tapes and Richard would speak in the voice, tone, tempo, etc. of Fritz Perls and Dr. Spitzer would sometimes accidently call him "Fritz." That got Richard interested in Gestalt. On one occasion Richard said that he was house setting for a professor, found a book on Gestalt in the library and thought that the idea of hallucinating your mom or dad into a chair and yell at them about your disappointments was great stand-up comedian stuff. But then after Fritz died (January 1970) Spitzer asked him to finish transcribing and editing the materials for a book. That

became the book, *The Gestalt Approach and Eye Witness to Therapy,* published in May 1973.

The films and the transcribing gave Richard some experience with Gestalt and so in the spring of 1972, as a fourth year student, he was allowed to create his own curriculum for a class. That's when he "taught" a "student directed seminar on Gestalt Therapy." (McClendon, *Wild Days,* 1989, p. 9). And that had to be under the supervision of a professor, and that's how John Grinder got involved.

What surprised them both was that by merely repeating the Gestalt language patterns, Richard was able to "do Gestalt" and the participants began to experience some tremendous changes in their lives. How did that happen? And that led to the mythical story of their original collaboration: John would analyze the linguistic patterns that Richard was using to make explicit the "magic" of the transformations and Richard would show John how he was doing what he was doing so he could learn to do it as well.

Somewhere about the same time, Dr. Spitzer wanted audio-tapes made of Virginia Satir and so sent Richard to Canada to record her and then transcribe those tapes. This led to integrating Satir's language patterns, those of Family Reconstructions with those of the Gestalt awareness, empty-chair, and encounter processes. It began with their use of the "Encounter Group" as they had inherited it from Fritz, but because they were not therapists themselves, and had no training in such, they sought to understand what was happening using the tools (and theories) from other fields— primarily linguistics (transformational grammar) and computer modeling.

And that's how the adventure began. They happened upon two people who were leaders in the Human Potential Movement (which they either ignored or just didn't know) who were excellent in facilitating change and development in people using their separate models and understandings about people. So simply replicating those patterns and seeking to understand what was going on within the people due to the re-languaging and the re-patterning, they stumbled on a somewhat theory-free form of therapy (they thought they were modeling without any theory, but they did have a theory. But I'll leave that for later.)

To this format now add their attitude. That was a key to what happened as well. Both men were absolutely curious and playful and "Richard had a flair for the bizarre." They both sorted for differences, each had a lust for life, a "go for it" attitude and they were willing to play around so that if something didn't work, they'd do something different. And it was in that mix that NLP emerged a little bit at a time beginning in 1972 and fully as a model (the Meta-Model) in 1975.

THE THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

NLP began with the surprising effectiveness of certain linguistic patterns that Richard found in Perls and then Satir. So John got involved when fourth-year student Bandler wanted to teach a class on Gestalt. The surprise that *language itself* could facilitate pretty incredible therapeutic change by two men with no psychology or psychotherapy background sent them on a wild chase to find out what was going on— so using the tools they had available, they began modeling the language of magic.

That's what they called it, *The Structure of Magic.* Why? Mostly because what seemed like "magic," what seemed "magical" was not really magic, it had a structure and that structure could be identified. So what were the theoretical foundations of NLP at the beginning? Mostly and primarily *Transformational Grammar.* That was Grinder's contribution to it all.

In fact, my read on things is that John had been looking for some way to use Transformational Grammar (TG) for some years. After all, that was his speciality. He wrote his dissertation on it. He even wrote a book in the early 1970s with Suzette Haden Elgin, *A Guide to Transformational Grammar* (1973). And in *Whisperings*, John wrote,
> "We have stated that Transformational Grammar was the single most pervasive influence on NLP." (p. 92)

So in terms of theory, NLP began with all of the premises and assumptions of the Cognitive Psychology Models— which are inherent in TG. This explodes the myth that Bandler and Grinder propagated in the early NLP books that NLP is a model and has no theory. Well, excuse me, but if "TG was the single most pervasive influence on NLP" and TG was the work of Noam Chomsky who along with George Miller are credited with being the founders of the Cognitive Revolution in Psychology in 1956, then *NLP does have a theory.* It does come from a discipline (actually several disciplines) and so does have premises and presuppositions.

It was because Grinder and Bandler had their heads down— buried in the specifics of Perls' and Satir's language patterns and processes for facilitating growth, they were blind to the larger context— that Perls and Satir were leaders in the Human Potential Movement, that they were carrying out the original vision of Maslow and Rogers.

So yes, NLP has a theory. And that theory involves the premises that any intelligent reader can find in Cognitive Psychology (Chomsky, Miller, etc.), in General Semantics, in Humanistic

Psychology (Maslow, Rogers, May, etc.), in Gestalt, Family Systems, Bateson, etc. And as I have noted in numerous articles and books, Bandler and Grinder *snuck in the theory* and hide it in the form of the "NLP Presuppositions" (*User's Manual of the Brain, Volume I*). In other words, if you want to find the theory, you need to look no further than the list of NLP Presppositions.

> The map is not the territory.
> People operate from their maps of reality, not reality.
> You cannot not communicate.
> The meaning of your communication is the response you get.
> People are not broken, they work perfectly well given their representations and strategies.
> Behind every behavior is a positive intention.
> Etc.

And these are the ideas and premises that arose originally from Maslow and Rogers and that you can find scattered throughout the writings of Perls, Satir, and others of the Human Potential Movement as well as in Cognitive Psychology.

Now earlier this year, I've been in conversation with some people from the Grinder camp of NLP and several recommended that I go back and re-read what Grinder wrote about the history of NLP—at least as he remembers it or after he's run the Change History Pattern on himself (!). So I did. And in doing so I now understand why Grinder does not understand or like Meta-States, he no longer likes the original NLP! In fact, in *Whispering in the Wind* (2001) he rejects a lot of what the rest of us call NLP. I did not fully picked up on this when I originally read the book. For example, in that book he argues against accepting many of the NLP Presuppositions:

> "There is no need to subscribe to the so-called presuppositions of NLP in order to benefit from an effective application of the patterns to some problem or challenge. Normally these presuppositions include statements such as: having choice is better than not having choice. All resources necessary to make changes are already available at the unconscious level." (2001, p. 201)

> "If the so-called presuppositions are NLP are to be taken seriously this decidedly odd collection of different logical types and levels are badly in need of revision and reorganization. I believe that Robert Dilts played a strong role in their compilation. ... Unfortunately, presuppositions, like beliefs, are ultimately filters that reduce the ongoing experiences of their possessors. We personally do not find any value in the enumeration of such rationalizations (the so-called presuppositions of NLP)." (202)

Even some of the presuppositions which Grinder himself introduced, he no longer accepts. For example, he no longer accepts the law of requisite variety.

> "I accept responsibility for importing this law of requisite variety — here argued to be inappropriate for NLP practice." (309)

Rather than base NLP on these premises and make them conscious, Grinder prefers to postulate them upon something much more vague and indescript, "the unconscious mind." This, for him is the chief flaw with what he calls "the Classic Code:"

> "There are important decisions and it is unfortunate in the extreme that the classic code assigns the responsibility for these decisions to the client's conscious mind— precisely the part of the client

least competent to make such decisions. (214)

"This makes the work shallow and unecological as the conscious mind is notoriously weak in its ability to appreciate what the function of a consciously undesired piece of behavior might be in the larger system of the person's experience.   The critique we offer is that such classic code patterns are flawed. They fail to provide for any systematic framing or access to the enormous potential of the unconscious. (215)

"The unconscious is superior in its competency for accessing the long term and global effects of some particular change with respect to consequences. Consciousness with its limitation of 7 -+ 2 chunks of information is ill-equipped to make such evaluations." (218)

So does that mean that "the unconscious mind" is more competent to make decisions for us? Does that mean the unconscious mind doesn't make mistakes (like allergies, false memories, auto-immune system diseases, etc.)? And didn't Grinder, quoting Freud, also postulate that there is *no time* in the unconscious mind? Then how does the "unconscious" now have such competency for accessing the long term and global effects of the consequences of a change? All of that strikes me as especially convoluted.

Of course, many other problems are also created when we a dichotomy is set up between the parts of the mind that are conscious and that are not. So rather than solving problems, it only creates more problems.

Personally I prefer the original NLP model that equally trusted (and distrusted) both aspects of our mind— what is conscious and what is outside consciousness. I like the original design of NLP— to discover how to "run your own brain" and take charge of your states.   I like the original NLP that sought to make explicit its theory and then hid them in the form of the NLP Presuppositions.

WHEN THE MAGICIANS WENT TO WAR

A few years ago, while thinking about writing a History of NLP, I played around with the title, *When the Magicians Went to War.* Several I spoke to didn't like it, and then many did. And undoubtedly there was a little bit of mischievousness in me as well to like it. Anyway I thought I'd use it for this post in the history of NLP series.

The "magicians," of course, are John Grinder and Richard Bandler and first went to war in the late 1970s. I don't know when the conflict between them began or even why (except for their egos, see below), but they did and the lawsuit between them was settled in 1981. Then a year or two later "The Society of NLP" went bankrupt and that marked the beginning of the end of that first era of NLP. Then in 1981, a lawsuit ended in which Grinder agreed to train in only six American cities for the following ten years, six cities that would be agreed upon by Bandler. Strange? Yes, very strange.

And why couldn't they get along? Terry McClendon wrote in *The Wild Days of NLP: 1972–1981* that Bandler and Grinder "realized that the stage was not big enough for both of them" and so decided to go their separate ways in 1978 (p. 117). Undoubtedly there's a lot more of that story, but I don't know it. Perhaps it was over differences in how they thought about NLP; perhaps it was over differences in style. Perhaps it was that each thought they could do better apart from the other one.

From the court records that came later, Richard began using drugs like cocaine in the late 1970s after NLP exploded onto the national and international scene. And so when "the stage was too big for both of their egos" and they split, various trainer told me that they guessed that Grinder signed that lawsuit because he thought Richard would not be alive a decade later. That's what I was told. And given that Bandler experienced cocaine drug over-doses in the 1980s several times, it doesn't seem all that farfetched. The article about Richard's murder trail (1986-1988) in *Mother Jones magazine* said that "Bandler bragged about using large amounts of cocaine" (1989, p. 25) and described his life story as one of "a blur of fact and fiction, obscured by cocaine and gin..." (p. 27).

Whatever happened behind the scenes, what we know publically is that Bandler and Grinder went separate ways and stopped talking to each other. And as the 1980s saw a wild growth of NLP training centers everywhere and then various Associations around the world and Conferences, both men seem to avoid such as well as contributing any writings to the journals and magazines

that rose. Now there is a quotation that I came across some years ago accredit to Robert Dilts that went something like this:

> "NLP was given birth by two mad-men who modeled three wild individualists and who they never stayed around to father the community."

All of this has led, over the years, to the charge that many have made: Bandler and Grinder don't apply NLP to themselves. They created a world-class communication model, but do not or cannot communicate between themselves and the community that arose from the model. That was one of the comments I heard from the very beginning of my introduction to NLP in 1986. In 1997 at the *Visionary Leadership* conference that Dilts sponsored with Judith DeLozier at NLP U., there were even some skits that several people put on making fun of this very fact and asking why is this.

But more recently, Grinder (2001) tried really hard to answer this complaint. He wrote the complaint: "Why can the developers of the NLP communication model *not* communicate between themselves?" Then he not only denied it entirely(!), but turned it around asserting that he and Bandler "communicate perfectly." Yes, you read that right. Here it is in his own words:

> "We are aware during the last decade plus of a number of criticisms voiced with the implication that the 'two great communicators', Bandler and Grinder, themselves are not *communicating effectively*—that they are failing to use the very tools they created. .... From my point of view at any rate, Bandler and I are communicating perfectly. Neither of us has any further interest in pursuing either a professional nor a personal relationship and all the signals between us carry precisely this message— communication complete. ... The evidence for this alleged failure to communicate typically cited is that Grinder and Bandler don't agree. This is absolutely correct— Bandler and I do not agree." (2001, p. 121)

So let me see. When two people won't talk to each other any longer, that is "communicating perfectly"!? So rather than accepting responsibility for the division and the lack of communication, Grinder argues that he and Bandler are effectively and perfectly communicating by disagreeing with each other to such an extent that they won't even talk to each other! Amazing. So in spite of having engaged in two major lawsuits and refusing to have anything to do with each other, somehow this is "effective communication?" It is "communicating perfectly?"

Well, if that's effective communication, then I hope you and your loved ones never get to the place of communicating perfectly! It's best that you stay with your current ineffective communicating and at least love each other and stay together!

What ever happened to the idea that *communication* refers to people *communing* with each other to create a *union* together? Yes, when two people say words about how each do not like the other and do not agree and do not want to work with each other that may be a clear message, but it is not *using the tools of NLP to create the kind of relationship so that there's mutual understanding, respect, and a collaborative spirit.* And for two people who once worked together to co-create something to move to an absolute refusal to work together for a greater good even is while disagreeing, why not be agreeable and pleasant and affirmative of the other

person? That would be a demonstration of *using the very tools that they created to communicate effectively.*

Then to make things worse, John wrote in the following paragraphs the following about him and Bandler and how they are similar:

> "... the characteristics that I believe we share: arrogant, unimpressed by authority or tradition, strong personal boundaries, willingness to try nearly anything, utterly lacking in self-doubt— egotistical, playful, full capability as players in the Acting As If game, full behavioral appreciation of difference between form and content." (2001, pp. 121-122)

Perhaps this is the problem that keeps them from being able to demonstrate a respectful attitude toward each other, and toward others in the field with whom they disagree. Perhaps it lies in the characteristics of arrogance and being egotistical. This certainly does not strike me as something to be proud about. That seems like the wrong meta-state in this instance. Anyway, this is part of the story of when the Magicians went to War ... and the Cold War that has ensued since— a sad and tragic tale in the discovery of perhaps the most powerful Communication Model on the planet! (And yes, I realize the irony of that last statement.)

WHERE DO YOU GET ALL YOUR ENERGY?

As you probably know or can imagine, I often get a lot of personal questions at trainings and/or in interviews. And I'm fine with that. After all I have made *apply to self* one of our key distinctions in Neuro-Semantics and have been proclaiming for years that "apply-to-self" is built into the recursive and reflexivity of the Meta-States Model. In addition to that, we have made the theme of *implementing what you know, and closing the knowing-doing gap* another key facet of everything we're doing in Neuro-Semantics. So getting personal questions about how I do things, or handle various facets of life, seems par for the course.

Now of all the personal questions that I receive in trainings and interviews, the energy question comes up a lot. "Where do you get all your energy?" or "How do you keep your energy up?" People seem surprised that I easily handle 12 to 14 hour training days, or do them 8 days consecutively (Meta-Coaching) or 14 days (NSTT).

Now for years I have *not* really understood these questions. I suppose it is like anything that habituates. Once you get use to the habituation of something, you don't notice it. That's what habituation means—it is outside of conscious awareness and so just assumed as "the way it is." And that's how generally the way I experience my "energy." For years also, the only way I knew how to answer the question was to say something on the order of taking care of the basics of health, fitness, and energy:

> "Well, I eat moderately, simply, stay with what I know and like, I get some cardio-vascular exercise as well as some weight training everyday, and I always aim to get seven to eight hours of sleep every night."

More recently, with the development of the Self-Actualization Assessment Scale, I have begun to discover and understand other facets of my energy. The Self-Actualization Assessment Scale is the scale that I created in partnership with Tim Goodenough after the Self-Actualization Workshop, *Unleashing Leadership,* in South Africa last year. Tim began the conversation by asking how to assess each and every level of the hierarchy of needs so that we could obtain pre- and post- measurements to enable people to effectively assess where they are and their next step. Then at the NS Leadership Summit in San Francisco this past January, we ran our first prototype run of the assessment scale.

From using the assessment scale now with a lot of people, I began realizing that a person's sense of physical-emotional-motivational *vitality* is first and foremost a matter of adequately finding and using the "true satisfiers" for the biological-psychological needs. And that's what lead to the development of the newest Self-Actualization Workshop, *Unleashing Vitality.*

In Self-Actualization Psychology we begin from the premise that human beings are innately motivated. You don't need to "motivate" people. That presupposes they are not already motivated. But they are. We all are. We are born with all kinds of *motivational energies within us.* The problem is never "Why aren't you motivated?" It is,

> "What are you motivated to do or not do?" "How are you handling your motivational energies?" "How effective are you in satisfying your innate biological-psychological needs with true gratifiers?"

With us humans, since we are without instincts, we do not know innately or instinctively how to accurately and adequately gratify our needs, we have to learn. And because of that, we can mis-learn. We can then *waste a lot of energy* trying to gratify our needs with things that will not satisfy them and when that happens, then you truly have a problem—one of *wasting energy.* Conversely, when you discover how to gratify the basic needs, *you release all kinds of energies for the higher needs.*

That's what I've been discovering about myself. Over the years I've happened upon some effective ways of gratifying the basic needs via my eating and exercising (*Games Fit and Slim People Play,* 2001). That has enabled me to avoid needless waste of energy with psycho-eating, psycho-spending, and other psycho-activities. That has also allowed me to tap into some of the higher needs and to experience at least some of the vitality of those needs.

Above and beyond the basic needs, vitality is a function of vision, intention, and actualizing your highest and best. That's because when you move to the higher self-actualizing needs, you enter into another domain. You move from *the realm of deficiency* (the mechanism that governs the lower needs) into *the realm of abundance.* And a sign of this is that you don't burn out with activities. Now you are so awakened to your own unique contributions and creativity that you find yourself experiencing more and more energy and vitality for the things that truly matter to you. At the higher levels, there's an ongoing energy infusion from the peak experiences that your synergy of meaning and performance produces.

"Where do I get all of my energy?" Well, I think it is a fortunate combination of getting to work in this field with Self-Actualization Psychology. I think it is from having to happened upon and discovered some of the basic principles that govern the unleashing of vitality and potentials.

If you're interested in increasing your own personal energy and vitality, my recommendation is to get to the first two Self-Actualization Workshops—
- *Unleashing Vitality* — learn how to use the Hierarchy of Needs as embedded in the Neuro-Semantic Matrix Model so that you can develop your base, seek your peak and then live the vitality.
- *Unleashing Potentials* — learn how to use your Construct of Meaning-Making to create great meanings, suspend old meanings, and actualize your meanings in behavior, enter the Crucible to transform needs, emotions, and old meanings, and then synergize your meanings and performances for peak experiences and performances in the genius state of flow (the Zone of self-actualization).

THE INVIGORATING 1970s

It all began with the creative collaboration of Bandler and Grinder which apparently occurred in 1973 to 1975. It was in 1974 that they collaborated on the writing of *Structure of Magic I and II* (published in 1975) and *Patterns of the Hypnotic Patterns of Milton H. Erickson* (published in 1975 and 1976). "What was within the original mix out of which came "Neuro-Lingiustic Programming?"

> 1) Gestalt Therapy (Perls) and 2) Family Systems Therapy (Satir) as viewed through the theoretical formulations of 3) Transformational Grammar (Chomsky) and 4) the Cognitive Psychology Movement (Miller, Pribram, Gallanter) and 5) the Anthropological and Systems approach of Bateson.

This is *the psychology of NLP as well as the philosophy of NLP.* So what became NLP was truly an inter-disciplinary field from the beginning. Its theoretical and philosophical foundations come from Anthropology, Neurology, Psychology, Physiology, Linguistics (Transformational Grammar), Systems, General Semantics, Cybernetics, and Communication Theory. Many "NLP Trainers" either don't know this or don't communicate this foundation— to the detriment of those entering this field.

Who were the people who started it? NLP began with a young college student along with an associate professor. When it all began *Richard Bandler* was only 21 years old (in 1972) and a student at Kresge College. Myths have him as a mathematician and a computer science, but he never received any degree mathematics or computer science and such things were *not* part of the original models. As a matter of fact, Richard was *not* a Gestalt therapist, he was *not* a mathematician, and he was *not* a computer scientist. He was in his third or fourth year, it wasn't until 1973 that he got his bachelor's degree in philosophy and psychology (not in mathematics or computer science). His master's degree was also in Psychology. And John Grinder was 32 (in 1972), had just completed his doctorate degree (1971) in linguistics, "On Deletion Phenomena in English."

The Modeling of three experts in therapeutic communication. Each of these experts had a different model and focus. Each also had a very different style and yet somehow each was able to facilitate transformational change that struck people as fascinating and amazing. Perls, Satir, and Erickson were the three original models. Yet what no book on NLP before 2007 ever noted was that Perls, Satir, and Bateson knew each other and worked together at Esalen as part of the Human Potential Movement (*Self-Actualization Psychology,* 2008).

1972 Fritz Perls was the first person modeled, but not in person. He died in January 1970 in Chicago after spending most of 1969 in Canada attempting to establish a Gestalt community there. There are mythical stories that Bandler has propagated about meeting Perls, but I have not been able to find any evidence of those stories. What apparently happened was that Richard read and studied various books on Gestalt and then learned the language patterns and voice emphasis from the tapes of Perls so that he was able to replicate those patterns. He then taught a Gestalt Class in 1973. Dr. Spitzer later wrote about this:

> "Richard spent day after day wearing ear phones watch watching the films —making certain that the transcription was accurate. He came out of it talking and acting like Fritz Perls. I found myself accidently calling him Fritz on several occasions." (p. 41)
> [Spitzer, Robert S. (1992). <u>Virginia Satir and the Origins of NLP.</u> *Anchor Point.* July, 1992, pp. 40-44]

1973 Virginia Satir was doing a Family System's Reconstruction and Robert Spitzer sent Richard Bandler to record the program. Richard apparently picked up on her patterns and processes while sitting in the small recording room. One story has it that he was listening to Pink Floyd cassettes and Virginia got upset and confronted him. His response was that "Anyone could do this stuff" and so Virginia challenged him to show what he could do. When he was able to replicate the patterns, Virginia was surprised and amazed.

> "During the summer of '73 Richard was asked to record for transcription a seminar Virginia Satir was doing in Cold Harbor, Canada." [Interview with J. Grinder by Patrick Merlevede, 1999, *NLP World,* Volume 5, No. 1, p. 51.]

1974 Gregory Bateson introduced Richard and John to **Milton Erickson.** Milton Erickson, a medical doctor (MD) and psychiatrist in Phoenix Arizona who had established the credibility of medical hypnosis, from which Ericksonian Hypnotherapy evolved. Two books were immediately produced from modeling Erickson, *Patterns of the Hypnotic Patterns of Milton H. Erickson.* In NLP, this became known as "the Milton Model." It is about the language patterns and processes that comprise the heart of trance.

About the same time that *The Structure of Magic* books were published, 1975, Bandler got his master's degree from Lone Mountain College in San Francisco. If you google "Richard Bandler" there are many websites that provide the following information:

> "Born: February 24, 1950) is the co-inventor (with John Grinder) of Neuro-linguistic programming (NLP). Bandler holds a BA (1973) in Philosophy and Psychology from the University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC), and an MA (1975) in Psychology from Lone Mountain College in San Francisco. Bandler has no *earned* doctorate. There are various (unsubstantiated) reports (on alt.psychology.nlp) that Bandler has been awarded two honorary doctorates though the details of these awards are not specified."

So 1975 is the date usually given for the beginning of NLP. That was the date of the publication of the original books that brought together the original discoveries of the language patterns of Perls and Satir. Now one story that I heard in the late 1980s was that the University of Southern California at Santa Cruz wanted to grant Bandler recognition for his co-creation of the new model but that he had not finished his thesis, so Grinder wrote it for him. But apparently that's not

accurate, his master's degree wasn't granted from that university, but from Lone Mountain College in San Francisco. There must be a story behind that, but I don't know that one.

What was NLP called before it was called NLP?   I don't know. Rodger C. Bailey (1991) says that Bandler and Grinder "came up with the name [NLP] in 1977." [*Anchor Point,* Is It Time to Restructure NLP?, Oct. 1991, p. 20]. I had not noticed that before, but when I flipped through *The Structure of Magic* volumes, it does not appear to be there. The only terminology used there was "The Meta-Model of Language in Therapy." Isabelle David, Montreal Canada, tells the story of Richard and John up at the log cabin in the mountains, after many hours and a bottle of California wine asking themselves, "What the hell are we going to call this?" And they decided on Neuro-Linguistic Programming.

I heard a different story from Richard in 1989. He told about being pulled over on the highway by a policeman and being asked, "Who are you? What do you do?" And Richard, looking in the back seat of his car saw a book on Linguistics, one on Neurology, and one on Computer Programming, so he said, "I'm a Neuro-Linguistic Programmer."   Of course, many, many years before all of this, **Alfred Korzybski** (1933) wrote about "neuro-linguistic" and "neuro-semantic" training and processes and in fact, Korzybski traveled the United States in the 1940s doing "Neuro-Linguistic Training." So who knows the real story. Given that "the map is not the territory" came from Korzybski who constantly used the term Neuro-Linguistic, I would put my money on him being the original source.

1976 Robert Dilts wrote his first papers on what was later titled, "Roots of Neuro-Linguistic Programming" (later published under that title by Meta Publications, 1983).

1977 NLP Taught for the first time as "NLP."   Richard and Leslie were married that year and then divorced in 1980. This was the year also that Leslie founded "The Society of NLP" over which the lawsuits in 1981 and 1996-2000 were about.

1978: David Gordon, a psychotherapist, took the basic NLP models and wrote the book *Therapeutic Metaphors.* 1978 also was the year that Bandler and Grinder ended their collaboration. Bateson moved to Esalen as the scholar-in-residence and died in 1980. This year also Richard and John commissioned Robert Dilts to write *NLP Volume I.* Robert had written a paper, "NLP: A New Psychotherapy." (McClendon, p. 103). Steve Johns left Gestalt therapy and entered NLP and become Steve Andreas (his mother Barry Stevens, owned Real People Press, a devotee of Fritz Perls).

1979: Daniel Goleman visited Bandler and Grinder and wrote an article in *Psychology Today,* "The People who Read People." In this year Leslie Cameron Bandler developed the first curriculum of NLP for the first Practitioner and Master Practitioner courses in 1979 and the first Trainers course was 1980. Rodger Bailey says that within the original curriculum a dilemma was introduced.

> "The modeling technologies and the psycho-therapeutic models were mashed together into a single, undifferentiated curriculum. People did not learn that Strategy Elicitation is a

modeling technology and that V-K Disassociation is a psycho-therapeutic model." (P. 21, *Anchor Point,* Oct. 1991).

During these early years of the 1970s John formed Grinder, DeLozier and Associates and Richard had his company, Not Limited. From *The Wild Days of NLP,* we learn that Leslie joined with Michael Labeau and David Gordon, Robert Dilts; Terry McClendon joined with Robert Dilts; and Frank Pucelik created a partnership with Byron Lewis.

In an Interview with David Gordon, Patrick Merlevede writes in *NLP World* about 1978-1979:
> "First Institute in San Francisco, called DOTAR (Division of Training and Research) ... situated in a converted church which they used as a seminar room. Leslie Cameron was the director of the Institute, Robert Dilts the director of research, and David the director of training. They worked together, basically every day, creating the field, including the first practitioner and master practitioner programs, but also working with private clients. Richard and John mainly acted as patriarchs. ... The DOTAR period was probably the most productive in the NLP field. It went on until 1982." (p. 63). [Merlevede, Patrick E. (2000). Volume 7, No. 1. The Story of David [Gordon]. pp. 61-64]

So the 1970s were indeed invigorating years for NLP as it was first launched!

UNLEASHING SELF-ACTUALIZING LEADERS

Yesterday I completed the 12 *Unleashing Leadership* workshop. This time in Auckland New Zealand, where along with Colin Cox and Lena Gray, members of the Neuro-Semantic Leadership Team, we had 5 other Neuro-Semantic Trainers and a whole lot of people really passionately committed to their own development as leaders. And that made the experience really an enjoyable one. What's in that training?

> Two key things: first unleashing leadership potential through the use of the Matrix Model and second, then utilizing that leadership to create a self-actualizing company (or family, community, organization).

And if you don't know it, this is a world of incredible potential —the potential to identify, develop, and unleash the leadership potential in people. Why? How is this? It is because we need leaders at every level in life, home, school, business, government. And more than that, we need *good leaders.* If we had *good* leaders, leaders skilled and competent, this world would be tremendously better.

And what if we had *great leaders!* Imagine that. And while we're on this line of imagination, what if we had truly *enlightened leaders*! Leaders enlightened about human nature— the best in human nature, what the hearts of human beings everywhere really want and hunger for. What if we had leaders enlightened about self-actualization psychology and competent to lead self-actualizing individuals, families, companies, communities, and countries!?

Leaders — are they born or made? Once upon a time that was the big argument in the field of leadership. Back then people queried, "Is leadership genetic or can it be nurtured and developed?" But no longer. That argument and controversy occurred when leadership was considered a matter of *traits*— innate traits that a person was born with. Today we know better. Today we can do so much better.

Today we know that because there are so many kinds of leaders, dimensions of leadership, and levels of leadership, there are no single set of traits that define "a leader." Leaders come in all shapes and sizes, traits and qualities, styles and attributes. And at different levels and in different dimensions, a leader needs different qualities. He or she will need to demonstrate different skills and different styles. And that's partly also because leadership is functional to a situation.

As a leader, what leadership function are you needing to perform? The function in a given

situation will define what will be effective and what will be ineffective leadership for you. Do you know that? The function in that situation will call forth a certain set of skills that will be required of you if you are to be effective.

Now at the heart of true leadership is *leading* and leading (as an unspecified verb) has to be contextualized. Who are you leading? To where? In what area or dimension? For what purpose? Then, after you have contextualize the situation in which you will lead and the skill-set required for that function, you have to do an evaluation of the quality of your leadership competencies.

> Are you competent to do that function? To what degree? Do you have that potential? How much has been identified, developed, and unleashed? How much more could be unleashed?

And when you answer those questions— you are at the door labeled, "Unleashing Your Leadership Potentials." Enter there and you enter into the journey, the adventure of *becoming more and more the leader you can become.* And it is a journey, a journey of learning, growing, and developing. It is a self-actualization journey.

Using Self-Actualization Psychology, *leadership bringing out the best in people.* It is that simple. And it is that unique and scarce. Too much leadership is money driven, greed-driven, ego-driven, status-driven —driven by everything but the true heart and passion of leadership: *bringing out the best in people.* profound!

And, of course, if a leadership isn't properly driven by this as their authentic intention and meaning, then their leadership will be a joke. It will be ineffective and at best, only in name. In fact, I would guess that 90% of all leaders do not really have a clue about leadership. And maybe the percentage is higher than that. I was recently with a group of senior managers / leaders (at least that's what they called themselves) but they were not executive or operational leaders at all; they were bureaucrats pure and simple and their primary mission as far as I could detect was to protect the status quo. And I told them, "I don't think you have a clue about true authentic leadership."

True leadership is radical— to be an authentic leader you have to believe in people's potentials and that typically means believing in them much more than they believe in themselves. It means challenging them to be more than they are now, stretching them to be all that they can be.

Post Note:
> I only have one more public training of *Unleashing Leadership* this year. So if you'd like to experience *Leadership in a whole new and higher dimension*— contact Gilles Roy for the training in Southern France this October. Hope to see you there!

THE 1980s
WHEN NLP FRAGMENTED

The 1980s started out pretty well for the field of NLP, but it did not end that way. In fact, almost as soon as the 1980s began, the field began dividing into various divisions as both founders led the way by going their separate ways. By the end of the 80s, each was claiming to do "pure NLP" and essentially "dissing" the other. As the 80s others were creating their versions of NLP and creating separate "kingdoms." What a sad development for such a dynamic field.

Now the 1980s actually began in a wonderful way with the publication of *"Neuro-Linguistic Programming, Volume I"* (1980) by Robert Dilts published by Meta Publications. Robert had been commissioned to write that book back in 1978 having written a document on strategies that impressed both Richard and John. And this book, along with Robert's other original books on NLP, went a long way to establishing the credibility of NLP.

Many years later, Oakley Gordon wrote a two part article in *Anchor Point,* "What is NLP? A Brief History" (May and July 1995). In those articles, he wrote in part the following:
> "*'Volume I'* implies a *'Volume II'*. The second volume was to present the modeling techniques of NLP, the processes by which the NLP developers modeled excellence in human behavior. The project was aborted, however, due to the dissolution of the community of NLP developers." (p. 14, *Anchor Point,* July 1995).

And so the vision of a series of volumes on NLP came to an end immediately after the first one. No other volume in that series ever appeared. Many years later when I wrote *NLP Going Meta* (1997/ 2004) I contacted Meta Publications and asked Fred Tappa for permission to name it "NLP: Volume II." He said the term was reserved for the next volume and that was 1997— 17 years later! At the time I thought Fred was holding onto hope; but looking back my guess is that it was a joke and I just didn't get it(!) at that time. The very next year, **1981**, the first law suit between Bandler and Grinder occurred and as McClendon noted in *The Wild Days of NLP,* "Bandler bought John out of the Society" of NLP (p. 117).

About this dissolution of the society (and the community to a great extent) the collaboration between the original developers came to an end. Gordon (1995) noted:
> "While there was some degree of tracking each other's innovations, the overall effect of the breakup of the original group was a diversification in the trajectories of NLP with a

resulting blurring of its definition." (p. 16)

So in a way, the 1980s brought so many challenges to the field that in some ways it is really surprising that NLP survived the 80s. Now among the challenges to the field, one of the strangest was Grinder's attack on the original formulations of NLP. In **1983** Grinder and DeLozier decide the whole field was wrongly oriented and formulated and so created a "New Code" to replace the old code of NLP. Grinder went on to argue against the focus on conscious awareness in NLP claiming the "unconscious mind" as more intelligent and less likely to error. So the idea of "running your own brain," so central to NLP (as per Bandler's 1985 book, *Running Your Brain for a Change*), was called into question.

1986: Bandler provided his own challenges to the field due to actions in his personal life. In the middle of the 1980s he was arrested, charged with an account of murder, and spent 120 days in county jail. That certainly didn't do the field of NLP any good! Steve Andreas lead a defense fund for Richard and personally provided $60,000 to Richard for the trial. What happened? A young woman, Corine Christensen, was shot by a .357 magnum revolver, the only other persons in the house was Richard Bandler and James Marino, an admitted cocaine dealer and her boyfriend. Though it was Marino's house and although they had been fighting, the district attorney decided that the evidence pointed to Richard than the drug dealer! Anyway this lasted from 1986 to 1988 and ended in the grand jury unable to decide, so the charge was dropped. But, of course, not without the trial hitting the headlines in many papers and journals— including a scathing review in *Mother Jones* magazine that you can still find on various websites.

Another Bandler lawsuit occurred sometime later (1988 or 1989) against Tony Robbins. That one was against Robbins because he was not certifying people as NLP Practitioners or Master Practitioners through The Society of NLP. Settled in 1990 out of court with Tony promising to "certify people through the Society and pay his $200 for each one certified in NLP," he promptly stopped training "NLP" as such and invented a new name, NAC— Neural Associative Conditioning. And so with that Richard Bandler essentially chased Robbins away from the field with the result that even to this day Anthony Robbins will not say the three letters, NLP, when he is on Larry King or other international television programs. Richard just chased away the greatest salesman he could have ever had!

Another conflict arose during my Master Practitioner training in San Diego, 1989. One of the trainer there was Tad James. He had been participating in the Bandler trainings, but this time was different. Apparently without informing Bandler, Tad had claim ownership of the Time-Lines model that Bandler had created and had filed a trademark for "time-line therapy" (which by the way was never registered). From the stories I heard from trainers who were there, Richard and Tad argued loudly about this and almost came to blows. So that ended their relationship. After that Tad introduced his many versions of New Age religions including Huna into his sect of NLP.

With all of this fragmentation, many new Associations were created throughout the 1980s, but by the end of the 1980s, there was no International Association or body to govern the field of NLP. Again, Oakley Gordon (1995) write in *Anchor Point:*

"There is no organization with the authority to pass judgment on the quality of the diverse NLP training programs currently being offered, or even to define what is, and what is not, NLP." (p. 17) ...   For the field of NLP has no single voice, no universally agreed upon definition, no quality control over what is offered under its name. An outside entering these waters may encounter anything from the sublime to the ridiculous." (p. 18)

On a very positive note, it was during the 1980s that NLP went global. It was introduced into England 1981 or 2; then to Europe in the early 1980s, NLP came to Hong Kong in 1982, and so it went. Men and women from around the world began showing up in Santa Cruz and other places in America where NLP was being taught and then taking it home to their own countries. When and by whom NLP was taken abroad is much of the story that I don't know so if you do know specific details, do let me know.

So the decade that began so positively and that began to see the spread of NLP everywhere, a decade that began with so much hope ended in fragmentation, embarrassment, and conflict. It's the way of many movements, perhaps most movements. And yet for a movement about positive psychology, human excellence, and all based on a cutting-edge communication model— the 1980s were really a challenging time for the field of NLP.

THE HISTORY OF
NLP's IDENTITY CONFUSION
1975– 1980s

From the beginDning NLP has had an identity confusion. After all, *what is it*? What exactly is this thing that we call Neuro-Linguistic Programming? Now if you ask the people who should know, even NLP trainers, you will actually get all kinds of answers. So the confusion exists even here.

 For example, many of them will identify NLP as a form of therapy. "It's a new form of psychotherapy," many will assert. True enough, this field began from the field of therapy as it was modeled from therapists and because it has at its heart many therapeutic processes. Yet while it began from there, that's not what NLP is.

The big confusion that confusing NLP with therapy has created for the field of NLP has been highly problematic from the beginning. And yet, how that confusion came to be makes perfect sense. After all, NLP was modeled from three therapists, three world-class communicators who worked with hurting people who needed healing. So it really isn't a big surprise that many people, right from the beginning even to this day, confused it with therapy. NLP has a significant background in therapy. Add to this the fact that all of the original books and writings about NLP were written in the context of therapy and the examples and illustrations that were used were almost always from the field of therapy. Nevertheless, this was still a big confusion because NLP is not a therapy, not even a psychology.

Of course it makes sense that it took two men from *outside the field of therapy* to walk into that field and see things that those on the inside did not. Thomas Kunn (1972) wrote about this in his book, *The Scientific Revolution.* Those inside a paradigm often become paradigm blind and cannot see what is obvious to those on the outside. So when Bandler and then Grinder happened upon the "magic" of Perls and Satir, for a short while they had a distinct advantage.

Now against that background is another one, and one of far more importance for identifying what NLP is. I have been calling it "The Secret History of NLP." This is the fact that Perls and Satir and Bateson were part of the *Human Potential Movement* and that means that the focus was on psychological health (self-actualization) rather than therapy. It was on Maslow's idea of modeling

the best and healthiest in human nature.

Imagine how things might have turned out for the field of NLP if that had been made the focus and the "therapy" context was made more peripheral.   But they didn't. In fact, one of the surprising things that I found from the time I began studying NLP is that throughout the early literature of NLP, both Bandler and Grinder refer to themselves as therapists! Of course, they were not. They might have been working with clients and taking on therapeutic issues, but neither was trained in therapeutic work and neither had any expertise as therapists or psychologists. As a side-note, later in the late 1990s, the name NLP was changed in several countries in Europe to NLP^t — which stands for Neuro-Linguistic Psychotherapy.

An interesting comment from Bandler, Grinder, and Andreas comes from *Frog into Princes,* which was published in 1978. In the following quotation they seemed to have just gotten the idea of moving from traditional therapy to Self-Actualization Psychology although they didn't have a name for that:

> "We are very slowly tapering off teaching and doing therapy because there's a presupposition common in the field of clinical psychology which we personally disagree with: that change is a remedial phenomenon. You find something that is wrong and you fix it.
> "There is an entirely different way to look at change, which we call the *generative* or *enrichment* approach. Instead of looking for what's wrong and fixing it, it's possibly simply to think of ways that your life could be enriched: 'What would be fun to do, or interesting to be able to do?' 'What new capacities or abilities could I invent for myself?' 'How can I make things really groovy?'" (190)
> "The idea of generative change is really hard to sell to psychologists. ... We are currently investigating what we call generative personality. We are finding people who are geniuses at things, finding out the sequence of unconscious programming that they use, and installing those sequences in other people to find out if having that unconscious program allows them to be able to do the task." (191)

What is NLP? Many others confuse it with hypnosis or hypnotherapy. But again, that's not what it is. That is just one of the sources of the original modeling and one of the applications. The "magic" that Milton Erickson was able to produce with his medical hypnosis led to a second communication model in NLP, the Milton Model. And with that discovery, it seemed that the original founders took a strange turn, one that brought many other confusions.

So what is NLP? *It is a Communication Model.* That's what it *is*— a discovery of how people use words to inform themselves, map reality, and create their behaviors. Modeled from people who were excellent in their use of language, NLP used Transformational Grammar to generate the Meta-Model from Perls and Satir. And as a set of communication tools, the NLP model provides a way for us to *model* human experiences. *So, NLP is a modeling process.* That's how it began, accidently, and that is (and will be) how NLP will grow and develop. The founders called themselves modelers in that early literature of NLP. And if they had really focused on that, they might have turned to focus on business and if they had done that, the field of NLP could have

possibly discovered the field of Coaching and would today own it. But they didn't. It would be many years later before NLP applications for business would develop. That came in the 1980s, not the 70s.

EVERY MORNING — EVERY EVENING

Every morning when I wake up I find myself completely back to the foundational level of Maslow's hierarchy of needs— I'm hunger. I need food. I need water. To thrive in this new day, I have to use the coping skills I've learned during my life to meet two of my most basic needs— food and water. Yes, I can go without these basics— for a day but just a day or two without water and then, whatever I'm seeking to actualize at the higher levels will come to an abrupt stop. Regarding food, well I could go several days, even a week, and if forced, perhaps a few weeks. But that's about it. And after a few days, a fast without any food at all will begin having strong effects on my thinking and emoting— diminishing their quality.

And then every evening, I also return to the most foundational level of the levels of needs— I need sleep. I begin yawning and I have to find a safe place where I can go unconscious for 6 to 8 hours.

Funny, isn't it? No matter how far along the personal development pathway you have come, you like me and like all of us, keep coming back to the fundamentals. Every day between waking and sleeping, we are called back to the foundational needs that drive us, that create our energy, our vitality, and our health.

So what does this mean? It means that to actualize your highest and best, you have to take care of the lowest and first. Ignore these and you do so to your own detriment. And you will pay for it. *The price?* Energy, health, short-life, vitality! *The price?* Ill-health, not feeling good, loss of motivation, fatigue, lack of a sense of pleasure, irritation, annoyance, stress, illness. So Self-Actualization also involves actualizing everyday, and an ongoing process, your lower biological needs.

When I began focusing on Self-Actualization Psychology as part of Meta-Coaching and Neuro-Semantics, my whole focus was on *the highest and the best.* I wanted to know *how to unleash* my potentials and to facilitate the same in you. So at first my focus was exclusively around the highest end of the hierarchy. Only later when Tim Goodenough and I created the *Self-Actualization Assessment Scale* did I fully turn my attention to the bottom of the hierarchy. That's when I realized that we have to get the foundation right for people to fully actualize their highest and best.

What the S-A Scale did for me was direct my attention to the problem that many of the people I was meeting were having in actualizing their potentials. They had holes and weak spots in how

they were coping, or not coping, with their eating, exercising, sleeping, etc. They were living in "the red zone" (not coping well with the lower needs) of the Scale. So their life-energies were being undermined and their energy depleted on the lower needs making them less alive andwith less vitality for the higher needs.

So now you know why our Self-Actualization Workshops began with *Unleashing Potentials ("The Ultimate Self-Actualization Workshop")* and then moved backward to *Unleashing Vitality* which uses the S-A Assessment Scale and deals with learning how to effectively cope with all of your needs and drives.

Now, if you're interested in *unleashing your own basic vitality* —and actualizing your potentials for lots and lots of energy and vitality— there are 2 workshops for you this year.

> **1) South Africa — Pretoria**
> *People South Africa*
> September 3-5
> Organizer: Cheryl Lucas cheryl@psacoaching.co.za
> > Cell: 083 267 1412
> > Tel: 012 362-6542
> > Skype: Meta Coach
> > www.psacoaching.co.za
> > www.meta-coaching.org

> **2) Italy — Bolgna**
> November 19– 21
> Bologna (http://foxyurl.com/4qg) 25 miles away),
> Organizers: Nicola Riva and Lucia Giovannini
> > mobile: +39 348 5600507
> > nicola@blessyou.it

NLP'S "NEW AGE" CONFUSIONS

Not only has NLP long been confused with therapy, it has also for a long time been confused with the New Age movement and many of the way-out ideas involved in that. I don't know when "The New Age" movement began. In the USA it seemed to have arisen during the 1960s as freedoms of various sorts were sought for and explored— during the Civil rights movement, Women's Rights, etc.

It also seemed to have also been part and parcel of the Human Potential Movement (1962–1985) and eventually became part of the Trans-Personal Psychology (approximately 1965). Esalen played a big role in it as it served as the New Age Center where the wildest ideas could be explored and where "East and West spirituality" could mix and mingle in new forms.

What specifically is this "New Age" movement? What ideas determine and govern it? Well, that's where things get pretty messy. It is almost a catch-all-term for *anything outside of the mainstream thinking.* Sometimes it involves thinking outside-the-box and imagining what could be such imaginative questions as the following:

> *What if* we could send our thoughts through space without speaking, just thinking? *What if* we could move physical objects by our thoughts? *What if* we are reincarnated from a previous life? *What if* this is just one expression and we will be back? *What if* thinking creates reality without having to invent and innovate products?

Wild and crazy and imaginative ideas, right? And if we keep it as just that— some imaginative thinking for exploring—it keeps us playful and open. But once a person starts to believe in such things—well, then the self-validating and self-reinforcing and self-fulfilling nature of a *belief* kicks in and then a person will begin to "see" and "perceive" evidence of their belief— even when there is nothing in reality. That's when all of this becomes a problem. Then imaginations take flight and they never come in for a landing! They continue to hoover in la-la-land.

The challenge here is how to maintain a realistic (and scientific mindset) of testing things, checking things out, demanding rigorous standards for "proof," *and* staying open, playful, and imaginative. It is believing-while-being a skeptic until there's external evidence that even an unbeliever has to acknowledge.

So a New Age *Believer* is just that— *a believer* in something, someone fully convinced about something and who also believes that he or she has "proof." In this, a non-believer does not see

or perceive what the believer does. This differentiates true science from pseudo-science. In legitimate science, the evidence stands on its own— there's a process for testing, and it can be replicated by others, even by those who do not believe that something exists or that something works. In fact, when the non-believer has to agree with the facts and legitimacy of something, then you have proof that isn't a function of a self-validating belief.

Now you know why double-blind and triple-blind research design projects are so important in science. If the persons conducting the study *know* what to look for or *believe* that they will find it, they will mess up the results.

Why is it that this comes so easily into NLP? Well the answer is this: As a cognitive-behavioral psychology based on a constructivist philosophy about reality and a phenomenological philosophy of human nature, we start from the assumption that there's a difference between our mental maps about the world and the world. We start from this "the map is not the territory" distinction. We know that the way we "bring the world" into ourselves is through the "abstracting of our nervous system with its sense receptors." This is what Alfred Korzybski described in great detail in *Science and Sanity* (1933, 1995). This is what NLP began with in saying that "We do not deal with reality (the territory) directly, but through our maps."

> [In *Whispering in the Wind* Grinder reveals that he has *not* read Korzybski as he accuses him of a shallow understanding of the "map" that we use to navigate reality and what Grinder calls 'first access' Korzybski mapped out in 1933 in much greater detail than Grinder as his Structural Differential and the neurological stages of abstractions.]

So far, so good. In science we know that the electro-magnetic spectrum of "energies"out there in the world are processed and interpreted by our nervous system and sense receptors as light, sound, and sensation. And we know that different nervous-system structures in neurology, as the eyes of owls, the ears of dogs, etc., see and hear and interpret the "energy signals" out there in the world differently from ours. They may see the ultra-violet aspect of the spectrum where for us, we see nothing and sense nothing. Then there are all of the extra-neural devices that we have invented over the years— devices that allow us to register, detect, recognize, interpret, and understand what is "out there" that we cannot pick up naturally with our neurological sense receptors.

And yes, there is a world "out there" beyond our nervous system. There is a reality of objects that impact us independent of whether we know what they are or how they work. You don't have to believe in cars or car accidents (or disbelieve in them) in order to experience an accident. Reality exists outside of you and your inner "reality" (subjective experience of reality) is co-created by the mixture of your thoughts and beliefs with the stuff outside. So reality is not pure or only subjectivity. We do not merely project the world. We project our models and theories *onto* the world, our assumptions and then see the world in terms of those assumptions.

So we know that there is more "out there" than we can detect without special help. And this is where our playful imaginations come in as we imagine the *what ifs...* and play around in our thinking about what other extra-neural devices we could invent and wonder if we could re-

program our thinking and feeling in order to expand our capacities. And as long as that's what we're doing, I say, go for it.

But I also think we should be very, very, very careful about turning imaginative ideas into beliefs, and then into creeds. I would love to move things only with my mind. But until someone figures out how to do that, demonstrates it to non-believers, and can demonstrate it under laboratory conditions, tele-kinesis is just an imaginary desire and sci-fi plaything, and not reality.

But this is what begins to create *the New Age Believer*— that person has jumped over the evidence stage and has become a *believer*, and often times a *fanatic,* who is absolutely convinced and therefore no longer open-minded and no longer open to feedback that he or she could be wrong. And that, of course, is a big danger sign!

NLP was designed, as a child of the Human Potential Movement, to be creative, playful, imaginative and to stretch forward to play with the various possibilities for developing new human resources. So no wonder so many "New Agers" were (and are) attracted to NLP and many end up as Trainers. And with that another problem begins. They not only teach and train the Cognitive-Behavioral psychology of NLP (if they even know it), but they also *mix it with their religious belief system, alias their "New Age Religion."*

And they have the right to whatever religion they want! I have no problem with that. But to confuse NLP and New Age Religion, well, with that I do have a problem. They are fusing together a model of human nature with a set of beliefs. And doing that confuses things. Nor should someone confuse NLP wth Christianity, or NLP and Buddhism, or NLP and Isalm, etc.

We have been very, very careful in Neuro-Semantics about keeping the model of Neuro-Semantic-NLP clean and clear from any and every religion. Within our ranks are people who are believers in these different spiritual disciplines who *use the models* that govern language, emotion, meaning, performance, mental filters, etc. in their religious expressions. So far, so good. And what we ask is that they keep them separate. One is the model itself, the other are the various applications.

So if you see or read about some NLP or Neuro-Sematnic person into what I personally consider pure non-sense, like the stuff in "The Secret," or other New Age Beliefs about tele-kinesis, channeling the dead, reincarnation, Huna (Tad James), "quantum" psychology or linguistics, "new humans" emerging with mutated DNA, etc., *none of that has anything to do with NLP or Neuro-Semantics.*

Now our official position in Neuro-Semantics is that all of this is pre-scientific and much of it is pseudo-scientific and is the idiosyncratic *beliefs* of certain people and have *nothing to do with the models.*

From: L. Michael Hall
Meta Reflections 2010 – #46
September 11, 2010

A STRATEGY FOR DEFEATING
BOOK BURNING

Unless you have been lost in the wilderness for the last week, you have heard about Terry Jones the pastor of the very small church in Florida who somewhere got the idea that burning the Koran would be a good idea and instead of letting that fleeting thought pass, he decided to act on it. Now normally this would not have been a problem because it would have been contained in his little community. No one would have heard of it. No one would have made much of it.

With the hundreds of thousands of Christian pastors all over the planet doing things every single week, almost none of it is ever considered newsworthy. And they actually do lots of good things —from helping the poor, visiting the sick, providing inspiration for people who and down and discouraged and so on. But none of that hits the news. None of that is considered newsworthy (!) (which is a real shame that the Media around the world is so negatively and catastrophically oriented).

But just let some not-so-bright pastor talk about burning a book, and presto, *News-Worthiness!* of such a high degree that every radio station and every television station and every cable outlet, and every blog and internet website carries it. And why have we heard so much about Terry Jones? Well, it's obvious, the News Media think they can make money that way, fan a controversy, and get new readers or viewers. And of course, they then take no responsibility to being a part of it!

The other key contributing factor to all of this is an invisible one— the invisible attitude and frame of mind called *fundamentalism,* both the pastor's and those who are cursing him. Fundamentalism is an attitude driven by the belief that a symbol is not just a symbol, it is more, it is "real." This is the failure to distinction map and territory. The mental map of ideas, feelings, and beliefs about something is confused and over-identified with what's real —the territory.

Personally, I think it is a stupid idea to burn books and that stupidity is having a field day in all of this. Yet Jones has no monopoly on stupidity. The curses against hm, the protests, the threats to kill him, and the over-identification of him with "America" — all of that is just as stupid. Ultimately, the pastor is just burning a book. In response they burn the American flag or the Bible. Yet all of these things are just symbols. And that's all.

Even though I wish he wouldn't burn books, Jones certainly has the right to burn any book or flag or anything else if it is his. In a democracy that's called freedom. And in a democracy people

have the right and responsibility to live by their own values and beliefs. That's why we don't allow ourselves or others to become dictators of another's conscience. Instead we treat people as adults who are responsible for their own actions.

Here's the craziness in the current conflict: Every Moslem who gets stirred up, provoked, and reactive to Jones is actually letting Jones control them! By dis-empowering themselves over the symbolism, they are empowering him to push their buttons. Confusing map and territory, and getting serious about this, they are endowing Jones with a whole lot of power, authority, and influence. And that's the problem from that side: they are taking him serious. They are giving to this unknown person his 15 minutes of fame and they are making him more important than I think he deserves!

My recommendation: ignore him. Don't let him push your buttons. Set higher frames in your mind to his provocative actions. As long as you respond at his level — pushing back and trying to make him stop or calling him names or insulting him, you are coming down to his level and letting him win! When you unplug your buttons and view it as a silly choice on his part, you make him and his actions less import ant, and redundant.

The Koran, the Bible, the Torah and every other religious book is just that— a book, a symbol. It is just writing about spiritual issues— and so is a map, not the territory, not reality.

THEY ARE JUST SYMBOLS
Unplugging Buttons and Opening the Mind

In writing about a *Strategy for Defeating Book Burning* (Meta Reflection #44), I mostly got emails about the spelling of Koran (Quran) but also three that questioned my comment about holy books and flags and the like being "just symbols." Only one disagreed; the other two asked how could that be and what did I mean. Two others asked about beliefs and especially beliefs-about-beliefs. So here goes.

We are all believers. I am. You are. We all have to believe in things. You have beliefs about yourself, about others, about school, about money, about work, about emotions, about where you came from, about the source of the universe, about what happens after you die, about intelligence, and a thousand other beliefs. You cannot be human and not a believer. The only question is: *What do you believe in?* And you can't escape this even by *not* believing in things because your *not-belief* is a belief! To believe "there is no God" is a belief. That's what you believe!

So, first, we all have to believe. And believing simply refers to the fact that you have taken some of your thoughts and confirmed them. You made a meta-move to a higher level to establish a frame about your thought, "This is real, true, and the way it is." It is this confirmation that transforms a mere thought into a gestalted meta-state that we call a "belief."

What is a belief made out of? Thoughts, ideas, and understandings and a level of confirmation. And it is the *level of confirmation* that distinguishes a belief from just a mere "thought." Now you believe in something and that makes it operate as a "command to the nervous system" which in turn, sets up a self-fulfilling prophecy so that you become organized around your beliefs. Now you will see and hear and experience the world *through the color of your beliefs.* If you have ever tried to "argue" someone out of his or her beliefs, then you know that doing that only makes their beliefs stronger!

As a meta-state structure, beliefs are strong, resilient, and self-organizing. So what happens when a person creates a belief-in-a-belief? Well, that's an entirely different story from a belief. When you believe in your belief, you end the discovering, you stop the exploration, you close shop, you stop your openness to new information, and you become a fundamentalist! A fanatic. Now you act as if you "know" something. Now you stop recognizing it as a belief and you treat it as unquestionable fact.

Now the belief that any book (religious or otherwise) is not just a book but more, that it is the "reality," confuses map and territory. It confuses what the book speaks about and refers to — that is, *to the territory beyond the book,* to the reality which is not words or sentences or ink or paper. As this belief confuses and over-identifies a person's map about something and the territory, it violates a basic epistemological understanding— "The map is not the territory." ("The menu is not the meal.")

Interesting enough there's a passage in the Bible that speaks to this, distinguishing "the book" from the reality. The context was a debate with the religious leaders, the Pharisees and so to them Jesus said, "You search the scriptures because *you think* that in them is eternal life, *but* they are they which testify of me." (John 5:39). Now whether you agree or disagree with the content of that statement, he at least distinguished from *the means* that delivered the message, the book, the scriptures, and *what the writings referred to—* that which they pointed to outside of the text itself. Maybe there's something similar in the Koran, I don't know because I'm unfamiliar with that text. It would be nice if those scriptures also distinguished between the map / territory.

> [Another verse in Romans says that the "letter of the law kills, but the spirit (the intention) gives life."]

Now you know why one of the chief problems in our world (if not *the chief problem)* is **fundamentalism:** a belief-in-a-belief and how this creates fanatics! They close their mind, they look for no new evidence, they can't be talked to, they are on a mission to convert everyone to their way of thinking. This is true of every form of fundamentalists, even atheistic fundamentalists, or the fundamentalists of scientism. The belief has become an *-ism* and that's what makes it dangerous. Now they believe they have a mandate to do anything to force others into their way of thinking, believing, and acting. And that's what gives them the green light to become dictators!

> [That might explain why Dr. Bob Bodenhamer writes fundamentalists as "funDAMentalists!" I like that. My thought is: If only they would have more fun there'd be less damnation going on!]

"But this book is more than just a book!" That's what a fanatical "true believer" (Eric Hoffer) or fundamentalist believes. In terms of human cognitive and emotional development, this reflects the "magical thinking" stage of childhood wherein a child believes that things can be magically powerful and so they go through the superstitious stage.

Yet in the end, a book is just a book— any book, Koran, the Bible, Book of Mormon, Torah, etc. It is not a magical item dropped out of the heavens. And as a "map" about spiritual things, it offers various ideas about a great many things. And as a "map" is it not the territory. So burn them or kiss them, toss them away or read them daily— know what you have in your hands, *a symbol* ... full of *symbols* ... and not the reality. If you believe in the reality behind it all, then that reality is so much more than paper and ink! Or is that your god?
Provocatively Yours

From: L. Michael Hall

THE LAWSUIT
THAT ALMOST KILLED NLP

In the 1990s a blow was delivered to the field of NLP that nearly destroyed the field in the United States. Elsewhere in the world NLP kept growing and thriving, but not in the United States and the effect has continued to this day. What happened is a very sad chapter in the history of NLP.

It began in July of 1996 when Richard Bandler filed a $90,000,000 lawsuit as a civil action against John Grinder, Carmen Bostic St. Clair, Christina Hall, Steve and Connirae Andreas, and Lara Ewing and 200 John and Jane Does. In that lawsuit Bandler claimed exclusive ownership of the Society of NLP. Copies of the lawsuit are still available on various websites.

The first effected me in early 1997. Having just completed another NLP Practitioner Course with 20 people, I sent a check for $4,000 ($200 per participant was the arrangement) and the certificates to the "First Institute of NLP" in San Francisco for Richard Bandler to sign. As a NLP trainer, this was the arrangement that I had been following for seven years, but this time Brahm von Huene returned the check and certificates and sent a *new* contract for me to sign.

In the contract, I crossed out the section that said that anything I developed based on NLP would be considered the intellectual property of Bander and the section that if he decided to sue me, I would assume responsibility for all legal bills. Of course, I would *not* sign *that*! I initialed both places, and then sent the money, certificates and the contract back. Shortly thereafter all was returned again with the statement that I was no longer a NLP trainer under the Society of NLP.

By June of 1997 the lawsuit had become big news in the field of NLP, and so when Robert Dilts sponsored the *Visionary Leadership* conference in Santa Cruz California, word about the lawsuit was the central thing that everybody was talking about. There were over 200 NLP Trainers who had gathered from all around the world for this conference.

A day or two later, Judith DeLozier announced in the conference that John Grinder had showed up—but he would not come into the meeting place where we were all gathered. I think it was Judith DeLozier who announced that John would meet with anyone who wanted to talk to him about the lawsuit "out on the grass" in front of the venue. So many of us met with John and listened to what he told us about the lawsuit. He was there also to raise money for his legal defense.

The very next day, Richard Bandler sent his lawyer (!) who also came and meet with anyone who wanted to talk to him "out on the grass." And again, many of us when out to talk to him. Wyatt Woodsmall and I stood next to each other, and when there was a moment for some questions, I had the contract that had been returned to me, so I held it forth and asked Richard's lawyer about it. But it was a futile attempt for any reasoning.

The contract that I signed, sent back with the two sections crossed out, began with these words which tells a lot about what all the ruckus was about:

> "The Licensor owns throughout the World all rights, title, and interest in and to the intellectual property known as Neuro-Linguistic Programming..."

So there was no question that Bandler's 1996 lawsuit was an attempt to take over and totally control the field of NLP. And from the perspective of 1996, 1997, etc. it seemed very likely that that might happen. It seemed that he had the trademark. That's why Dr. Bob Bodenhamer and myself decided that we would trademark and register "Neuro-Semantics." Our thinking was that if Bandler did win the lawsuit, and forbid us from training NLP, we would still be able to train under the banner of Neuro-Semantics and that also explained why we set forth a vision of being more professional, more collaborative, more "applying to self," etc.

During this time John Grinder put out a Statement about the lawsuit, Robert Dilts wrote a paper on Trademarks, and *NLP Connection,* and many other journals kept the field informed about what was going on. Steve Andreas asked me if I would be available and willing to make a deposition about NLP and be disposed by Bandler's lawyer. I was to provide "some substantial documentation of the many sources that Bandler drew upon in the development of NLP— what he got from Bateson, from Perls, Satir, Chomsky, etc." I had been writing about the intellectual history of NLP for years, and I readily agreed to provide that. I told Steve that I was highly disappointed in Bandler, that Steve had done more to put Bandler on the map than anyone, and that yes, of course, I would testify on his behalf.

From 1996 to 2000 (when the lawsuit was settled), hundreds of people in the United States, scared of Richard and fearful of being added to the lawsuit as one of the "John Does" began divesting themselves of NLP— they stopped referring to what they did as "NLP" and those running training centers either closed shop or changed their names. By the end, there were but a dozen centers left (if that) and even today, there's very few Centers left, no journals, no magazines, and no associations of NLP in the US.

What happened? Chris Hall (no relation to me) explained in *NLP World* (July 2001):

> "The Court's rulings have made it clear that Bandler's claim to exclusive and sole ownership of the Society and the intellectual property rights associated with NLP have been false and unlawful." (p. 17)

Christina Hall was one of my trainers when I learned NLP. I recorded some of her presentations and referred to her in my first two books on NLP: *The Spirit of NLP* (1989; 1996) and *Becoming More Ferocious as a Presenter* (1990). She was in a special internship with Richard when I first

met her in 1989 and the president of "The Society of NLP." And given that she was the representative leader of the "Bandler Group" who owned the trademark, "Society of NLP," when the trial was all over, she won the judgment over Bandler and was awarded some $600,000. I doubt she will ever receive any of that because Bandler moved to Ireland! It turned out that Richard Bandler did not have the trademark for "NLP"—no one did. And with that NLP was declared in public domain. (A similar thing happened in the UK, as Bandler was convicted of receiving the trademark of NLP by fraud and fined 175,000 pounds.)

"The Bandler Group" was the group who in 1983 purchased the trademark of "The Society of NLP" after Liquidation of *NOT Ltd.* (Bandler's original company) went bankrupt. This group was named "the Bandler group" and was comprised of Christina Hall, Max Steinback, M.D., Karen MacDonald, Ed and Maryann Reese, Joseph and Linda Sommers-Yeager, and Richard Morales.

The trial lasted nine days and ended on Thursday, Feb. 10, 2000. Chris Hall tells about the testimony against Bandler and those who testified in the court of Judge Yonts in Feb 2000. This included Dr. Max Steinback, John Grinder, Karen MacDonald (widow of Will MacDonald), and Christina Hall.

References:

Andreas, Steve (1999). Personal communications.

Hall, Chris. (2001). *NLP World* (Vol. 8, No. 2, July 2001). In The Matter of ... Summary of the Bandler Lawsuit. pp. 15-24.

NLP Connections: June 10, 2010. Volume XI, No. 2 and 3. Phoenix, Arizona.

MORE MISUNDERSTANDINGS
OF MASLOW AND HIS MODEL

Every once in a while I will read something that is so ridiculous and absurd that while I read I continually shake my head back and forth from side-to-side not believing the non-sense. This happens this week when I read an article about some "psychologists" who tried their best to discredit Abraham Maslow and they did so by mis-representing what he actually wrote and, in my opinion, completely failed to understand the model they want to replace with their own.

Here's the scoop: These evolutionary psychologists want to replace self-actualization at the top of the hierarchy of needs and replace it with "parenting" as the "paramount" human need, the ultimately "evolutionary fundamental need" and along with it put "mate acquisition and mate retention." Incredible!

Now what is so unscientific and unprofessional about all of this is some of what I consider their adolescent language which they use in putting down Maslow and his Hierarchy of Needs model. It is unscientific because they make statements without taking ownership for them. When I first read the following, I wondered, "Who is making these judgments and based on what?"

> "Maslow's time-tested pyramid, first proposed in the 1940s, had begun to look a bit weathered and outdated."
> "The pyramid was increasingly viewed as quaint and old-fashioned and badly in need of updating."

True enough, Maslow first developed the Hierarchy of Needs in 1941 and published it in 1943, but he then spent another 13 years researching and supporting the model. It was in 1954 that his classic work was published, *Motivation and Personality*. Then in January of 1970, Maslow updated it with all of the research that had occurred and the new edition was published soon thereafter, just about the time of his death in June 1970.

In all of this works, Maslow himself never called the *Hierarchy of Needs* a "pyramid." Whoever first did that I still do not know. I just know that there is no record in all of Maslow's writings about that. And in *Motivation and Personality* he never said that "those at the bottom take precedence over those higher up." Instead he wrote about the emergence of human needs as lower needs are truly satisfied. He never said that they had to be completely 100 percent or absolutely satisfied.

> "The degree of fixity of the hierarchy of basic needs: we have spoken so far as if this hierarchy were a fixed order, but actually it is not nearly so rigid as we may have implied. (p. 51)

"If one need is satisfied, then another emerges.   But it doesn't have to be satisfied 100% before the next emerges. We could assign arbitrary numbers: 85% of physiological needs satisfied, 50% of love, 40% of self-esteem needs, 10% of self-actualization needs." (1970, p. 54).

Kenrick and Neuberg et. al. further mis-represent Maslow when they write: "For Maslow, once a need was met, it disappeared as the individual moved on to the next level." That is blatantly false. Maslow said that all of the needs keep operating, they operate simultaneously, and everyday all of the needs reassert themselves. Writing in this way creates "a false-man argument" — they present something that Maslow did not say, then criticize it, and present a fuller picture (which the person original did also) and hope in the process to be seen as updating and improving the original.

He never said "if you are starving and craving food that will trump all other goals." He never said that and he especially did not use that language. What he did say was that such needs as "mate acquisition, mate retention, and parenting" would fall into the category of *the love and affection needs*—the needs for bonding, connecting, being a part of a group. Somehow Douglas Kenrick and Steven Neuberg missed that. Maslow indeed included finding a mate and having children as one biological "need" in the hierarchy. But he also discovered from his interview of thousands of psychologically healthy people that there were "needs" beyond marrying and having children.

Kenrick and Neuberg also seemed to not have carefully read Maslow's work or they would not have written that "while self-actualization is interesting and important, it isn't an evolutionarily fundamental need." They would have learned that self-actualization is *human development at its highest level*— seeking knowledge, meaning, justice, truth, love, contribution, altrusism, making a difference, creativity. So in terms of "evolutionarily fundamental need" — our one and only "instinct" as humans is to learn, to gain knowledge, to create meaning, and so on. So given all of this, then of course, "self-actualization" is an evolutionary need. In the evolution model, it is how we evolve.

Comparing self-actualization to "artistic creativity" and then declaring that that is about gaining status also completely mis-understands and mis-represents what Maslow actually said.

In my opinion, what I see that Kenrick and Neuberg have done is to impose their own limited views onto the Hierarchy of Needs in an attempt to hijack Maslow's work to give their work some credibility. But it does not work. "Reproductive goals are ultimate causes..." they write. And what evidence do they point to for that? Birds! Birds migration(!).

Anyway, if you also want to shake your head side-to-side and read something unbelievably uninformed— what follows here is the article that appeared at the University of Arizona website. It is a brief summary of the original article published in Perspectives on Psychological Society. The original article is better than this summary. Yet in both the problem with all of this is *the frame* that they start with, use to judge Maslow, and reject "self-actualization." Their frame is that of animal psychology (and not human psychology) and of evolutionary psychology (not humanistic psychology).

Maslow's frame came as he interviewed and modeled self-actualizers. So he started with real live people (starting with Max Wertheimer and Ruth Benedict). He looked at people who were psychologically healthy and who were making significant contributions that were enriching the lives of many others.

In a reply to the reviews of their paper, the authors later write the following which gives a sense of their frames and therefore attitude:

> "From an evolutionary perspective, people do not matter, per se. Rather, people are essentially vehicles for genes, and they are designed by genes to do the kinds of things that facilitate the replication of those genes." (*Perspectives on Psychological Science,* 5 (3) pp. 335)
> "Meaning and wisdom matter, but they have no particular place in the pyramid..." (337, reference: http://pps.sagepub.com)

http://asunews.asu.edu/20100819_maslowspyramid

Maslow's Pyramid Gets a Much Needed Renovation

If you have ever felt that your children are your life's work, then you may in fact be recognizing a high-level psychological need. Caring for your children, feeding them, nurturing them, educating them and making sure they get off on the right foot in life – all of the things that make parenting successful – may actually be deep-rooted psychological urges that we fulfill as part of being human.

This is according to a team of psychologists who have updated a cornerstone of modern psychology – Abraham Maslow's pyramid of needs. Maslow's pyramid describes human motivations from the most basic to the most advanced. But Maslow's time-tested pyramid, first proposed in the 1940s, had begun to look a bit weathered and outdated.

So a team of psychologists, including two from Arizona State University, recast the pyramid. In doing so, they have taken on one of psychology's iconic symbols and have generated some controversy along the way.

The revamp of Maslow's pyramid reflects new findings and theory from fields such as neuroscience, developmental psychology and evolutionary psychology, said Douglas Kenrick, an ASU professor of psychology and lead author of the paper, "Renovating the pyramid of needs: Contemporary extensions built upon ancient foundations." The paper was published in the May issue of *Perspectives on Psychological Sciences*.

Despite being one of psychology's most memorable images, Maslow's pyramid hasn't always been supported by empirical research, said Steven Neuberg, an ASU Foundation professor and co-author of the paper.

"Within the psychological sciences, the pyramid was increasingly viewed as quaint and old-fashioned, and badly in need of updating," Neuberg added.

"It was based on some great ideas, several of which are worth preserving," Kenrick said. "But it missed out on some very basic facts about human nature, facts which weren't well understood in Maslow's time, but were established by later research and theory at the interface of psychology, biology and anthropology."

Maslow developed the pyramid of needs to represent a hierarchy of human motives, with those at the bottom taking precedence over those higher up. At the base of Maslow's pyramid are physiological needs – hunger, thirst and sexual desire.

According to Maslow, if you are starving and craving food that will trump all other goals. But if you are satisfied on one level, you move to the next. So, once you are well fed, you worry about safety. Once you are safe, you worry about affection and esteem and so forth. Perhaps most famously, at the top of Maslow's pyramid sat the need for self-actualization – the desire to fulfill one's own unique creative potential.

The research team – which included Vladas Griskevicius of the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, and Mark Schaller of the University of British Columbia, Vancouver – restructured the famous pyramid after observing how psychological processes radically change in response to evolutionarily fundamental motives, such as *self-protection, mating or status concerns.*

The bottom four levels of the new pyramid are highly compatible with Maslow's, but big changes are at the top. Perhaps the most controversial modification is that self-actualization no longer appears on the pyramid at all. At the top of the new pyramid are three evolutionarily critical motives that Maslow overlooked – mate acquisition, mate retention and parenting.

The researchers state in the article that while self-actualization is interesting and important, it isn't an evolutionarily fundamental need. Instead, many of the activities that Maslow labeled as self-actualizing (artistic creativity, for example) reflect more biologically basic drives to gain status, which in turn serves the goal of attracting mates.

"Among human aspirations that are most biologically fundamental are those that ultimately facilitate reproduction of our genes in our children's children," Kenrick said. "For that reason, parenting is paramount."

The researchers are not saying that artists or poets are consciously thinking about increasing their reproductive success when they feel the inspiration to paint or write.

"Reproductive goals are ultimate causes," Kenrick added, "like the desire of birds to migrate because it helps them survive and reproduce. But at a proximate (or immediate psychological) level, the bird migrates because its brain registers that the length of day is changing. In our minds, we humans create simply because it feels good to us; we're not aware of its ultimate function."

"You could argue that a peacock's display is as beautiful as anything any human artist has ever produced," Kenrick said. "Yet it has a clear biological function – to attract a mate. We suspect that self actualization is also simply an expression of the more evolutionarily fundamental need to reproduce."

But, Kenrick adds, for humans reproduction is not just about sex and producing children. It's also about raising those children to the age at which they can reproduce as well. Consequently, parenting sits atop the revamped pyramid.

There are other distinctions as well. For Maslow, once a need was met, it disappeared as the individual moved on to the next level. In the reworked pyramid, needs overlap one another and co-exist, instead of completely replacing each other. For example, certain environmental cues can make them come back. If you are walking down the street thinking about love, art or the meaning of life, you will revert quickly to the self-protection level if you see an ominous-looking gang of young men headed your way.

The new pyramid already has generated some controversy within the field. The published article was accompanied by four commentaries. While the commentaries agreed with the basic evolutionary premise of the new pyramid, they take issue with some of the specific details, including the removal of self-actualization and the prominence of parenting in the new pyramid.

"The pyramid of needs is a wonderful idea of Maslow's," Kenrick said. "He just got some of it wrong. Now people are talking about it again, which will help us get it right."

NEURO-SEMANTICS
ENTRANCE INTO BRAZIL

At the end of September I was in Brazil and had the privilege of introducing Neuro-Semantics and Meta-States to the NLP community there. Invited by Dr. Jairo Manchilha, I got to speak to the *LatinAmerican Congress of PNL* as the keynote speaker. The theme of the Congress was: *NLP and Genius* and as the pre-conference workshop, I did the *Accessing Personal Genius* (APG) training, and at the Congress my subject was provocatively, *Neuro-Semantics: A Step Beyond NLP*. I say "provocatively," and yet it did not provoke like it would have, say in Europe!

There were 120 or so at the Congress itself. And prior to the congress I enjoyed the privilege of introducing 80 very passionate Brazilians to *the Meta-States Model*. So in the end, we certified 80 people in Meta-States (which is also *Coaching Genius,* Module II of Meta-Coaching). Now those 80 are licensed to jump logical levels in a single bound, climb the ladder of Meaning-Making all the way up to Meta-Land, and have the right and responsibility to set higher frames of mind and make transformative changes.

It was a great delight to also see and spend time with Dr. Paulo Jose Brindeiro again. He first met me in Geneva for APG some years back and then in Grand Junction Colorado. And Paulo has committed his time, effort, and money to creating a practice group in Rio de Janiero for those who want to practice and use and develop their skills in Meta-States.   Paulo single-handled translated the APG manual into Portugese, and "just for his own learning and development" he translated *Unleashed* (!) and was the person who did the basic translation of *Mind-Lines*. Paulo was a medical researcher prior to retiring and as you can tell, he didn't retire, he just signed up for a new profession— being a Neuro-Semanticist! We just need a thousand more like him around the world!

While a medical doctor, a cardiologist, Jairo has been an NLP Leader in Brazil since 1993 and has led the PNL Congress for the past 9 years. And having learned NLP via Robert Dilts, he has a much broader vision than most which has enabled him to lead the way in terms of collaboration and cooperation within the NLP Community. In addition, Jairo set me up with the Quality Imprint company who began translating *Mind-Lines* into Portugese (to be ready in a 4 weeks or so) and next year, there will be two more books— *Unleashed* and *Inside-Out Wealth* translated as well.

Now this was my first trip into the heart of Latin America. I had been down to the bottom of Mexico where David Murphy runs Neuro-Semantic NLP Trainings in Chipas, Mexico. But that was as far south as I had been until this trip. The person primarily leading Neuro-Semantics in Latin America is Omar Salom who regularly trains in Equador, Panama, Columbia, etc.

For APG there was simultaneous translation which I really, really like and prefer. But for the Congress we reverted to sequential translating and Maíra Larangeira Carvalho (Jairo's daughter) provided that and did a fantastic job —even imitating the numerous voices that I provided to my delight and that of the audience.

The response in Rio de Janeiro at the APG training and the Congress was overwhelming— tremendous excitement about the new things in NLP that Neuro-Semantics represents. Not only did I find the people of Brazil extremely open and friendly, but the PNL people were as open and passionate about NLP as you can imagine.   So I'll return next year in Sept. to speak at the Congress PNL again. This time the theme is *NLP and Prosperity* and will be at Belo Horizonte, Brazil.   And prior to the Congress, I will do the three-day training on *Inside-Out Wealth.* And probably one of the Self-Actualization workshops and APG ... all in order to prepare Brazil for *Coaching Mastery for ACMC credentials* in 2012.

Since returning I have already had several emails of PNL People in Brazil wanting to be a part of the vanguard of the Neuro-Semantic NLP movement there! So you can expect to see some of them at the First International Neuro-Semantic Conference next year (July 1-3) in Colorado.

THE WHEN NLP BECAME A BUSINESS

In the history of NLP, it didn't take long before those who were first into the field realized that they could make money with this stuff. That would be my guess about why John Grinder so quickly gave up being an Associate Professor at the University at Santa Cruz and "went on the road" doing workshops and trainings with Richard Bandler. And I'm sure that's why most of the others in the 1970s immediately began applying NLP to training and the training of therapists. But that was just the beginning.

One fascinating thing about the field of NLP in terms of business is that *it is about nothing in particular and everything in general.* As a field, NLP is about the structure of human experiences and what that means is that it is about everything human! Any and every experience — from learning, changing, leading, developing expertise, delegating, parenting, sports, medicine, entrepreneurship, training, education, and so on— has a structure above and beyond the content information that governs that experience.

So the content of the NLP models about the structure of experience therefore can be applied to *everything human—* everything that we humans think, feel, say, and do as we relate. This also means that NLP is *not* about any single field. And in business we know that when something is about everything, it is about nothing. So, NLP does not have a field!

> NLP's area of expertise goes to the *processes regarding how we create models of the world and a sense of reality.*

So when NLP became a business in itself, it started with the fields that it had arisen from— therapy and training. But soon, it began spreading out to other fields— to those of communicating, selling, influencing, persuading, educating, etc. And that's why NLP got connected with these areas rather than academia where it originated.

So just as soon as the first books were created, the two founders left the bosom of the university where it was given birth and created their own companies— training companies. Bandler called his company, *Not Limited,* and Grinder named his company, *Unlimited Limited* (now there has to be a story behind these names, but I don't know it!). Then they went "on the road" with their seminars and trainings.

Now the official date for the beginning of NLP is 1975. That's when it was given birth as a model. But it was not called "NLP" at that time. That did not happen until 1977 which was the beginning of the terminology "NLP" and from there the first official trainings in 1978. That's when Leslie Cameron Bandler put together "the Society of NLP" and organized what later became known as "the Practitioner" training. And the first Practitioner training was 35 days long. By the 1980s the Practitioner course was shorted and streamlined to 21 to 24 days and eventually a Master Practitioner course was added to that.

In terms of business development, it was Anthony Robbins in the mid-1980s, who really stepped up and showed what kind of money could be made with NLP. Probably unknown at the time, but Tony's genius was (and continues to this day to be) that of marketing, selling, and promoting. So when he found NLP in 1985 (or thereabouts), he learned it well enough to give him the courage to step up and put its most dynamic aspects on TV. And with that, he built a name and reputation. And soon thereafter he had a best-selling NLP book, *Unlimited Power* (1987).

Somewhere about that time, Wyatt Woodsmall taught Anthony the Master Practitioner materials and worked with him on the government shooting modeling program. And a year or two later, when Tony was certifying people as NLP Practitioners, but not doing so through "the Society of NLP." So that brought about a lawsuit from Bandler(!). From the stories I've heard, Richard didn't talk to Tony directly about any of that, he just filed a lawsuit against him. When it all ended, Tony settled out of court, Richard "won," got a signed agreement that Tony would certify through the Society, and send his $200 for each participant certified in NLP.

Yet that small win was a big loss. I say that because ultimately, with that action Richard Bandler chased away the greatest salesman he could have ever had or wanted. So instead of putting the mantle on Tony, and giving him a world-wide commission: "Bring the world to me!" Richard essentially drove him away and added massive pain so that it conditioned him to never utter the three letters, "NLP" in public. So to this day, whether on Oprah, Larry King, or any other talk show, Tony will not say those three letters. And yet he still brings more people to the field of NLP than any other single person and undoubtedly makes more money than everybody in the field put together and multiplied by 10. So much for wisdom.

Today *NLP as Business* is in just about everything— Sales, Persuasion, Hypnosis, Hypnotherapy, Psychotherapy, Counseling, Coaching, Leadership and Executive Development, Management, Presentations, Training, Learning, Education, Medicine, Health and Fitness, anywhere and with anything that involves *human beings seeking to be their best— NLP offers business applications.*

NLP is into just about everything, but it is a wrong-headed myth to think that "everything is NLP." It isn't. *NLP itself is a model about experience* and so has many applications. As a model about "communication" it provides a way to identify how language and meaning forms ("in-forms") and governs the things we do as human beings. And that's what makes it such a valuable tool.

NLP DISCOVERIES IN THE 1990s

1970s: Neuro-Linguistic Programming (NLP) was launched with the Communication Model that we today call *The Meta-Model*. That set everything in motion because using the linguistic distinctions that Grinder had already identified in the Cognitive Model of Transformational Grammar (TG), they were able to identify the "structure of the linguistic magic" in Fritz Perls and Virginia Satir. Then with those same tools, they modeled the hypnotic language patterns of Milton Erickson and created *The Milton Model*. NLP then had two communication models. One set of tools enables a person to become more professional as a communicator through *precision communicating* and the other through the skill of being *artfully vague*. One grounds a person in reality, the other seeks to build new and better abstractions to live by (non-sensory-based mappings using hypnotic language patterns).

1980s: The 1980s brought into full development more models: The Strategy Model for how to track an experience step by step as the NLP developers enriched the TOTE model of George Miller, detailed the Representational Model with its cinematic features (called "sub-modalities" even though they are not *sub*, but meta), Perceptual Positions (Grinder), Time-Lines (Bandler), Meta-Programs (Leslies Cameron-Banlder), Neuro-Logical Levels and SCORE Models (Robert Dilters), and lots and lots of patterns. I don't include "New Code" even though it was developed in 1983/85 by Grinder and Judith DeLozier; it was not really a new model, just a different focus on things (a dis-avowing the conscious mind and a treating of the unconscious as nearly infallible).

1990s: *What new models appeared in the 1990s?* In addition to more patterns which are particular processes (strategies, guided experiences, or steps) for a particular experience, and various tools (which provides a method for using a Model or a Pattern), several new models appeared within the field of NLP in the 1990s. Central to them were the following: DHE (Design Human Engineering), Meta-States, Clean Language, Social Panorama. Now Models are different from Patterns. Models have and operate by a theory, they have basic guidelines, variables, and they lead to patterns. They also differ from *Tools.* The Lab Profile that was developed in the 1980s is a Tool of Meta-Programs (a Model). And as another tool, a tool for NLP Modeling, David Gordon and Graham Dawes created the Experiential Array (putting together the basic NLP strategies, beliefs, states, behaviors, etc.). [There may be other Models created during the 1990s that I have not listed here, if so, do let me know.]

DHE (Design Human Engineering): Richard Bandler.
Richard developed DHE in the early 1990s and he had hoped it would be the next big revolution after NLP. That didn't happen. But the idea was great! The ideas was that instead of modeling an expert, instead of finding an expert — a human being who could already do something at the level of excellence—why not take a more direct route? Why not simply design or engineer the skill, state, or experience that you desire and then install it? The metaphor was a cyborg: If you had a cyborg and could program anything into it, what would you design? This is the heart of DHE.

So what is DHE? It is essentially sub-modalities and representations within a hypnosis format. Trance yourself into a state, or have Richard Bandler do it. And then invent whatever you want to design for human excellence, and make it so. Of course, the problem is that merely designing things without taking the constraints of reality into account doesn't produce much. So after ten-years of DHE, I wrote an article, *"Ten Years and Still No Beef"* as a review of DHE challenging the fact that after ten years— DHE had produced nothing, and people with DHE training could do nothing more than those with NLP training could do. It was a great experiment: fun, play, silly, etc. but not productive in terms of actually creating results. You can read the article on www.neurosemantics.com (Writings, NLP Critiques, Strengths & Weaknesses of DHE).

Clean Language — Modeling Symbolic Landscape and Space
In the 1990s James Lawley and Penny Tompkins (England) modeled David Grove and came up with a model that they called Clean Language for Symbolic Modeling. Their book came out in the year 2000, *Metaphors in Mind: Transformation through Symbolic Modelling* (2000). Researching the field, they used several sources: Lakoff and Johnson's *Metaphors we Live By*, Pinker's work, *How the Mind Works*. This lead to using the sub-modality of *location* (space) to construct *metaphoric landscapes*—which is truly a new creative addition to the field of NLP.

My only critique is about the name itself. Calling this powerful tool for symbolic modeling "clean language" seems to suggest metaphorically that it is uncontaminated by the user's own thoughts, emotions, states, assumptions. And that's just not the case. It can't be. Now the intention is great— not wanting to impose upon a client "any value, construct, or presupposition" (p. 52). But, of course, that's not possible. To their credit, they do begin with a focus on using the client's words and then go into questioning about the shape of the metaphor: it's location, direction, size, etc.

Questions	Structuring Frame
"And is there anything else about that? And what else is there...?"	Expanding Frame
"And what kind of a thing is that thing?"	Quality frame, Categorizing frame
"And that kind of a thing is like what?"	Metaphor frame
"And where is this thing?"	Location frame
"And whereabouts is this thing?"	Location frame
"And then what happens?"	Spatial location frame in future time

"And what happens next?"	Spatial location frame; Consequence frame
"And what happens just before this?"	Prior spatial location frame
"And were could this come from?"	Source frame

Social Panorama — Modeling the Semantic Space of Relationships

Another tremendous contribution to the field of NLP comes from taking a tool that the field of Sociology gave us, the Sociogram and updating it with some NLP. Lucas Durks from The Netherlands did this as he applied the idea of sub-modalities to *relationships* (the Others Matrix). By doing this he created the Social Panorama (which has since been published as a book by that title, published by Crown House Publications). So as we code and represent "time" externally to ourselves so that we can point in space to such concepts as "the past," "the future" (and so create "time-lines"), so using various cinematic features we can locate people in space around us.

In the Social Panorama model, you can take the cinematic features (sub-modalities) of distance (close and far), height (up and down), two and three dimensional, color or black-and-white, etc. and can create a world of people all around us. Then in this model, you symbolically use physical space to stand for and represent the meanings that we give to the people in our mental-emotional world.

Meta-States - Modeling of Self-Reflexivity

It was while modeling resilience (1992-3) that I discovered the Meta-States Model. I was studying highly resilient people (Frankl, survivers, etc.) as well as continuing my study of the sources of NLP, especially Bateson and Korzbyski on the subject of "logical levels." This resulted in discovering the meta-layers of states-about-states and so the modeling the kind of consciousness most unique to human beings— *self-reflexive consciousness.* This gave birth to the Meta-States Model in 1994 which was almost immediately recognized by the International Association of NLP Trainers in 1995 as "the most significant contribution to NLP." Soon thereafter I began putting the Meta-States Model into various books: *Secrets of Personal Mastery, Meta-States, Dragon Slaying, Winning the Inner Game.* Then over the years literally hundreds of patterns arose — there are 143 Meta-State Patterns in the book, *Sourcebook of Magic, Volume II.* And, of course, after that arose the field, model, and community of Neuro-Semantic itself.

The unique thing about the Meta-States Model, is that it re-models the models of NLP because reflexivity is built into the model and that's, in part, why the model has been so rich and robust over the years.

COLLABORATING FOR GREAT IMPACT

Having just completed Module III of Meta-Coaching in Sweden (*Coaching Mastery*) for the second year in a row, I thought it might be very useful to *celebrate and honor* the collaborators in Sweden who made this possible. There's not enough collaboration occurring in the field of NLP and so few role models. So I offer to you the following as some Role Models for Collaboration. May there be many more to follow in their steps!

In 2006 *Sara Lee* was living in Sydney Australia and took Modules II and II and became a Certified Meta-Coach, then she moved to Sweden. And in Stockholm she was the one and only Meta-Coach in that major city. She didn't like that. (There were 2 other Meta-Coaches in Sweden but they lived elsewhere— one is Mats Lundberg— who was part of the Team Leaders this year and last year!)

So Sara began talking up Meta-Coaching and lo and behold, in 2008 she influenced *Niklas Daver* and *Helene Nordgren* to travel to Colorado — both NLP Trainers— and become Meta-Coaches. And now there were 3. And in Colorado the three of them caught a vision— or created it— or co-invented it: "Why not bring Meta-Coach Training to Sweden." And so a dream was born and in 2009 they pulled it off — so that now there were 23 Meta-Coaches in Sweden. Then this year, they joined with *Carina Juserius* (who became a Meta-Coach in 2009) and the 4 of them collaborated to create the module III of Meta-Coaching again this year.

The Coaching Boot Camp of *Coaching Mastery* is really too much for a single person or even company (although people are doing it). But collaboratively— joining forces and dividing up the work, the influence, the investment, etc., makes it much more doable. So with our four collaborators — we had 2 other Swedes on the Team of Team Leaders who did the benchmarking— Patrik Fordell and Mats Lundberg. And to that we then had a group of Meta-Coaches from last year who revisited— Garik Paltsev, Monica Mohlin, Henrik Schalén.

In this training — as almost always— we had an international group. So we not only had people from Sweden, but from Norway, Holland, Germany, Japan, Canada, USA, France, Kenya, Schweiz (which I think is Switzerland!), and England. This provides the opportunity to work with people from many different backgrounds and cultures which requires that you develop greater flexibility in your approach.

Now in Sweden, we were in the very best meta-room ever— we used the sixth floor of an old building in downtown Stockholm for the coaching sessions and then we went up to the seventh

floor for the large group presentations. This large floor was entirely open and from it — you had a 360 degree view of Stockholm, the River that we were at, and the surrounding city.

A very special treat this time was that Helene talked to the sponsor of Robert Dilts who was in town doing a training and so we entertained Robert Dilts as one of our Expert Coaches. The evening we did that, another 70 people joined us making a very full room. I interviewed Robert or perhaps I should say I gave the "go" signal and Robert took off with stories about NLP and Coaching and his focus in the field of Coaching on *presence*. The interview was recorded and will eventually be posted on you-tube or made available in some format.

In terms of coaching, knowing what to do, and how to cope when you don't know what to do, Robert told the story of "The Miracle over the Hudson." This "miracle" was the story of the US Airways Airbus A320 that took off from LaGuardia airport and struck a flock of birds during the takeoff and which then took out both engines. At that moment, what did "Sully" Sullenberger, the pilot do? Was there a page in the flight manual, "What to do with bird knock out an engine at 3,000 feet?" No. Sullenberger later said that he had practiced for 42 years. Now it was time to trust himself and operate from calmness. "Were you scared?" "Terrified."

Our second expert coach was *Lene Fjellheim* from Norway, who was added as a member of the Neuro-Semantic Leadership Team in 2009. Lene runs a highly successfully NLP training center in Norway, has been a Meta-Coach since 2005, she reached PCMC level in January 2010, and is the organizer for *Coaching Mastery* in February 2011 in Norway. Lene's strengths is in her group and team coaching, her infectious optimism and persistence, and her business smarts for running a business– and guess what, she too has a business that's comprised of collaborative partners.

What we need in the field of NLP and Neuro-Semantics is much more collaboration and the creation of collaborative partnerships. So what stops us? *Individualism*— the need to do things my way, the need for me to get the credit, the need to promote my business and company and approach. *Fear of confrontation*— the inability to work through differences and conflicts and create a collaborative solution, the fear of being open and forthright, the fear of bringing things up when they are small and manageable. *Inadequate communication skills*— the inability to be specific about details, to set a mutual vision and use it for keeping the inspiration high, the inability or unwillingness to actively listen and support.

Here's to the great role model of Collaboration by the Organizers of the Sweden experience of Meta-Coaching!

From: L. Michael Hall

NLP AND MODELING

NLP is essentially a communication model, a model about how we use language and neurology to communicate to ourselves and create our mental maps or models by which we then navigate life. At the same time, NLP is also essentially about modeling. It arose from modeling and as a communication model, it provides tools by which we can model other experiences.

> Does that make sense? Is the relationship between communication and modeling obvious to you?

It isn't to many, so here's an explanation of the relationship between communication and modeling. Human experiences are obviously *neuro-linguistic* in that our experiences occur within our *neurology* (nervous systems and physiology) by our *linguistics*. Being without instincts (Maslow) the only "instinct" that we have is to *learn* and by learning we then inevitably and inescapably add the *content information* about *what things are and how to function*. And when we do that, the meanings we make are the instincts we live (Hall, *Self-Actualization Psychology,* 2007).

So when we study the inter-disciplinary fields of neuro-linguistics and neuro-semantics (Korzybski) we see *how our communications* to ourselves and others *construct our realities* (our experiences) and in doing that we model how those experiences / realities are formed and structured. In NLP and Neuro-Semantics we do not study *linguistics* as such, we study *neuro*-linguistics— what language does to us and how it affects our mind-body system. And that's why NLP is about "the structure of subjective experience" as noted by the subtitle of the book, *NLP— Volume I.*

Now when NLP began, the modeling was done with micro-behaviors— motivation or getting up in the morning, spelling, decision making, etc. And for micro-behaviors, the Strategy Model is excellent. J. Grinder's approach has always been on such. That's why he demands a living exemplar for the "unconscious uptake" phase of modeling. His modeling has also always been on micro-behaviors— behaviors that someone does at a certain time and place and typically kinesthetic behaviors. This is good for rock climbing, playing drums, dancing, and other physical experiences. Yet it is useless for more complex experiences like wealth creation, leadership, entrepreneurship, long-term health and fitness, etc. —anything that occurs over time and requires extensive content knowledge of a given area.

So in the history of NLP, short-term content-free modeling was a great place to begin. It was, however, a terrible place to end. Why? Because some experiences require persistence over an extended period of time in order to achieve expertise and within that experience certain content is also required. To fail to model the content information is to miss many of the critical success factors of that very experience.

Take *leadership development* as an example. You cannot develop a leader in a three day workshop. The skill-sets required for the attitude, understandings, states, and relationships for an executive leader does not arise from learning five "how to" skills, nor twenty-five. Consider also *wealth creation*. Here is another long-term process that involves numerous stages over time and that involve numerous strategies for many different dimensions: vision, talent search, talent development, market discovery or creation, finances, relationships, etc. "Wealth" is not created by knowing one secret strategy or "silver bullet." (See *Inside-Out Wealth,* 2010).

So while NLP has been very effective in modeling short-term, single-strategy experiences, it has just as spectacularly failed to model the more complex skills– which happens to be the most important skills. So when Robert Dilts began modeling "dead people" like Walt Disney, Sigmund Freud, etc. in his "Strategies of Genius" series, those in Grinder's camp of NLP, and others, criticized him. The same criticisms came my way when I began modeling resilience, self-reflexivity, leadership, self-actualization, coaching, wealth creation, and other experiences. The criticisms were that we did not use a single exemplar or a living exemplar. The criticism was that we used meta-levels to model the higher level frames to specify various contexts (external and internal) that govern the experience.

Personally I'm fine with those criticisms because, in the end, at least I have models by which I can navigate these areas and replicate it in others. Ah, yes, the proof is in the pudding! And I can demonstrate that the models work having personally applied them to myself and to those in the Neuro-Semantic community.

This explains why traditional NLP and especially the so-called "pure" NLP of both the Bandler and Grinder camps do not have models for Community building, Collaboration, Wealth Creation, Leadership, Entrepreneurship, Resilience, etc. No wonder then that the field of NLP has struggled with or ignored these complex states. They were meta-states and their modeling models are not able to model the hidden invisible structures of frames behind them.

What is the solution for the future? I think it is obvious —we have to get back to the centrality of modeling and we have to use the meta-level models (Meta-States Model, Neuro-Logical Levels, Meta-Programs, Matrix Model, Meaning-Performance Axes, etc.) to map out the higher levels of frames.

NEURO-SEMANTICISTS
HYPHENATE FOR SANITY

I hyphenate. When I write meta-states, Meta-Coaching, mind-body system, Neuro-Semantics, etc., I hyphenate these words. I do not gam the words together, but put a hyphen between them. I do this on purpose. I do it because Neuro-Semanticists hyphenate for systemic sanity! What does that mean? What is hyphenating? How does it work for sanity?

I'm glad you asked! Alfred Koryzbyski introduced the use of hyphens and describe them as *safety devices*. They remind you that you are working with a system of responses, a set of interactions and not just a singular thing. Korzybski recommended hyphens as an aspect of *the extensional orientation*. This is the scientific method of questioning, observing, evaluating, and revising. And for Korzybski this involved the development of numerous extensional devices for operationalizing terms: indexing, etc. (et cetera), dating, over/under defined terms, E-priming, quotes, and hyphenating. Hyphens are used to reconnect words that when appearing in isolation convey a false elementalism.

Korzybski spoke about the values of this by referring to Einstein. Albert Einstein recognized that "time" and "space" were not separate entities, but part of a larger whole. So he hyphenated and called into existence a new concept— the time-space continuum. And from there he was able to pioneer new directions in physics.

Similarly Korzybski introduced the same thinking into the debate between "mind" "body" and "emotion." These are not separate entities nor should they be dealt with as if they operated in a distinct and separate way; they are interactive. So he hyphenated to refer to the whole system— the mind-body-emotion system. Hence the hyphenated term— "organism-as-a-whole-in-environment."

Hyphenating enables you to say, "What I'm speaking about is a rich, interactive phenomenon and not just a singular thing." It also enables both you, and the person receiving your words, to *think systemically*. That is, to recognize that something is *a system of interactive parts* and that because it is a system, emergent properties will arise from that system. So with Meta-Coaching, I hyphenate these words because it refers to a system of Coaching involving seven formal models each corresponding to the 7 distinctions that we made about the process of coaching itself.

With regard to the Meta-States Model, the hyphenation says that a meta-state is not just a "state" of mind-body-emotion, it is more—much more. It involves meta-levels of the layering of other thoughts and feelings about the primary level of experience. We hyphenate Meta-States in order to communicate the richness of the model and so that people can expect there to be emergent qualities that result from meta-stating.

Obviously, the hyphenated terminology from Korzybski — neuro-linguistics and neuro-semantics—speaks about the psychological system that emergences from the way we use *words* and create *meanings* within our neurology. This makes for our psycho-logics— another hyphenation from Korzybski that highlights the nature of "logic" inside the mind-body-emotion system. Your psycho-logics speaks about the nested states that construct the unique meanings that you experience in your reality.

Bateson also hyphenated.

> "It is now empirically clear that Darwinian evolutionary theory contained a very great error in its identification of the unit of survival under natural selection. ... The unit of survival is not the breeding organism, or the family line, or the society. ... The flexible environment must also be included along with the flexible organism because, as I have already said, the organism which destroys its environment destroys itself. The unit of survival is a flexible organism-in-its-environment." (1972, p. 457)

Neuro-Semantics, following General Semantics, assumes a non-linear view of how reality works. So to avoid the world of "delusional verbal-splits" which so much of our language assumes, we follow Korzybski in using hyphenation as a linguistic device for putting the world back together again as a whole. Then we can deal with it holistically, as a whole or gestalt with all of its inherent complexity. And now you know why real Neuro-Semanticists hyphenate!

THE RICHNESS WITHIN
META-STATING

In the primary process of *meta-stating* you simply and elegantly bring one state to another state. Bring joy to learning and you have *joyful* learning. Bringing calmness to anger and you have *calm* anger. Whenever you bring a particular state to a given primary state that you want to influence and qualify, you set a meta-level state and so create a meta-state out of the two experiences. Bring any resource that will temper anger and you develop empowering meta-states: *respectful* anger, *thoughtful* anger, *gentle* anger, *self-confident* fear, *playful* seriousness, etc.

Now if you look at the list of italicized words in the previous paragraph, you'll notice that meta-states show up as the modifiers (adjectives, adverbs). *Respect* for human beings as persons can be set over your anger, your fear, your confusion, your awkwardness, your embarrassment, and so on. And here's the crazy thing, when you do that, when you make all of these primary experiences *members of the class of respect.* You set a category as you frame it in that way and so you create your own private psycho-logics.

Ah, yes, *psycho-logics.* I got this idea originally from Alfred Korzbyski (*Science and Sanity*) and incorporated into the Meta-States Model (1994/ 2007). What this means is that when you meta-state, you are doing many things at the same time. You are setting a frame using the thoughts-and-feelings-and-physiologies of the state (say, *respect*) over the primary experiences. Now the primary experiences are filtered, tempered, textured, qualified, governed, classified, and experienced *through* the second state. You are not doing just one thing, you are doing many things. This explains, in part, some of the complexity involved in meta-stating.

You are also creating your own private "logical level" system around that primary state. Each time you meta-state, you establish another layer or level of thought-and-emotion *about* the first one. This classifies the first experience. It categorizes it. It textures it. It qualifies it. It creates your internal psycho-logics in your private Matrix. Ah yes, you are now doing many things when you meta-state. A lot of NLP-trained people don't know this. If a person thinks linearly rather than systemically, they will draw that kind of a conclusion. But it is erroneous.

So if you bringing *joy* to eating and that joy *means "the good life" or "reward"* then "eating" or "food" becomes a member of the class of "The Good Life" or "Rewards of the Good Life." Logical? Not according to Aristotelian logic. But yes, *logical* to the way you are experiencing

and feeling the world. So, it is *psycho*-logical. It makes sense from within. And it only makes sense from the outside if you and I spend time asking meta-questions about the person's inner structures of states-about-states so that we come to understand the states of meaning frames that the person has nestled together over eating.

In presenting all of this in this way, I hope you now see the tremendous benefit of using the Meta-States Model for modeling the invisible structures that govern an experience. And you can probably now see why we use the Matrix Model as well for modeling the higher levels of frames (meta-states, classifications, categories, logical-levels, etc.). And there's something else. This is process the process by which we *qualify* our experiences— the meta-state brings a quality to the primary experience. Do that with a positive resource and that's what you get — *honorable* confrontation, *joyful* discipline.   Do that with a negative resource and that's what you get — *fearful* anger, *guilty* anger, *stressful* anger, *hated* fear, *sad* sadness, etc.

Now in training Meta-States, I always say (and try to drive home the point) that *the quality of your life is the quality of your primary states.* For me, that explains why all people everywhere are forever seeking to have the best primary states and experiences possible, why they try to avoid and even forbid "negative" states, emotions, and experiences. But do that and you are operating at the wrong level!

Consider what happens when you avoid or forbid or hate or reject a primary experience. You are thereby *meta-stating yourself with avoidance, taboo, hatred, rejection, fear, anger, etc.* And when you do that, you are turning these energies against yourself and making yourself an enemy of reality! This is not good. Then, your mind, your emotions, your body will pay the price. It will create blind spots, limitations, inhibitions, repressions, body pains, ulcers, etc.

The primary experience is just that— an experience, an experience of response to something. It may be accurate or inaccurate; it may be useful or unuseful; it may be empowering or diminishing. Whatever it is, the best choice is to meta-state that experience with *awareness, acceptance, acknowledgment, curiosity, learning,* etc. Then you can put the experience to good use.

So — if the quality of your life is your state— then *the quality of your state is the quality of your meta-state.* And when you know that, you have in your hands the secret to the highest and deepest parts of your personality. You have the key to effective self-management and the way to unleash your full potentials.

Want to know more about Meta-States as a Model? Begin with *Secrets of Personal Mastery* (1997) or *Winning the Inner Game* (2007) and then progress up to *Meta-States— Mastering the Higher Levels of Your Mind* (2008). [You can find these on www.neurosemantics.com under products, Catalog.]

From: L. Michael Hall

META-STATING AND EMOTIONS
Part I

> "I have some questions about the word 'state' in NLP and Neuro-Semantics. I'm confused because it seems to be used in many different ways. My question is, 'Is a state an emotional state? Or is a state a mental state? Or is a state a physiological state? Which is it?"

And the answer is, *Yes.* At one and the same time, *a state is all of these things.* And this speaks to why we use the word *state*— it is a systemic term that combines all of these facets into a single term and so breaks up the old delusion of the separate words, "mind," "body," "emotion," as if they referred to isolated entities.

Today there's a lot of research and writing on *emotional intelligence.* And Daniel Goleman uses this phrase to refer to the awareness (detection), monitoring (observing), managing of emotions, and then using those *emotions* to relate to others. NLP and Neuro-Semantics have been speaking about E.Q. (Emotional Quotient) since the 1970s as *state awareness, eliciting, monitoring, interrupting, managing, anchoring,* etc.

And what is an emotion? *Motion!* It is a *moving* within a person, an activation within all of the aspects of the brain— the thalamus, associative and motor cortexes so that somatic (body) energy is generated so that a person *moves out* [e(x)-motion] from his or her current experience. So an "emotion" is a system function of mind-and-body and that's why we *hyphenate* the full phrase—mind-body-emotion (see Meta Reflection #53).

> Neurologically, an emotion is "an action tendency" generated by the information in our context that activates our motor cortex and other brain structures (amygdala, thalamus, hypothalamus, adrenal gland, etc.). Understanding emotions in this way enables us to hold the tension between several realizations that are simultaneously true.

What is an emotion? *It is how you **feel** your meanings.* The meanings you create are the meanings that you then feel as "emotions." Create ideas, understandings, beliefs, and meaning frames of joy, delight, and pleasure and you will be feeling the emotions that correspond to these meanings. So with fear and timidity and insecurity—these emotions arise from your beliefs and understandings about something that you interpret as scary. Emotions make sense according to the frames and layers of frames that you have about things. Emotions manifest somatically (in your body) the maps you create about things.

What is an emotion? *It is the **difference** that you experience between what you have mapped about things and your experiences of those things.* It is the map–territory difference. If the territory is not living up to your understandings and expectations, then your *maps* are being violated and when your maps are being violated— your very sense of the world is in danger. So no wonder you feel "negative!" No wonder you feel threatened at a very basic (existential) level! No wonder you feel afraid, angry, sad, disappointed, frustrated, guilty, bad, etc. And when the territory is fulfilling your perceptions and expectations, then your *maps* are being confirmed, validated, and proven right. No wonder you feel pleased, delighted, happy, content, and "good!" Everybody in your mind-body-emotion system says, "You're on the right track, keep going." Conversely, when you feel the "bad" (the "negative" emotions), everything inside you is screaming, "Stop, look, listen, change course, something is not right."

In Neuro-Semantics, we illustrate this with a scale. Using the metaphor of a scale, we put "map" on one side and "territory" (or your experience in the territory) on the other side. As the scale balances out— going up and down, *experience* in the territory confirms or disconfirms the *map* a resulting *emotion* occurs. The emotion provides you information about how you are doing with your map in the world. If doing well, it activates your *excitatory nerves* so that you continue; if it is not doing well, it activates your *inhibitory nerve impulses* so that you slow down or stop to re-evaluate things. Then you can change either your map or your experience (your competence in coping).

And there's more. That's not the last word in Neuro-Semantics about *emotions.* The scale metaphor speaks generally to how you and I experience "positive"and "negative" emotions and directs us to both our *mapping* about things and *our skills in coping* with the territory that we are attempting to navigate. Yet there is more. What is more are the higher frames that you have about all of this. What do you believe *about* your mapping? What do you believe about your beliefs, your expectations, your understandings, your skills, the territory, etc.?

So *the quality of your emotions, as the difference between mapping and experiencing,* is governed by even higher meta-states (frames of meanings). Among these I find the following are some of the most important ones to check on:

> *1) Demandingness.* How much demandingness do you have in your mapping? The more you *demand* that things have to be the way you want them and expect them, the more violation you will experience and therefore the more negative emotions and the more negative the emotions that you experience.

> *2) Appreciation.* How much appreciation do you have for yourself, others, life, the world, emotions, etc.? The more you have a frame of appreciation, the more good feelings you will generate, and the more good feelings you can generate even for the smallest of blessings, the smallest of delights.

> *3) Surprise.* What do you believe about being surprised, shocked, unsure, etc.? The more you accept and welcome surprises, the more comfortable you will be with ambiguity, with

differences between what you get and what you expected, and the more you'll bring a child-like attitude of wonder and curiosity to things.

4) Counting / Discounting. What do you believe about things counting? Does everything count? Or does nothing except the very best count? If you tend to discount, to background everything good except the big thing you are wanting or working on, you'll find that very little will excite or motivate you.

5) Habituation. What do you believe about the things that you are used to? The more you let things habituate and not keep a "freshness of appreciation" about them, the more you get "used to your blessings" which Abraham Maslow said is one of the greatest sources of human evil on the planet.

In Neuro-Semantics we focus on all of this in our flagship Training — APG (Accessing Personal Genius). It occurs at the beginning of Day 2 and the reason for that? Because to access your highest and best (your "personal genius" or focus state), you have to have a good relationship to your emotions. And mostly for those emotions that trouble you, you just need to meta-state them with acceptance (and I'll write about that in the next Meta Reflection).

META-STATING AND EMOTIONS
Part II

What is the best way to get along with emotions that trouble you? With those annoying "negative emotions?" The best thing is to *accept* them!

I ended Part I with a statement about meta-stating your troubling emotions with *acceptance* and a promise to continue that thought. So here goes. Given that *emotions* are motions within our mind-body system giving us signals and messages about the difference between our mappings about the world and our experiences in the territory of the world (Meta Reflection #55), then here are some facts about emotions that you can set as frames (meta-state levels of meaning) which will give you some real mastery and management of your emotions:

1) Emotions measure the map/territory difference.
    Neuro-Semantically, an emotion is the *difference* between our mental maps of the world (map) and our experiences of the world (territory). What you and I experience as "positive" and "negative" emotions are just the somatic energy in our body and neurology that *excites* (positive) and *inhibits* (negative). One energy encourages continuing with what you are doing, the other discourages you to continue as it encourages you to stop, look, listen and make some adjustments in how you are navigating the world — change either your map or your experiences or both!

2) Emotions are just processes of the mind-body system.
    Emotions are not things!   They are not solid. Emotions are activities going on within your mind-body system and so produce them each moment as energies to move at from where you current are, to move out forward or away from. So welcome the process and learn from it. How are you creating that process that you're experiencing? Are you creating it in your mapping, in your body and how you're using your physiology (your eating, sleeping, exercising, etc.)? What adjustments in these processes will give you more mastery over the somatic feelings?

3) Emotions are always right.
    Your emotions are right to the maps and experiences out of which they arise! Say that to yourself, "My emotions are okay, they are right. They are not "bad" and don't need to be punished. I don't need to feel bad about the emotions I'm experiencing." Now embrace

them, welcome them, accept them, and most importantly *learn* from them. How are you creating them? What do you need to learn? What changes in your mapping or experiencing? How well are you coping with the context in which the emotions are arising? What new skills do you need?

4) Emotions are just emotions.

Repeat this frame 100 days every day until you know this inside-out. Your emotions are not orders about what to do. Your emotions are not indicators of external reality. And especially, your emotions are completely fallible! They are not an infallible voice or authority. You do not have to "obey" them or "be true to them." They are just messages about the difference you're experiencing right now between what (and how) you have mapped something and your experience in the territory that you are wanting to navigate. That's all.

5) Emotions are always relative, conditional, and liable to error (fallible).

Your emotions are relative to your maps and experiences and so are *informational* about your mental mapping and experiential activities. Emotions can be very wrong and erroneous to the outside world. Do you know that? They can be erroneous! They can be a reflection of distorted thinking and fallacious reasoning. What cognitive distortions can you find in your mental mapping that's creating a lot of the trouble in your emotions? Are you willing to find out? If anything needs to be eliminated it is not the energy of your emotions, it is the fallacious and distorted cognitions in your thinking. If you have been guilty of worshiping your emotions and treating them like god, it's time that you become an atheist of that old belief. Your emotions may be from drinking too much, eating too much or eating the wrong stuff!

6) Emotions are somatic registering of our meanings.

Your emotions give clues about your Matrix. The bottom line is that y*ou feel our meanings.* We all do! Your emotions are symptoms of your Matrix of frames— form all of the meanings (understandings, beliefs, expectations, memories, imaginations, etc.) that you map about something. So your emotions always make sense even if they may be really dysfunctional to your self-actualization. In your emoting, your body is given you a somatic registering of some of your meanings. How are you at creating great meanings? How are you at suspending old and stupid meanings that you no longer need?

7) Emotions can be responded to in a variety of ways.

You can listen to them, suppress them, ignore their message, obey them, release them, take them into consideration, etc. There's lots of things that you can do. How do you want to respond when you feel a given emotion? How do you want to respond to anger or fear or joy or playfulness? You can qualify your emotions. You can meta-state them and bring whatever resourceful quality that you want to bring. After all, the quality of your states is the quality of your meta-states. So what will you choose to do?

META-STATING AND EMOTIONS
Part III

In the previous two Meta Reflections I've described a theory and understanding of "emotions" from the Neuro-Semantic and NLP perspective. And if you've read any of the *Frame Game Books* or *Sourcebook of Magic,* or *Unleashed,* or *The Crucible,* you will have seen that before. What you have not seen before is the following. It is only in the Training Manual, *Emotional Mastery* although I have talked about it at numerous times.

There's another unique and fascinating feature about emotions— emotions occur along a range and have varying degrees of intensity. And because of the natural *range* of an emotion, we have numerous terms for emotions as they increase or degree in intensity. We also can now gauge an emotion's intensity on a scale and distinguish emotions at different levels of significance.
• What is the range of the emotion and on what scale?
• When is the emotion more intense or less intense, what is it? What do you call it?
• What is the significance of being able to scale and gauge an emotion?

The significance is that because an "emotion" as a process of thinking and feeling (somatizing your meanings), we can now create an emotional scale for any given emotion and begin distinguish the emotion at different degrees of intensity. What this means is that there are typically a constellation of emotions around an area of emotionality. An example is *the Dislike Scale.* Here you will see a list of the range of emotions that's involved in "dislike" which makes up the Anger or Displeasure Scale:

<div align="center">

Displeasure Continuum
Violence
Out-raged
Rage
Wrath
Fury
Indignation
Anger
Ire
Offended
Stress
Frustration
Agitated
Upset
Vexed / Irked

</div>

Dislike
                        Annoyed / Bothered
                        Peeved

So, what do you feel? Oh, you feel "angry?" Okay. Is your anger an ire? Or is it a sense of being offended? Or is it stress? Frustration? Agitated? Upset? Vexed / Irked? What would take your anger down to a frustration so that it is a strong "frustration," just before it comes "anger?" What would turn your anger up to an indignation? Or fury? Or rage?

The fact that every *emotion* sits on a range of emotions— and can be located in a continuum of emotions speaks about how what we call and experience as one emotion can become another emotion, more or less of the same emotionality that creates the emotion. This highlights how emotions change. As neurological processes of mind-body, they are forever changing and altering and shifting and changing. And with a little bit of meta-stating, you can easily and effectively and powerfully become a change-agent to yourself so that you manage these processes rather than be a victim of them.

Here is another set of emotions— fear, sadness, joy, and guilt. And you view them form the perspective of a range, a continuum, think about how the cognitive– meaning mechanism that creates them (in the italics underneath) generates the emotion and your experience of it. And when you know this, you know the leverage point for transformation, do you not?

Fear	**Sadness**	**Joy**	**Guilt / Wrongness**
Terror	Depression	Ecstasy	Overly conscientious
Panic	Bitter, victim	Happiness	Guiltiness
Paranoia	Emptiness	Delight	Self-betrayal
Fear	Grief-stricken	Mirthful	Pained Conscience
	Grief	**Joy**	**Guilt**
Worry	**Sadness**	Playful	Shame
Apprehension	Loss, miserable		Embarrassment
Stress		Pleasant	Remorse
Upset		Content	Disappointed
Out of sorts	Hurt		Feeling bad
Avoidance			

Danger/Threat/ Possibility   *Sense of Loss of Value*   *Fulfillment of*   *Conscience about "bad"*
of Hurt   *Value*

For example, with "guilt" many people are quick to feel guilty whnever anything goes wrong. "Wrongness" is translated into "guilt" rather than "feeling bad or sad," disappointed, having some remorseful feelings, embarrassment, or shame. All of a sudden, the person jumps all the way up to "guilt" which is much more intense and series than just embarrassment or shame. Now the person has made a moral issue out of something that might be a communication issue or a social etiquette issue. Having toilet paper dragging on your shoe is not a "sin" for which you need to feel "guilty." Just feel embarrassed!

So I always ask, "What law have you violated?" *Embarrassment* would be your rules and social rules, *shame* would be societal rules, and that leaves *guilt* for true moral rules, God's rules. Ah emotions, we all have them and we have them everyday and we have them just about everything! Well, we're fallible human beings who register our meanings in our bodies— we somatize what things mean to us, and when we do our feelings (kinesthetic sensations) turn into *emotions.*

WHAT ABOUT FRANK PUCELIK?

In J. Grinder's impossible-to-read mismatching book criticizing almost everything happening in the field of NLP that didn't come from him (!) called *Whispering in the Wind,* John described Frank Pucelik as one of the co-founders of NLP.

> Frank Pucelik was "third man in the initial modeling and testing of patterning in NLP." (p. 126)
> "Richard Bandler and Frank Pucelik, were doing a Gestalt therapy group nearby and he [Frank] was inviting me to come along." (p. 143)
> "Pucelik, Bandler, and Grinder had sorted out unconsciously the most effective of the verbal patterns used by Perls and Satir through the process of unconscious editing during imitation. Grinder a professional syntactician. The patterns were already very familiar to him." (p. 151)

When I first read this in 2002 about Frank Pucelik, I was shocked. First I hardly even had heard about Frank and second, this was now 30 years *after* the very beginnings of NLP and this was the first time that a "third" co-founder had ever been presented. So lots of questions assaulted my mind:

• Was there a third co-founder of NLP?
• Was Frank Pucelik one of the founders of NLP?
• Was John writing to reduce the position and role of Richard Bandler by making him "just one of two persons" who were doing the original Gestalt processes thereby exalting his position?
• How come no one else ever spoke of Frank in these terms?

Several more years passed and in 2010, Frank Pucelik responded to these questions on an NLP blog site and wrote saying that yes he was a co-founder. A few months later at the NLP Conference in London (Nov. 13-14, 2010) I meet Frank for the first time and we spent a delightful evening talking as I interviewed him about the early days of NLP and his role in its formation. I found him a charming and gracious man, intelligent, well informed about NLP, and that he could easily be provoked into making some very reactive judgments against some of the other NLP founders and developers. The next day I had the opportunity to sit in his presentation and see him present to a group, he was not only knowledgeable and skilled in NLP but he was an entertaining and engaging speaker.

So what is the scoop? Frank dated "NLP" back to 1971, rather than 1972 as Terry McClendon (*Wild Days of NLP: 1972-1975*). He claims that the first group of people — before Terry McClendon, Robert Dilts, David Gordon, Judith DeLozier, Leslie Cameron, etc., there was a group of 7 others:

"The 'real' originators never get the credit for what they have done. Their names are; Marilyn Moskowitz, Ilene McCloud, Trevelyan Houck, Patrick Rooney, Terry Rooney, Jeff Paris, Lisa Kiarra [not sure of last name here], Devra Canter, myself, and a couple more I will remember soon, I hope. None of the people know as originators are among this group. If you doubt my memory, ask John. Richard's memories serve his intentions a bit more creatively than John or myself. John has no concern or personal agendas about the facts and is perfectly comfortable with the truth. If he can remember, he will tell you."

When I asked about these people and what happened to them, Frank said that they were students and after the "classes" with him and Richard, and later John, they just moved out with their lives and never got involved with NLP. Strange. They just moved on?! So I asked, "Did they not know what they had; what was going on?" Apparently not. What this original Meta-Model group found and experienced before the Mission Street Group somehow didn't make enough of an impression so that most of them never became part of what was later called NLP. Of course, they were just working things out at that time, doing Gestalt (not NLP) and didn't have any of the models. So those who could have become leaders in the movement *did not, they just moved on and apparently didn't get involved later when NLP did emerge.*

By contrast, the Mission Street group, which was the second group, did continue on and did become the Leaders to this day of the movement that we call NLP. And that is pretty obviously why we look to the second group, rather than the first, as the true source of NLP today. That group groomed the leaders who gave NLP its form and structure and who, to this very day, remain leaders.

Now Frank gets pretty animated when people talk about who was part of the original group and really dislikes it when members of the second group (Dilts, Gordon, etc.) are described as part of the original group. But "NLP" didn't exist when the first ones were doing Gestalt practices and didn't continue. The term "NLP" came about in 1977 or 1978.

Now it is obvious from the history of NLP that Frank did play a significant role. Terry McClendon indicated this in the book, *The Wild Days.* Frank, having served in Vietnam as a corpsman, returned and was studying Gestalt Therapy when he somehow got connected with Richard Bandler. That's when they began "teaching" those unofficial Gestalt Classes. Frank says he was able to make that happen because he was a student at Southern California University at Santa Cruz and Richard was not. So Frank could get access so the classrooms to use whereas Richard could not. Now in McClendon's history, John came in because Richard he needed a faculty supervisor, but Frank says that was not so due to the nature of the *avant garde* experiment called Kresge College.

So Frank says this group of 7 people with him and Richard learned the Gesalt patterns. Then later John started coming in, sitting in the back and noticing some of the linguistic patterns that were being demonstrated. That must have been late 1971 and/or early 1972. Then someone else strange happened. As Frank puts it, "Richard started to slowly favoring John over me and so I took more and more of a backseat and became the third man."

But he did not take a backseat entirely. He got connected with Judith DeLozier and married her, they having a son together, Eric. Then he got connected with Leslie Cameron and they lived together before she and Richard got met and married for one year (1977-78).   Frank also said during 1973 and 1974 Bateson would begin coming around, popping into the Meta-Model groups and observing.

The Meta-Model became a two-volume book in 1975 and 1976, *The Structure of Magic.* John and Richard's names are on the book, but not Frank's, nor is his on *Hypnotic Patterns of Milton H. Erickson* (1976, 1977). Then Frank said that in 1977 Richard "asked" him to leave. In the blog, he wrote the following:

> "I was forced out of the 'group' in late 1976, but actually left in 1978, by Richard for his own personal reasons. At that time I took several of the 'meta' guys to San Diego with me and we formed 'Meta Institute'. This organization continued with the development and training in NLP for several years until 1983, when I moved to Oklahoma. I then opened 'Meta International' and continued the work with NLP. I was also a professor at the University of Oklahoma for 4 years and supervised 2 treatment centers for young drug addicts and alcoholics. In 1987 I was invited to visit Moscow, went several times over the next 4 years, and by 1991 I was living and working in Russia. Now I live in Odessa, Ukraine, work all over the CIS and love it here. I do mostly business consulting here but keep my hand in the NLP market a bit as well."

So what about Frank Pucelik? Well, here is another chapter in the history of NLP, and one not well known. I was pleased that David Bowman invited Frank to the NLP Conference at London, that Frank came from the Ukraine to make an appearance and that I got a chance to speak with him about all of this. For a long time Frank has been out of the field and community and doing really significant work with drug addicts and alcoholics. He spoke about the centers that he has in the Ukraine and Russia and is obviously a tremendous contribution that he is making to the field. And, I don't think we have heard the last from him!

Unleashing Your Real Self

"To be natural and spontaneous, to know what one is, and what one *really* wants, is a rear and high culmination that comes infrequently, and that usually takes long years of courage and hard work." (Maslow, *Motivation and Personality,* 1970, p. 273)

"First and foremost find out what it is you're about, and be that. Be what you are and don't lose it. ... It's very hard to be who we are, because it doesn't seem to be what anyone wants."
Norman Lear

"No one can tach you how to become yourself, to take charge, to express yourself, except you."
Warren Bennis *On Becoming a Leader* (p. 51)

I began an indepth study of the pioneering work of Abraham Maslow in 2004 after re-reading *Toward a Psychology of Being* thinking that I would quickly access his model for self-actualization. When I couldn't find that model, I then set out to read everything by Maslow and Rogers, which I did. That lead to several Neuro-Semantic models that now governs the Meta-Coaching model as well as the Self-Actualization Trainings:
• The Meaning— Performance Axes
• The Self-Actualization Quadrants
• The Volcano of Needs (Matrix Embedded Pyramid)

And with these, they led also to the four Self-Actualization Workshops (along with the books):
• Unleashing Vitality
• Unleashing Potentials
• Unleashing Creative Solutions
• Unleashing Leadership

The first workshop (Unleashing Potentials) details how *the unleashing process* work and after presenting it some 20 times, many people commented that the whole self-actualizing process of being unleashed *from* constraints and being unleashed *to* felt like a lot of work—a lot of effort. Some even complained that they just did not have the energy or motivation to do all of that. So that feedback then led me to an exploration of what was needed and what was missing. And the answer was *energy and vitality.*

When several told me that they didn't have sufficient "motivation" to put in the effort for the self-actualizing life, I began designing a training to address that need. So in this year (2010), I designed the *Unleashing Vitality* workshop and presented it twice, in September I presented it in South Africa and in November I presented it in Italy.

Now with every Self-Actualization Workshop, my own appreciation for the original pioneering work of Maslow deepens. As an aside, that's why I am constantly amazed and shocked that the people in *Positive Psychology* systematically ignore Maslow and act as if they invented "positive psychology" or were the first people to focus on human strengths! Yet the fact is, they are missing out so much by ignoring Maslow.

During 2010 two Neuro-Semantics Training Centers completed sponsoring all four workshops— Cheryl Lucas and Carey Jooste in Pretoria South Africa and Nicola Riva and Lucia Giovannini in Italy. So this year, I presented the Vitality workshop in Europe and Africa and in doing so, I learned a lot.

The Discovery
Recently, I sat down with Nicola and Lucia and Mario Mason and talked through what *really goes on in the vitality workshop.* Doing so made me realize that I mis-named the training. That is, "Unleashing Vitality" under-states and actually mis-states what most participants actually experience and take away from the experience. So, if that is the case, then what does "unleashing vitality" actually *do and achieve?* What is the actual delivery in that training?

The answer is that the training is really about *unleashing your real self.* It is about identifying your authentic identity so that you discover your unique vision and mission as you step up to the meta-needs and begin creating a way to live the meta-life in your unique way. And, of course, do that and you'll have all the vitality, energy, passion, and healthful zest that you want! Do that and you will never have a problem with "motivation" again.

So what shall we call this training? Right now, the new title is: *Unleashing Your Real Self.* This is one of the things that Maslow said repeatedly, "You have a *real* self, an inward *real* nature. And if you learn to listen to your inner voice, hear the meta-needs clamoring to be expressed, gratify your foundational needs, then you can identify, develop, and release your authentic self." The problem is that the voices of society and of others may drown out your inner voice and you not discover how to be you— your best self. And the problem with that? You'll be false, not able to be true to yourself, not know yourself, live behind a false persona, be incongruent, and therefore not aligned with your inner energies.

Unleashing Your Real Self is therefore about human nature— the bright side of human nature, and human identity and how to become fully real, authentic, congruent, and to find your true place in life. Do that and *zestful, healthful vitality* will naturally and inevitably result!

Maslow on "the Search for Identity"

What did Maslow write about this search to find your real self and to unleash your inner nature? Here are a few quotes:

> "In the intrapsychic realm, the first great task is to search for one's identity. Each person must find his or her true, active self, and after that task is accomplished, then life's real problems lie ahead. Clearly, this task is related to finding one's vocation, or calling, or biological destiny. That is, what is the mission that one chooses to love and sacrifice to?" (*Maslow's Business Reader*, p. 145)

> "Most people lack a strong sense of self. They do not know what want or what they are looking for in life. As a result, they are extremely suggestible and will follow a self-confident leader rather than determine their own destinies." (143)

> "The persons who have achieved their identity are *causers* rather than *caused.*" (146)
> "The difference between the diminished individual, wistfully yearning toward full humanness but never quite daring to make it, verses the unleashed individual, growing well toward her destiny, is simply the difference between fear and courage." (317)

> "If you deliberately plan to be less than you are capable of being, then I warn you that you will be deeply unhappy for the rest of your life. You will be evading your own capacities, your own possibilities."

> "Even if all these needs are satisfied, we may still often expect that a new discontent and restlessness will soon develop, unless the individual is doing what *he*, individually, is fitted for. A musician must make music, an artist must paint, a poet must write. What a man *can* be, he *must* be. He must be true to his own nature. This need we call self-actualization." (*Motivation and Personality,* 1954/ 1970, p. 46)

The 3 Day Training — Unleashing Your Real Self
Now that I'm a little more clear about the training, the theme of the days of the training provide more clarity as to what you will experience and get out of the training.

Day 1: Fulfill your Needs-Driven Nature
> You are an embodied creature. That means that you have basic neurological and physical needs as does every a higher intelligence animal. You have needs for survival, safety, social connection, and self-value. But without instincts you have to find out *what* these drives are and *how to* gratify them effectively. This is required for well-being, happiness, and vitality. You are a social being and a semantic being and you do not innately know what these needs are or how to satisfy them. You are instinct-less! That's why and how they can go astray and become distorted, even neurotic. And when you have gratified all of the lower, foundational needs, you are just a good healthy animal— the unique human needs come after that. Step one: know your Foundational Nature and accurately gratify your needs so that you can *move on up* to your highest needs!

Day 2: Seeking the Peak of Your Unique Identity and Meta-Needs

You are also a meta-being! You are a being with a higher nature and higher drives. That's why you cannot be fully human, fully alive with vitality by only living for the lower needs. You have to discover, identify, and unleash your higher, meta-needs. As a semantic class of life, you make not only make meaning, you must make meaning that is highly significant and inspirational. If you don't, you will suffer! You will deny your full humanity. Conversely, do that and you create your own unique identity that fits for your nature which will then give you a high level of aliveness, humanness, and zestful vitality. Mis-use your higher meta-meaning-making powers and you will create a false and probably distorted sense of self.

Day 3: Peaking— Life as a Self-Actualizing Person

Seeking the peak is just the beginning. That's because seeking alone does not guarantee that you will stay there. So *living at the peak* requires that you develop some "peaking" skills so that you can turn on peak experiences at will, so that you can begin to identify with and incorporate the *being-values* into your personality, and so that you develop a rich self-actualizing perspective with "the four eyes" — the innocent eye, the integrative eye, the sacred eye, and the transformative eye. Do that and your whole perspective about yourself, others, the world, life, your work, etc. changes. It transforms so that you see things as they can be and live to make that happen!

Are you ready for the adventure of a life-time? The adventure of being a human being, a meaning-making human being? If the idea of becoming *fully alive/ fully human with zestful vitality* excites you— then meet us at the **Unleashing Your Real Self** training.

META-STATING AND EMOTIONS
Part IV

If the Meta-States Model offers anything, it offers some very powerful processes for detecting your emotions and managing those emotions from a higher level. When most people first experience *Meta-States as a Model*, the process seems counter-intuitive, it seems paradoxical, and the last thing they would have thought of or utilize for emotional mastery— yet it is the most effective method.

So what does the Meta-States Model say about "emotions?" First that there are levels of emotions; that is, emotions do not occur just at one level, but multiple levels. First there are primary emotions —direct and emotions that are in direct response to a stimulus in the world. Theorists tend to posit that there are anywhere from 7 to perhaps 20 primary emotions. I follow Robert Plutchik (*The Emotions*) who posited the following primary emotions: joy / sorrow; anger / fear; anticipation / surprise; acceptance / disgust; tension / relaxation; love / apathy. Then, when you begin mixing these primary emotions, you get secondary emotions — similar to how mixing primary colors gives secondary colors.

Then above and beyond primary emotions and various mixtures of those emotions, there are the *meta-emotions* of your meta-states. These arise due to your self-reflexive consciousness as you associate emotions to emotional states. To detect these and to flush them out, just inquire, "What do you think and feel about X state?"

> What do you think and feel about anger? What emotions do you experience when you experience anger? Or fear, sadness, anxiety, guilt, tenderness, love, joy, etc.?

Now generally speaking, when you bring *a negative emotion* against a previous emotion, you set the second negative emotion as a frame about and over the first emotion. Now you have *fear* of anger; *anger* at your fear; *shame* about your guilt; *fear* of relaxation; *anxiety* about anger, and so on. Do this and you construct a "dragon state" within your mind-body system so that you are essentially in self-attack. And the energy of the meta-emotional state has no where to go except *against* your mind-body system. Then you will pay for this construct by experiencing mental and emotional suffering.

Yet here also begins the processes that seem paradoxical and counter-intuitive. If you bring emotional states as *acceptance, observation, interest, curiosity, appreciation, learning,* etc. to your negative emotions, your "negative" emotion will change. Typically the intensity level of the energy of the emotion will be reduced so that you'll be able to handle it much better. *Calm* anger, *acceptance* of fear, *curiosity* about sadness, *appreciation* of anger, etc. transforms the primary emotional state so that it can be much more useful and resourceful.

When you *meta-state* your primary emotional state with resourceful emotional states, you are in a position to *qualify* your emotional states in ways that will transform them into allies that will support you rather than diminish you. So in Neuro-Semantics, we don't repress emotions, nor do we suppress them as much as we *meta-state them* and *transform them into resources.* This creates a new level of emotional intelligence and effectiveness.

So when you next experience a negative state, the first thing to do is to *bring a state of calmness* to the experience. Step back in your mind for just a moment and appreciate that you just received a signal— a communication signal. And just observe it. What is the signal about? Something "out there" in the world? Something within your mental mapping about something? What?

Next *bring states of curiosity, interest, and exploration* to your primary state. Curiously explore how you just created that negative emotion. Accepting that the emotion is yours, and that you created it within your mind-body system, you now have an unprecedented opportunity for deepening your self-knowledge and self-control. Wow! And, once you discover the process, then you can meta-state yourself with a strong sense of commitment to yourself and others as you choose the best way to respond to the situation that has triggered the emotion.

This means that you are creating new adjustments to your life-coping maps, making yourself more effective, enriching your relationships, and properly using your emotions, especially your negative ones. And while doing this, meta-state yourself that it is *just an emotion* (not "you," don't identify with the emotion and personalize it). It is just an emotion— a somatic energy response giving you a signal. Now you can choose:
- What would be the best response I can now make?
- Act on it; explore it some more; notice and ignore it; act against it; etc.?
- Is the emotion appropriate, accurate, useful?
- What resource would texture and qualify it making it more ecological for me?

Emotions — we all have them, they are a vital and important part of our mind-body system, and like the rest of the system, they are fallible and can easily be mis-used, abused, and become problematic for us. Emotional mastery and intelligence requires awareness, monitoring, managing, meta-stating, and then using them effectively.

INSIDE-OUT-NESS

From a NLP and a Neuro-Semantic perspective, *it is always and only inside-out.* And what is? Everything—anything and everything important in human experience is an inside-out phenomenon.

Wealth is inside-out. I discovered that in the modeling project that I did back in the mid-1990s, and why I gave it the title, *Inside-Out Wealth.* Success is inside-out. That's why I wrote *Winning the Inner Game. Values* is inside-out, so is *identity, esteem, creativity, health, leadership,* and so on.

And why? It is all inside-out because *meaning* is an inside-out process. "Meaning" doesn't exist on the outside, it is an inside-out process. You have to go *in* if you want to create meaning and after you go inside, then you have to actualize it on the outside. It is *what you do on the inside* that determines your success, effectiveness, and results on the outside. Further, it is the *quality* of what you do on the inside that determines the quality of your experiences on the outside.

I knew this before I found NLP, but I really didn't know how to capitalize on the advantages of this. It was with the detailing of the map / territory difference that NLP offered that really enabled me to understand and translate a richer inside-world to the outside. With the discovery of the Meta-States Model, new tools emerged for this. One set of tools was frame detection, frame changing, frame analysis. In 1998 this became *the frame games approach.* And that led to a series of books, *Games Fit and Slim People Play, Games for Mastering Fear, Games Business Experts Play,* and *Games Great Lovers Play.* That also led to a wide series of trainings and training manuals— *Inner Games* for writing, learning, selling, etc.

The inside-out principle also gives us *a guiding principle in Neuro-Semantics.* I think of it as the secret for being a professional community. This first of all means that professionalism is an inside-out process. First you have to develop an inner competency, inner knowledge, inner authenticity, integrity, and passion. First comes the inner empowerment and then comes the outer unleashing and actualization. To turn this around, to try to first have the outer recognition, reputation, and success invites a person to emphasize external signs over internal reality. It encourages external PR (public relations) and image over internal authenticity.

The inside-out principle speaks to the subject of branding. The best branding is also inside-out. And how does that work? First you develop the inner reality of knowing your stuff and the inner skill of being able to deliver what you offer. Once you can do that, then you are ready to let the outside world know. Then comes your external communication of what you have created and are

able to innovate. So you market and publicize to thereby create your reputation in the minds of people. That's your brand.

The *inside-out principle* says that everything is created twice— first inside in your mind, imagination, hopes and dreams and then outside as you innovate in the world. It is the same process that governs creativity and innovation within any industry or business. As such, it is the most natural sequence of how new things are generated. Yet in spite of this, so many people (perhaps most people) try to do it backwards.

First they want health, energy, vitality, a gorgeously fit body and then they will be able to choose the exercise of their choice and fully enjoy it. *Backwards!* First they want fame and fortune and great position and then they will develop the required knowledge and skills. *Backwards!* They first want to get rich and then decide what they really want to spend their lives doing. *Backwards!* Lottery winners have repeatedly proven that this is backwards and ineffective.

To put your highly desired outcome first and then you do the work of getting there is not only backward, but ignorant, stupid, and impossible. Life just doesn't work that way. And that's why persistence, patience, resilience, commitment, ongoing learning, continuous adjustments, and generative change are always listed as essential keys to success. If that sounds old fashion, then reframe it as being well-documented and credible evidence of these critical success factors.

And if it sounds like a lot of work, that means that you have not yet created the *inside understanding, know-how, and passion* for the outside stuff. How can I say that? Because once you win the inner game and succeed with this inside stuff, then it is no longer "work." The effort transforms into fun, excitement, and play. It is the effortfulness of a child at play ... lots of effort, lots of movement, expenditure of energy and yet for the child, it is not "work." *It is play. It is fun.* So with every application of the *inside-out* principle.

When someone notices me reading, scribbling notes, typing away at my lap-top and says, "Wow! A lot of work; you work so hard." I hardly know how to respond. It completely jars with my inner experience:

> "'Work?' Are you kidding, this is fun! I'd pay to do this! You can't keep me from this. I'm delighted, thrilled, passionate about doing this stuff. I'm exploring and discovering; it's like a treasure hunt."

This is the power of finding a self-actualizing passion. The day you find it is the day you Quit Work! That day becomes the end of doing things based on external motivation! And that day may be the day that you put forth much more effort and energy in what you are doing— but of course, on the inside, you are at play, having fun, and delighting yourself in something that calls to you from within!

> May you find your self-actualizing meta-need and post your address in Meta-Land as your live your Meta-Life with all of the Meta-Vitality that fulfills your highest and best Meta-Identity!

WHAT ABOUT ROBERT SPITZER?

Another long lost person who was highly instrumental in the origins of NLP was Robert Spitzer, M.D., Ph.D.   Without Robert Spitzer, there might not have been any NLP at all. He was the person who entrusted the audio-tapes of Fritz Perls to young Richard Bandler and who later was the publisher of the first books, *The Structure of Magic I and II.* It was Spitzer who also provided the opportunity for Richard, John, and Bateson to live at the same place on his property as neighbors. And that's just the beginning; there's more, much more.

It was 1967 when Robert S. Spitzer met Richard.   Dr. Spitzer wrote about that in his article "Virginia Satir and the Origins of NLP (*Anchor Point,* Volume 6, No. 7). What he didn't write about was how he met Richard, why, what that was all about, and what came out of it. I found that out from Dr. Martin Roberts (Pilot, Business Consultant, NLP Trainer, founder of Crown House Publications) in an interview. Robert told Martin that he met Richard as a patient when Richard was brought to him for a "speech impediment." Robert never told Martin the specifics of that impediment, but Martin's impression and sense was that it was for stuttering.

Dr. Spitzer worked with Richard on the speech impediment by asking him, "Who would you want to be *if* you could be someone else?" That could have been his opening question for accessing where his client would find resources for his problem, or it could have been a question from a comment like, "I don't like who I am; I wish I could be someone else." Anyway, Richard said, "John Wayne."

The assignment that Robert then gave young Bandler was to go away, watch John Wayne movies and return in one month and "convince me that you are John Wayne." So that's exactly what Bandler did. And in one month, having watched the old western movies of John Wayne, Richard Wayne Bandler had overcome his speech impediment. Martin's comment to me was that he recalled that Richard had more of a western American accent rather than an eastern New Jersey (his place of birth and young childhood) or Californian (San Francisco), and that there was a certain swagger to the way he walked and conducted himself. My own first recollections of Richard was that of him carrying his knife and keys on his belt and swaggering around in a very macho way.

Next, Robert asked Richard what he liked to do and the answer was play drums. So again he asked a resource-searching question. Who is the best drummer that you know? And while Martin couldn't remember the answer, the next assignment was to watch that person on the drums, watch the movements, the gestures, the pace, the rhythm, etc. and copy it. Watch and copy the fine minute movements within the drumming. So Richard did precisely that and he became so good that a few years later, when Robert Spitzer's son wanted to learn to play the drums— guess who he hired to teach his son? Richard Bandler.

So where did Bandler get his modeling skills— his skills to see and copy another person's excellence? Could it have been that it arose from his work with Robert Spitzer as his therapist who later became his boss (when he worked in the warehouse of Science and Behavior Books, and when he worked to transcribe the Perls' tapes and then record the Satir seminar in Canada), who later became his landlord (when he lived in the small house on his property), and who later became his publisher?

Robert Spitzer later wrote that when Richard was listening to the Perls' tapes and transcribing, that sometimes when he would walk in the room, Richard would say hi using Perls' tone of voice and Robert would say hi back, "Hi Fritz, I mean Richard." So my impression as well as that of Martin Roberts is that Dr. Spitzer was incredibly influential in what eventually evolved —in Richard's copying / modeling skills, in putting Richard into contact with three highly influence people (Perls, Satir, Bateson and Bateson put him and John in touch with Milton Erickson), and in creating the opportunity for creating and publishing the original works.

This also accords with what Malcolm Gladwell has written in his recent book, *Outliers.* There he described the importance of the right social conditions for success– that success is not merely a personal and individual thing, but that every highly successful person is such because of the social-economic-political conditions that have contributed to that success. That it takes a community to create a successful person or movement, that we are the people we are due to the influence of those who came before us and those around us who have created the conditions within which we have actualized some potential.

WHAT IS
THE THIRD GENERATION NLP?

Robert Dilts along with Judith DeLozier and Debra Dilts have just completed a new book that presents "third generation NLP." And "NLP: Volume II" is a good book. It is a book filled with *Robert's contributions of models and patterns to NLP*— Neuro-Logical Levels, SCORE, SOAR, Somatic Syntax, Time-Lines, etc. It is a very good collection and synthesis of what Robert has created over the years.

And simultaneously it is this tremendous contribution from Robert that is the book's the biggest weakness. That's because the book presents nothing else that has happened in NLP for the past 20 years except what Robert has contributed and by doing that it leaves the impression that nothing else is part of "the third generation of NLP." So the title of the book announcing "The Next Generation" of NLP and especially "the third generation" is really a misleading one.

Has nothing else occurred in the field of NLP? For instance, there is nothing in the book about the developments that I've contributed regarding *Meta-States, Neuro-Semantics, Meta-Coaching,* etc., or that of James Lawley and Penny Thompson and their development of *Clean Language*, or Lucas Derks and his *Social Panorama* model, or writings and contributions from Ian McDermott, or Richard Bolstad and the *RESOLVE model*, or Rodger Bailey and Shelle Rose Chevet and their work on the LAB profile and the use of Meta-Programs, and many more people who have contributed and developed NLP since 1990. So while the title suggests an inclusiveness about the field, the content of the book does not include anything other than the author's own works. I find this facet of the work is really disappointing because the book could have brought more of the field together and could have embraced what others are doing.

So with that critique out of the way, now for the good parts of the book, Robert does present a set of distinctions that he uses to distinction the first, second, and third generation of NLP. "Key distinctions and tools of the first generation of NLP include:
• The Meta-Model language patterns
• Representational Systems and the 4-Tuple
• Sub-modalities
• Eye Accessing Cues
• Anchoring
• Six-Step Reframing

- Changing Personal History
- Visual Squash
- V-K Dissociation Technique [Movie Rewind Pattern]
- New Behavior Generator
- Metaphor and Milton Model hypnotic patterns" (page xxvii)

"Second generation NLP techniques integrated the use of new distinctions such as Time-Lines, Neuro-Logical Levels and Perceptual Positions. Some of the other key distinctions and techniques that emerged from the second generation of NLP include:
- Sleight of Mouth patterns [Mind-Lines Patterns]
- Spatial Sorting and Psychogeography
- Meta Mirror
- Imagineering Strategy and Strategies for Genius
- ReImprinting
- Integration of Conflicting Beliefs
- Neuro-Logical Level Alignment" (page xxviii)

And what about the "third generation NLP?" Robert presents the following as his thinking and evaluation about that. He describes it as meeting the following criteria:

> First there are three different intelligences or minds: "a *cognitive mind* that emerges from the brain, a *somatic mind* centered in the body, and a *'field' mind* that comes from our connection and relationships with larger systems around us." (xxix)

> "Some of the practices and processes of third generation NLP include: centering, the inner game and finding your inner zone of excellence, opening to the field, generative change, holding difficult feelings, integrating archetypal energies, the hero's journey and archetypes of change, transforming belief barriers by building belief bridges, techniques for promoting collective intelligence and generative collaboration."

> "Third generation NLP also adds other frames and values to those applied by earlier generations of NLP and places more focus on issues such as: generativity and empowerment, connection and relationship, aesthetics and harmony, and purpose and transformation." (xxx)

Now if that is the "third generation" of NLP, then the funny, or crazy, or weird thing is that *this is precisely where so many of us in the field of NLP has been moving.* So the book could have been a great collection of similar ideas converging with a commonality. But it isn't. No one else form the field is quoted except Robert's personal friends, Steven Gilligan, Robert McDonald, etc. Instead Robert quotes from several people outside the field and brings in information on Neurology from several people: Michael Gershon, Andrew Armour, Jeffrey Ardell, Donald Epstein, etc. and quotes from some pop writers like Malcolm Gladwell. But he does not quote and describe with others in the field of NLP having been doing and are doing that meets the criteria that he sets forward.

As I read the book regarding these criteria, I thought about how Neuro-Semantics does or does not measure up to the criteria of "third generation NLP." So I wrote out (below) Robert's list of criteria and then identified where we in Neuro-Semantics have been addressing these concerns:

Dilts' Criteria	Neuro-Semantic Models and Patterns
Centering	— Responsibility For/To, Meta-Stating Self pattern.
The Inner Game	— Winning the Inner Game; The Game series— Lovers, Business Experts, Mastering Fear, Fit & Slim People, etc.
Finding your inner zone of excellence	— Accessing Personal Genius pattern
Opening to the field	— Cultural Meta-States, Cultural Modeling, Unleashing Leadership
Generative change	— Axes of Change Model; The Crucible model.
Holding difficult feelings	— Meta-Stating Troubling Emotions pattern, the Crucible.
Integrating archetypal energies	— Crucible, Facilitation Model
The hero's journey and archetypes of change	— Included this as one Conversation in *Coaching Conversations*
Transforming belief barriers by building belief bridges	— Dancing with Dragons, Mind-Lines for belief transformation Building a New Matrix
Techniques for collective intelligence, generative collaboration	—Group and Team Coaching
Somatic Mind	— Mind-to-Muscle Pattern; Coaching the body to feel an idea.
Field Mind	— Systems thinking – The Matrix Model

Now an interesting pattern occurs toward the end of the book. Robert quotes Virginia Satir, "How do you feel about feeling that way?" (p. 347). He then created a Meta-States Pattern, even with a meta-states diagram, but without any reference to the Meta-States Model (pp. 350-351).

Here is the Unacknowledged Meta-States Diagram [Read from the bottom up].

3) Coach State: What resources do you need to hold the second feeling?

2) Second feeling: How do you feel about feeling that way?

1) First feeling: How do you feel?

I'll end this review with one of the jewels in the book. Robert presents a great question about what it takes for something to be "NLP?" *What makes something NLP?* And he answers it in this way:
> "Emphasizes process and structure, as opposed to content.
> Grounds processes and distinctions in the anatomy and functions of the human nervous system.
> Ensures that distinctions and processes are able to be easily identified and influenced natural and spontaneous patterns of verbal and non-verbal communication.

Organizes the results of the study into practical exercises, techniques, tools and practices that can be used to influence or make a difference in people's experience or behavior." (xxiii)

From: L. Michael Hall
Neurons egroup — An Announcement

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL NEURO-SEMANTIC CONFERENCE

Beginning in 2011 the Leadership Team of Neuro-Semantics is launching the first annual *International Neuro-Semantic Conference.* And we have decided to begin this from Grand Junction Colorado where Dr. Hall conducted his original NLP Training Center and discovered the Meta-States Model.

Dates: July 1-3, 2011 — Country Inn Conference Center
Theme: Actualizing Excellence
Content: 15 workshops — two tracks: Personal Excellence — Business Excellence

The Schedule of events and workshops will be sent out on "neurons" the international egroup of Neuro-Semantics amnd will be on the website: www.neurosemantics.com.

Meta-Coaching Module III ---- *Coaching Mastery*
Immediately following the International Conference Dr. Hall will be conducting the Module III training of Meta-Coaching, the training which culminates in the ACMC credentials.

Come and enjoy.

For More information —

L. Michael Hall, Ph.D.
Neuro-Semantics International
P. O. Box 8
Clifton, CO. 81520—0008
United States

1 970- 523- 7877
meta@acsol.net   Or   usa@meta-coaching.org