
What People are saying about this book:

"A readable, practical, and entertaining book about a challenging, original, and promising new discipline. I recommend **it**."—**Dan Goleman**, Associate Editor of *Psychology Today*.

"NLP represents a huge quantum jump in our understanding of human behavior and communication. It makes most current therapy and education totally **obsolete**."—**John O. Stevens**, author of *Awareness* and editor of *Gestalt Therapy Verbatim* and *Gestalt is*.

"This book shows you how to do a little magic and change the way you see, hear, feel, and imagine the world you live in. It presents new therapeutic techniques which can teach you some surprising things about **yourself**."—**Sam Keen**, Consulting Editor of *Psychology Today* and author of *Beginnings Without End*, *To a Dancing God*, and *Apology for Wonder*.

"How tiresome it is going from one limiting belief to another. How **joyful** to read Bandler and Grinder, who don't believe anything, yet use everything! NLP wears seven-league-boots, and takes '**therapy**' or '**personal growth**' far, far beyond any previous **notions**."—**Barry Stevens**, author of *Don't Push the River*, and co-author of *Person to Person*.

"Fritz Peris regarded John **Stevens'** *Gestalt Therapy Verbatim* as the best representation of his work in print. Grinder and Bandler have good reason to have the same regard for *Frogs into Princes*. Once again, it's the closest thing to actually being in the **workshop**."—**Richard Price**, Co-founder and director of Esalen Institute.

frogs into PRINCES

Neuro Linguistic Programming

by

Richard **Bandler**

and

John **Grinder**

edited by

Steve **Andreas**

(formerly John O. **Stevens**)



TM

REAL PEOPLE PRESS



Copyright © 1979
Real People Press
Box F
Moab, Utah 84532

ISBN: 0-911226-18-4 clothbound \$11.00

ISBN: 0-911226-19-2 paperbound \$7.50

Cover Artwork by Elizabeth *Malczynski, Brooklyn, NY*

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication *Data:*

Bandler, Richard.

Frogs into princes.

"Edited entirely from **audiotapes** of introductory
NLP training workshops conducted by Richard **Bandler**
and John Grinder."

Bibliography: p.

1. Psychotherapy.
2. Nonverbal communication.
3. **Psycholinguistics.**
4. Imagery (Psychology)

I. Grinder, John, joint author. II. Title.

RC480.5.B313

616.8914

79-13255

ISBN 0-911226-18-4

ISBN 0-911226-19-2

Other books about Neuro-Linguistic Programming from Real People Press:

USING YOUR BRAIN—FOR A CHANGE, by *Richard Bandler*. 159pp. 1985 Cloth \$11.00 Paper \$7.50

REFRAMING: Neuro-Linguistic Programming and the Transformation of Meaning, by *Richard Bandler and John Grinder*. 220 pp. 1981 Cloth \$12.00 Paper \$8.50

TRANCE-FORMATIONS: Neuro-Linguistic Programming and the Structure of Hypnosis, by *John Grinder and Richard Bandler*. 250 pp. 1981 Cloth \$12.00 Paper \$8.50

CHANGE YOUR MIND—AND KEEP THE CHANGE, by *Steve Andreas and Connirae Andreas*. 187 pp. 1987 Cloth \$12.00 Paper \$8.50

The name *Real People Press* indicates our purpose; to publish ideas and ways that a person can use independently or with others to become more *real—to* further your own growth as a human being and to develop your relationship and communication with others.

8 9 10 Printing 93 92 91 90 89

Contents

<i>Foreword</i> by Steve Andreas (formerly John O. Stevens)	i-iv
<i>A Challenge to the Reader</i>	
I <i>Sensory Experience:</i> Representational Systems and Accessing Cues	5-78
II <i>Changing Personal History and Organization:</i> Anchoring	79-136
III <i>Finding New Ways:</i> Refraining	137-193
<i>Bibliography</i>	194

Foreword

I have been studying education, therapies, growth experiences, and other methods for personal change since I was a graduate student with Abe Maslow over twenty years ago. Ten years later I met Fritz Peris and immersed myself in gestalt therapy because it seemed to be more effective than most other methods. Actually all methods **work** for *some* people and with *some* problems. Most methods claim much more than they can deliver, and most theories have little relationship to the methods they describe.

When I was first introduced to Neuro Linguistic Programming I was both fascinated and *very* skeptical. I had been heavily conditioned to believe that change is slow, and usually difficult and painful. I still have some difficulty realizing that I can usually cure a phobia or other similar long-term problem painlessly in less than an **hour—even** though I have done it repeatedly and seen that the results last. Everything written in this book is explicit, and can be verified quickly **in** your own experience. There is no hocus-pocus, and you will not be asked to take on any new beliefs. You will only be asked to suspend your own beliefs long enough to test the concepts and procedures of NLP **in** your own sensory experience. That won't take long; most of the statements and patterns in this book can be tested in **a** few minutes or a few hours. If you are skeptical, as I was, you owe it to your skepticism to check this out, and find out if the outrageous claims made in this book are valid.

NLP is an explicit and powerful model of human experience and

communication. Using the principles of NLP it is possible to describe *any* human activity in a detailed way that allows you to make many deep and lasting changes quickly and easily.

A *few* specific examples of things you can learn to accomplish are: (1) cure phobias and other unpleasant feeling responses in less than an hour, (2) help children and adults with "learning **disabilities**" (spelling and reading problems, etc.) overcome these limitations, often in less than an hour, (3) eliminate most unwanted **habits—smoking, drinking, over-eating, insomnia, etc.**, in a few sessions, (4) make changes in the interactions of couples, families and organizations so that they function in ways that are more satisfying and productive, (5) cure many physical **problems—not** only most of those recognized as "**psychosomatic**" but also some that are **not—in** a few sessions.

These are strong claims, and experienced NLP practitioners can back them up with solid, visible results. NLP in its present state **can** do a great deal, but it cannot do everything.

... if what we've demonstrated is something that you'd like to be able to do, you might as well spend your time learning it. There are lots and lots of things that we cannot do. If you can program yourself to look for things that will be *useful for you* and learn those, instead of trying to find out where what **we** are presenting to you falls apart, **you'll** find out where it falls apart, I guarantee you. If you use it **congruently** you will find lots of places that it won't work. And when it doesn't work, I suggest you do something else.

NLP is only about four years old, and many of the most useful patterns were created within the last year or two.

We haven't even begun to figure out what the possibilities are of how to use this material. And we are very, very, serious about that. What we are doing now is nothing more than the investigation of how to use this information. We have been unable to exhaust the variety of ways to put this stuff together and put it to use, and we don't know of any limitations on the ways that you can use this information. During this seminar we have mentioned and demonstrated several dozen ways that it can be used. It's the structure of experience. Period. **When** used

systematically, it constitutes a full strategy for getting any behavioral gain.

Actually, NLP can do *much* more than the kinds of remedial work mentioned above. The same principles can be used to study people who **m** unusually talented in any way, in order to determine the structure of that talent. That structure can then be quickly taught to others to give them the foundation for that same ability. This kind of **i**ntervention results in *generative* change, in which people learn to generate and create new talents and behaviors for themselves and others. A side effect of such generative change is that many of the problem behaviors that would otherwise have been targets for remedial change simply disappear.

In one sense nothing that NLP can accomplish is new: There have always been "**s**pontaneous remissions," "miracle cures," and other sudden and puzzling changes in people's behavior, and there have always been people who somehow learned to use their abilities in exceptional ways.

What is new in NLP is the ability to systematically analyze those exceptional people and experiences **i**n such a way that they can become widely available to others. Milkmaids in England became immune to smallpox long before Jenner discovered cowpox and vaccination; now **s**mallpox—which used to kill hundreds of thousands **a**nnually—is eliminated from human experience. In the same way, NLP can eliminate many of the difficulties and hazards of living that we now experience, and make learning and behavioral change much easier, more productive, and more exciting. We are on the threshold of a quantum jump in human experience and capability.

There is an old story of a boilermaker who was hired to fix a huge steamship boiler system that was not working well. After listening to the engineer's description of the problems and asking a few questions, he went to the boiler room. He looked at the maze of twisting pipes, listened to the thump of the boiler and the hiss of escaping steam for a few minutes, and felt some pipes with his hands. Then he hummed softly to himself, reached into his overalls and took out a small hammer, and tapped a bright red valve, once. Immediately the entire system began working perfectly, and the boilermaker went home. When the steamship owner received a bill for \$1,000 he complained that the boilermaker had only been in the engine room for fifteen

minutes, and requested an itemized bill. This is what the boilermaker sent him:

For tapping with hammer:	.50
For knowing where to tap:	<u>\$ 999.50</u>
Total:	\$1,000.00

What is really new in NLP is knowing exactly what to do, and how to do it. This is an exciting book, and an exciting time.

Steve Andreas (formerly John O. Stevens)

A Challenge to the Reader

In mystery and spy novels, the reader can expect to be offered a series of written **clues**—**fragmentary** descriptions of earlier events. When these fragments are fitted together, they provide enough of a representation for the careful reader to reconstruct the earlier events, even to the point of understanding the specific actions and motivations of the people **involved**—**or** at least to reach the understanding that the author will offer at the conclusion of the novel. The more casual reader is simply entertained and arrives at a more personal understanding, of which **s/he** may or may not be conscious. The writer of **such** a novel has the obligation to provide enough fragments to make a reconstruction possible, but not obvious.

This book is also the written record of a mystery story of sorts. However, it differs from the traditional mystery in several important ways. This is the written record of a story that was *told*, and story-telling is a different skill than story-writing. The story-teller has the obligation to use feedback from the **listener/watcher** to determine how many clues **s/he** can offer. The kind of feedback **s/he** takes **into** account is of two types: (1) the verbal, deliberate conscious feedback—those signals the **listener/watcher** is aware that **s/he** is offering to the story-teller, and (2) the non-verbal, spontaneous, unconscious feedback: the glimpse, the startle, the labored **recollection**—those signals the **listener/watcher** offers the story-teller without being aware of **them**. An important skill in the art of story-telling is to use the unconscious feedback so as to provide just enough clues that the

unconscious process of the **listener/watcher** arrives at the solution before the **listener/watcher** consciously appreciates it. From such artistry come the desirable experiences of surprise and **delight**—the discovery that we know much more than we think we do.

We delight in creating those kinds of experiences in our seminars. And while the record that follows may have contained enough clues for the participant in the seminar, only the more astute reader will succeed **in** fully reconstructing the earlier events. As we state explicitly in this book, the verbal component is the least interesting and least influential part of communication. Yet this is the only kind of clue offered the reader here.

The basic unit of analysis in face-to-face communication is the feedback loop. For example, if you were given the task of describing an interaction between a cat and a dog, you might make entries like: "Cat spits, . . . dog bares teeth, . . . cat arches **back**, . . . dog **barks**, . . . **cat—**" At least as important as the particular actions described is the *sequence* in which they occur. And to some extent, any particular behavior by the cat becomes understandable *only* in the context of the dog's behavior. If for some reason your observations were restricted to just the cat, you would be challenged by the task of reconstructing what the cat was interacting with. The cat's behavior is much more difficult to appreciate and understand in isolation.

We would like to reassure the reader that the non-sequiturs, the surprising tangents, the unannounced shifts in content, mood or direction which you will discover in this book had a compelling logic of their own in the original context. If these otherwise peculiar sequences of communication were restored to their original context, that logic would quickly emerge. Therefore, the challenge: Is the reader astute enough to reconstruct that context, or shall he simply enjoy the exchange and arrive at a useful unconscious understanding of a more personal nature?

John Grinder
Richard Bandler

I

Sensory Experience

There are several important ways in which what we do differs radically from others who do workshops on communication or psychotherapy. When we first started in the field, we would watch brilliant people do interesting things and then afterwards they would tell various particular metaphors that they called theorizing. They would tell stories about millions of holes, or about plumbing: that you have to understand that people are just a circle with pipes coming from every direction, and all you need is Drano or something like that. **Most** of those metaphors weren't very useful in helping people learn specifically what to do or how to do it.

Some people will do experiential workshops in which you will be treated to watching and listening to a person who is relatively competent in most, or at least part, of the business called "professional communications." They will demonstrate by their behavior that they are quite competent in doing certain kinds of things. If you are fortunate and you keep your sensory apparatus open, you will learn how to do some of the things they do.

There's also a group of people who are theoreticians. They will tell you what their *beliefs* are about the true nature of humans and what the completely "transparent, adjusted, genuine, authentic," etc. person *should be*, but they don't show you how to *do* anything.

Most knowledge in the field of psychology is organized in ways that **mix** together what we call "*modeling*"—**what** traditionally has been called "*theorizing*"—**and** what we consider *theology*. The descriptions

of what people *do* have been mixed together with descriptions of what reality "is." When you mix experience together with theories and wrap them all up in a package, that's a **psychotheology**. What has developed in psychology is different religious belief systems with very powerful evangelists working from all of these differing orientations.

Another strange thing about psychology is that there's a whole body of people called "researchers" who will *not associate* with the people who are practicing! Somehow the field of psychology got divided so that the researchers no longer provide information for, and respond to, the clinical practitioners in the field. That's not true in the field of medicine. In medicine, the people doing research are trying to find things to help the practitioners in the field. And the practitioners respond to the researchers, telling them what they need to know more about.

Another thing about therapists is that they come to therapy with a set of unconscious **patterning**s that makes it highly probable that they will fail. When therapists begin to do therapy they look for what's wrong **in** a *content-oriented* way. They **want** to know **what** the problem is so that they can help people **find** solutions. This is true whether they have been trained overtly or covertly, in academic institutions or in rooms with pillows on the floor.

This is even true of those who consider themselves to be "process-oriented." There's a little voice **somewhere** in their mind that keeps saying "**The process. Look for the process.**" They will say "Well, I'm a process-oriented therapist. I work with *the process*." Somehow the process has become an **event**—a thing in and of **itself**.

There is another paradox in the field. The hugest majority of therapists believe that the way to be a **good** therapist is to do everything you do intuitively, which means to have an unconscious mind that does it for you. They **wouldn't** describe it that way because they don't like the word "unconscious" but basically they do what they do without knowing how they do it. They do it by the "seat of their **pants**"—**that's** another way to say "unconscious **mind**." I think being able to do things unconsciously is useful; that's **a** good way to do things. The same group of people, however, *say* that the ultimate goal of therapy is for people to have conscious **understanding**—**insight** into their own problems. So therapists are a group of people who do what they do without knowing how it works, and at the same time believe that the way to really get somewhere in life is to consciously know how things work!

When I first got involved with modeling people in the field of psychotherapy, I would ask them what outcome they were working toward when they made a maneuver, when they reached over and touched a person this way, or when they shifted their voice tone here. And their answer was "Oh, I have no idea." I'd say "**Well**, good. Are you interested in exploring and finding out with me what the outcome was?" And they would say "Definitely not!" They claimed that if they did specific things to get specific outcomes that would be something bad, called "manipulating."

We call ourselves *modelers*. What we essentially do is to pay very little attention to what people *say* they do and a great deal of attention to what they *do*. And then we build ourselves a model of what they do. We are not psychologists, and we're also not theologians or theoreticians. We have *no* idea about the "real" nature of things, and we're not particularly interested in what's "**true**." The function of modeling is to arrive at descriptions which are *useful*. So, if we happen to mention something that you know from a scientific study, or from statistics, is inaccurate, realize that a different level of experience is being offered you here. We're not offering you something that's *true*, just things that are *useful*.

We know that our modeling has been successful when we can systematically get the same behavioral outcome as the person we have modeled. And when we can teach somebody else to be able to get the same outcomes in a systematic way, that's an even stronger test.

When I entered the field of communication, I went to a large conference where there were six hundred and fifty people in an auditorium. And a man who was very famous got up and made the following statement: "What all of you need to understand about doing therapy and about communication is that the first essential step is to make contact with the human you are communicating **with** as a person." Well, that struck me as being kind of obvious. And everybody in the audience went "Yeahhhh! Make contact. **We** all know about that one." Now, he went on to talk for another six hours and never mentioned *how*. He never mentioned one single specific thing that anybody in that room could *do* that would help them in any way to either have the experience of understanding that person better, or at least give the other person the illusion that they were understood.

I then went to something called "Active Listening." In active listening you rephrase what everyone says, which means that you

distort everything they say.

Then we began to pay attention to what really divergent people who were "wizards" actually do. When you watch and listen to Virginia Satir and Milton Erickson do therapy, they *apparently* could not be more different. At least I couldn't figure out a way that they could appear more different.

People also report that the experiences of being with them are profoundly different. However, if you examine their behavior and the essential key patterns and sequences of what they do, they are similar. The patterns that they use to accomplish the rather dramatic things that they are able to accomplish are very similar in our way of understanding. What they accomplish is the same. But the way it's *packaged*—the way they come *across*—is profoundly different.

The same was true of Fritz Peris. He was not quite as sophisticated as Satir and Erickson in the number of patterns he used. But when he was operating in what I consider a powerful and effective way, he was using the same sequences of patterns that you will find in their work. Fritz typically did not go after specific outcomes. If somebody came in and said "I have hysterical paralysis of the left leg," he wouldn't go after it directly. Sometimes he would get it and sometimes he wouldn't. Both Milton and Virginia have a tendency to go straight for producing specific outcomes, something I really respect.

When I wanted to learn to do therapy, I *went to* a month-long workshop, a situation where you are locked up on an island and exposed every day to the same kinds of experiences and hope that somehow or other you will pick them up. The leader had lots and lots of experience, and he could *do* things that none of us could do. But when he *talked* about the things he did, people there wouldn't be able to learn to do them. Intuitively, or what we describe as unconsciously, his behavior was systematic, but he didn't have a conscious understanding of *how* it was systematic. That is a compliment to his flexibility and ability to discern what works.

For example, you all know very, very little about *how you* are able to generate language. Somehow or other as you speak you are able to create complex pieces of syntax, and I know that you don't make any conscious decisions. You don't go "Well, I'm going to speak, and first I'll put a noun in the sentence, then I'll throw an adjective in, then a verb, and maybe a little adverb at the end, you know, just to color it up a little bit." Yet you speak a language that has grammar and *syntax*—

rules that are as mathematical and as explicit as any calculus. There's a group of people called transformational linguists who have managed to take large amounts of tax dollars and academic space and figure out what those rules are. They haven't figured out anything to *do* with that yet, but transformational grammarians are unconcerned with that. They are not interested in the real world, and having lived in it I can sometimes understand why.

When it comes to language, we're all wired the same. Humans have pretty much the same intuitions about the same kinds of phenomena in lots and lots of different languages. If I say "You that look understand idea can," you have a very different intuition than if I say "Look, you can understand that idea," even though the words are the same. There's a part of you at the unconscious level that tells you that one of those sentences is well-formed in a way that the other is not. Our job as modelers is to do a similar task for other things that are more practical. Our job is to figure out what it is that effective therapists do intuitively or unconsciously, and to make up some rules that can be *taught* to someone else.

Now, what typically happens when you go to a seminar is that the leader will say "All you really need to do, in order to do what I do as a great communicator, is to pay attention to your guts." And that's true, *if you* happen to have the things in your guts that that leader does. My guess is you probably don't. You *can* have them there at the unconscious level, but I think that if you want to have the same intuitions as somebody like Erickson or Satir or Peris, you need to go through a training period to *learn* to have similar intuitions. Once you go through a conscious training period, you can have therapeutic intuitions that are as unconscious and systematic as your intuitions about language.

If you watch and listen to Virginia Satir work you are confronted with an overwhelming mass of **information**—the way she moves, her voice tone, the way she touches, who she turns to next, what sensory cues she is using to orient herself to which member of the family, etc. It's a really overwhelming task to attempt to keep track of all the things that she is using as cues, the responses that she is making to those cues, and the responses she elicits from others.

Now, we don't know what Virginia Satir *really* does with families. However, we can describe her behavior in such a way that we can come to any one of you and say "Here. Take this. Do these things in this

sequence. Practice until it becomes a systematic part of your unconscious behavior, and you will end up being able to elicit the same responses that Virginia elicits." We do not test the description we arrive at for accuracy, or how it fits with neurological data, or statistics about what should be going on. All we do in order to understand whether our description is an adequate model for what we are doing is to find out whether it works or not: are you able to exhibit effectively in your behavior the same patterns that Virginia exhibits in hers, and get the same results? We will be making statements up here which may have no relationship to the "truth," to what's "really going on." We *do* know, however, that the model that we **have** made up of her behavior has been effective. After being exposed to it and practicing the patterns and the descriptions that we have offered, people's behavior changes in ways that make them effective in the same way that Satir is, yet each person's style is unique. If you learn to speak French, you will still express yourself in your own way.

You can use your consciousness to decide to gain a certain skill which you think would be useful in the context of your professional and personal work. Using our models you can practice that skill. Having practiced that consciously for some period of time you can allow that skill to function unconsciously. You all had to consciously practice all the skills involved in driving a car. Now you can drive a long distance and not be conscious **of** any of it, unless there's some unique situation that requires your attention.

One of the systematic things that Erickson and Satir and a lot of other effective therapists do is to notice unconsciously *how* the person they are talking to thinks, and make use of that information in lots and lots of different ways. For example, if I'm a client of Virginia's I might go:

"Well, man, Virginia, you know I just ah ... boy! Things have been, they've been heavy, you know. Just, you know, my wife **was** ... my wife was run over by a snail **and** ... you know, I've got four kids and two of them are gangsters and I think maybe I did something wrong but I just can't get a grasp on what it **was**."

I don't know if **you've** ever had the opportunity to watch Virginia operate, but she operates very, very nicely. What she does is very

magical, even though I believe that magic has a structure and is available to all of you. One of the things that she would do in her response would be to join this client in his model of the world by responding in somewhat the following way:

"I understand that you feel certain weight upon you, and these kinds of feelings that you have in your body aren't what you want for yourself as a human being. You have different kinds of hopes for **this**."

It doesn't really matter what she says, as long as she uses the same kinds of words and tonal patterns. If the same client were to go to another therapist, the dialogue might go like this:

"Well, you know, things feel real heavy in my life, Dr. **Bandler**. You know, it's just like I can't handle it, you know ..."

"**I** can see that, Mr. **Grinder**."

"I feel like I did something wrong with my children and I don't know what it is. And I thought maybe you could help me grasp it, you know?"

"Sure. I see what it is you're talking about. Let's focus in on one particular dimension. Try to give me *your* particular perspective. Tell me how it is that you see your situation right now."

"Well, you know, I **just** ... I'm ... I just feel like I can't get a grasp on reality."

"I can see that. What's important to **me**—**colorful** as your description **is**—**what's** important to me is that we see eye to eye about where it is down the road that we shall travel together."

"I'm trying to tell you that my life has got a lot of rough edges, you know. And I'm trying to **find** a **way**..."

"It looks all broken up **from** ... from your description, at any rate. The colors aren't all that nice."

While you sit here and laugh, we can't even get as exaggerated as what **we've** heard in "real life." We spent a lot of time going around to mental health clinics and sitting in on professional communicators. It's very depressing. And what we noticed is that many therapists mismatch in the same way that we just demonstrated.

We come from California and the whole world out there is run by

electronics firms. We have a lot of people who are called **"engineers,"** and engineers typically at a certain point have to go to therapy. It's a rule, I don't know why, but they come in and they usually all say the same thing, they go:

"Well, I could see for a long time how, you know, I was really climbing up and becoming successful and then suddenly, you know, when I began to get towards the top, I just looked around and my life looked empty. Can you see that? I mean, could you see what that would be like for a man of my age?"

"Well, I'm beginning to get a sense of grasping the essence of the kinds of feelings that you have that you want to **change.**"

"Just a minute, because what I want to do is I'm trying to show you my perspective on the whole thing. And, you **know—**"

"I feel that this is very important."

"And I know that a lot of people have a lot of troubles, but what I want to do is to give you a *really* clear idea of what I see the problem is, so that, you know, you can show me, sort of frame by frame, what I need to *know* in order to find my way out of this difficulty because quite frankly I could get very depressed about this. I mean, **can** you see how that would be?"

"I feel that this is very important. You have raised certain issues here which I feel that we have to come to grips with. And it's only a question of selecting where we'll grab a handle and begin to work in a comfortable but powerful way upon this."

"What I'd really like is your point of **view.**"

"Well, I don't want you to avoid any of those feelings. Just go ahead and let them flow up and knock the hell out of the picture that **you've** got there."

"I ... I don't see that this is getting us anywhere."

"I feel that we have hit a rough spot in the relationship. Are you willing to talk about your resistance?"

Do you happen to notice any pattern in these dialogues? We watched therapists do this for two or three days, and we noticed that Satir did it the other way around: *She matched the client.* But most therapists don't.

We have noticed this peculiar trait about human beings. If they find something they can do that doesn't work, they do it *again.* B. F.

Skinner had a group of students who had done a lot of research with rats and mazes. And somebody asked them one day "What is the real difference between a rat and a human being?" Now, behaviorists not being terribly observant, decided that they needed to experiment to find out. They built a huge maze that was scaled up for a human. They took a control group of rats and taught them to run a small maze for cheese. And they took the humans and taught them to run the large maze for five-dollar bills. They didn't notice any really significant difference. There were small variations in the data and at the 95% probability level they discovered some significant difference in the number of trials to criterion or something. The humans were able to learn to run the maze somewhat better, a little bit quicker, than the rats.

The really interesting statistics came up when they did the extinguishing part. They removed the five-dollar bills and the cheese and after a certain number of trials the rats stopped running the **maze**. . . . However, the humans never **stopped!** . . . They are still **there!** . . . They break into the labs at night.

One of the operating procedures of most disciplines that allows a field to grow and to continue to develop at a rapid rate is a rule that if what you do doesn't work, *do something else*. If you are an engineer and you get the rocket **all** set up, **and** you push the button and it doesn't lift up, you alter your behavior to **find** out what you need to do to make certain changes to overcome gravity.

However, in the field of psychotherapy, if you encounter a situation where the rocket doesn't go off, it has a special name; it's called having a "resistant client." You take the fact that what you do doesn't work and you blame it on the client. That relieves you of the responsibility of having to change your behavior. Or if you are slightly more humanistic about it, you "share in the guilt of the failure" or say he "wasn't ready."

Another problem is that the field of pschotherapy keeps developing the same things over and over and over again. What Fritz did and what Virginia does has been done before. The concepts that are used in Transactional Analysis (TA)—"**redecision**" for **example**—are available in Freud's work. The interesting thing is that in psychotherapy the knowlege doesn't get transferred.

When humans learned to read and write and to communicate to one another somewhat, that knowledge began to speed up the rate of development. If we teach someone electronics, we train them in all the

things that have already been discovered so that they can go on and discover *new* things.

What happens in psychotherapy, however, is that we send people to school instead. And when they come out of school, *then* they have to learn to do therapy. Not only do they have to learn to do therapy, but there's *no way* to learn to do therapy. So what we do is we give them clients, and we call what they do "private practice" so they can practice privately.

In linguistics there's a distinction called nominalization. Nominalization is where you take a process and you describe it as if it's an event or a thing. In this way you utterly confuse those around you, and **yourself**—**unless** you remember that it is a representation rather than experience. This can have positive uses. If you happen to be a government, you can talk about nominalizations like "national security" and you can get people to worry about those words. Our president just went to Egypt and changed the word "imperative" to the word "desirable" and suddenly we're friends with Egypt again. All he did was change a word. That's word magic.

The word "resistance" is also a nominalization. It's describing a process as a thing without talking about *how it works*. The earnest, concerned, authentic therapist in the last dialogue would describe the client as being callous and insensitive, so totally out of touch with his feelings that he could not communicate effectively with **him**. That client was really resistant.

And the client would be out looking for another therapist because that therapist needed glasses. He had absolutely no perspective at all. He couldn't see eye to eye with him at all!

And they would *both* be right, of course.

Now, is there anyone here who hasn't yet identified the pattern that we're talking about? Because it really was the beginning point for us.

Woman: Ah, in the last dialogue the client was using visual words like "look, see, show, focus, perspective." And the therapist was using feeling words like "grasp, handle, feel, smooth, rough."

Right. And there are also some people who use mostly auditory words: "I hear what you're **saying**," "**That rings a bell**," "**I can resonate with that**," etc. What we noticed is that different people actually think differently, and that these differences correspond to the three principal senses: vision, hearing, and **feeling**—**which** we call kinesthetics.

When you make initial contact with a person **s/he** will probably be

thinking in one of these three main *representational systems*. Internally s/he will either be generating visual images, having feelings, or talking to themselves and hearing sounds. One of the ways you can know this is by listening to the kinds of process words (the predicates: verbs, adverbs and adjectives) that the person uses to describe his/her experience. If you pay attention to that information, you can adjust your own behavior to get the response you want. If you want to get good rapport, you can speak using the same kind of predicates that the other person is using. If you want to alienate the other person, you can deliberately *mismatch* predicates, as we did in the earlier client-therapist dialogues.

Let me talk a little about how language works. If I look at you and say "Are you comfortable?" you can come up with a response. The presupposition of your being able to respond **congruently** to my question is that you understand the words that I am speaking. Do you know *how* you understand the word "comfortable" for example?

Woman: Physically.

You understand it physically. You sense some change in your body which is distinctive. That shift in your feeling state is distinctive from "terrified." That's a different response.

She senses a change in her body as a way of understanding the meaning of the word "**comfortable**." Did anybody else notice how they understand it? Some of you will see visual images of yourself in a comfortable position: lying in a hammock, or lying on the grass in the sunshine. And a few of you may even hear the sounds which you associate with comfort: the babbling of a brook, or wind blowing through some pine trees.

In order for you to understand what I am saying to you, you have to take the **words**—**which** are nothing more than arbitrary labels for parts of your personal **history**—**and** *access* the meaning, namely, some set of images, some set of feelings, or some set of sounds, which *are* the meaning for you of the word "comfortable." That's a simple notion of how language works, and we **call** this process *transderivational search*. Words are triggers that tend to bring into your consciousness certain parts of your experience and not other parts.

Eskimos have some seventy words for snow. Now, does that mean that people who are raised in a tribe called Eskimos have different sensory apparatus than we do? No. My understanding is that language is the accumulated wisdom of a group of people. Out of a potentially

infinite amount of sensory experience, language picks out those things which are repetitive in the experience of the people developing the language *and* that they have found useful to attend to in consciousness. It's not surprising that the Eskimos have seventy-some words for snow in terms of where they live and the kinds of tasks they **have** to perform. For them, survival is an issue closely connected with snow, and therefore they make very fine distinctions. Skiers also have many different words for different kinds of snow.

As Aldous Huxley says in his book *The Doors of Perception*, when you learn a language, you are an inheritor of the wisdom of the people who have gone before you. You are *also a victim* in this sense: of that infinite set of experiences you could have had, certain ones are given names, labeled with words, and thereby are emphasized and attract your attention. Equally **valid—possibly** even more dramatic and **useful—experiences** at the sensory level which are unlabeled, typically don't intrude into your consciousness.

There is always a slippage between primary and secondary representation. There's a difference between experience and the ways of representing experience to yourself. One of the least immediate ways of representing experiences is with words. If I say to you "This particular table right here has a glass of water partially filled sitting on top of it," I have offered you a string of words, arbitrary symbols. We can both agree or disagree about the statement because I'm appealing directly to your sensory experience.

If I use any words that don't have direct sensory referents, the only way you can understand **those—unless** you have some program to demand more sensory-based **descriptions—is** for you to **find** the counterpart in your past experience.

Your experience will overlap with mine to the degree that we share a culture, that we share certain kinds of backgrounds. Words have to be relativized to the world model of the person you are talking to. The word "rapport" for a ghetto person, "rapport" for a white **middle-class** person, and "rapport" for someone in the top one hundred families in this country, are *very, very* different phenomena. There's an illusion that people understand each other when they can repeat the same words. But since those words internally access different **experiences—**which they **must—then** there's always going to be a difference in meaning.

There's a slippage between the word and the experience, and there's

also a slippage between *my* corresponding experience for a word and *your* corresponding experience for the same word. I think it's extremely useful for you to behave so that your clients **come** to have the illusion that you understand what they are saying verbally. I caution you against accepting the illusion for yourself.

Many of you probably have intuitions about your clients when you first meet them. There may be a certain type of client that comes into your office and even before they speak you look up and you *know* that one's going to be hard, that one's going to be really difficult. It's going to be a rather tedious and long-range project for you to assist that person in getting the choices they want, even though you don't know what those are yet. At other times, before a new client even speaks, you know it will be interesting, it will be a delight. There will be a spark there, there will be a sense of excitement and adventure as you lead this person to some new behavior patterns to get what it is that they came for. How many of you have intuitions like that? Let me have a volunteer. Do you know when you have the intuition that you are having it?

Woman: **Umhm.**

What is that **experience?** . . .

We'll help you. Start by listening to the question. The question I'm asking you is one that I'd like to train you all to ask. The question is "**Howdo you know** when you are having an intuition?" (She looks up and to her left.) Yes, that's how you know.

She didn't *say* anything; that is the interesting thing. She just went through a process **non-verbally** in responding to the question that I asked her. That process is a replica of the process she actually goes through when she has the intuition, and it was the answer to the question.

If you take nothing else away from this workshop, take away the following: *You will always get answers to your questions insofar as you have the sensory apparatus to notice the responses.* And rarely will the verbal or conscious part of the response be relevant.

Now let's go back and demonstrate again. How do you know when you are having an intuition?

Woman: Well, let me take it back to the dialogue here **earlier**. . . . I was trying to put that into some form. And what it was for me was the symbol of—

What kind of a symbol? Is this something you saw, heard, or felt?

I saw it in my head as **just**—

Yes. You saw it in your head. It was a picture.

Now, all the information that she just offered us verbally is wholly redundant if you were in a position to be able to watch her non-verbal response to the initial question. Everything that she just presented verbally was presented in a much more refined way **non-verbally**. If you clean up your sensory channels and attend to sensory experience, when you make a statement or ask a human being a question they will always give you the answer non-verbally, whether or not they are able to consciously express what it is.

The information about representational systems comes through in lots and lots of different ways. The easiest way to begin to train your senses is this: people make movements with their eyes which will indicate to you which representational system they are using. When somebody walks into your office, they are planning what they are going to do. They are either visualizing, or they are telling themselves what they are going to say, or they are paying attention to the feelings that they want to describe to you. When they do that, they go inside and they *access* that information, and they make typical gestures that every one of you knows about unconsciously, and yet through the whole history of psychology no one has ever explicitly described.

For example, I'll name a standard one. You ask somebody a question. They say "**Hm**, let's see," and they look up and to their left, and tilt their head in the same direction. When people look up, they are making pictures internally.

Do you believe that? It's a lie, you know. Everything we're going to tell you here is a lie. All generalizations are lies. Since we have no claim on truth or accuracy, we will be lying to you consistently throughout this seminar. There are only two differences between us and other teachers: One is that we announce at the beginning of our seminars that everything we say will be a lie, and other teachers do not. Most of them believe their lies. They don't realize that they are made up. The other difference is that most of our lies will work out really well if you act *as if they* are true.

As modelers, we're not interested in whether what we offer you is true or not, whether **it's** accurate or whether it can be **neurologically** proven to be accurate, an actual representation of the world. We're **only** interested in *what works*.

Let me have three volunteers to come up **here**. . . .

- **[Book of Fear here](#)**
- [Software Performance and Scalability: A Quantitative Approach book](#)
- **[click Cambridge Certificate of Proficiency in English 4 Student's Book with Answers \(CPE Practice Tests\)](#)**
- [Software Engineering: A Methodical Approach for free](#)
- [Fairies Cookbook online](#)

- <http://transtrade.cz/?ebooks/Book-of-Fear.pdf>
- <http://patrickvincitore.com/?ebooks/Toxic-Bachelors.pdf>
- <http://cavalldecartro.highlandagency.es/library/Cambridge-Certificate-of-Proficiency-in-English-4-Student-s-Book-with-Answers--CPE-Practice-Tests-.pdf>
- <http://musor.ruspb.info/?library/Quantum-Chance--Nonlocality--Teleportation-and-Other-Quantum-Marvels.pdf>
- <http://bestarthritiscare.com/library/A-Slap-in-the-Face--Why-Insults-Hurt--And-Why-They-Shouldn-t.pdf>