

IANLP International Association for NLP

Neubuchstrasse 98, CH-8406 Winterthur, Switzerland
Phone +41-52-3155252 | info@ia-nlp.org
www.ia-nlp.org



Can people read minds with NLP?

For years, rumours have been circulating that people trained in NLP would claim to be able to read thoughts via the eye access cues. This - of course - is absurd.

The founders of the NLP did not claim that one could 'read thoughts' because of eye movements, nor that a person would consistently prefer the same pattern (typology).

Quite on the contrary Bandler and Grinder emphasized the contextual nature of any such determination in the following passage of their ground breaking book 'Frogs into Princes':

"Our claim is that you are using *all systems all the time*. In a particular context you will be *aware* of one system more than another. I assume that when you play athletics or make love, you have a lot of kinesthetic sensitivity. When you are reading or watching a movie, you have a lot of visual consciousness. You can shift from one to the other. There are contextual markers that allow you to shift from one strategy to another and use different sequences." (Bandler, 1979, p. 36)

They also point out that there is no common structure and/or typology:

"You will find people who are organized in odd ways. But even somebody who is organized in a totally different way will be systematic; their eye movements will be systematic for *them*. Even the person who looks straight down each time they have a picture, will remain consistent within themselves." (Bandler, 1979, p. 25)

And on page 23 it all starts with a word of warning often emphasized by Bandler and Grinder:

"For those of you who are doubtful, and those who have skeptical parts, we would like to ask you - and this is true for all of the lies we are going to tell you - to do the following: accept our lie for a limited period of time, namely during the exercise that follows our description of the pattern we claim exists. In this way you can use your own sensory experience - not the crazy verbalizations we offer you - to decide whether in fact the things we describe can be observed in the behavior of the person you're communicating with."

Bandler, R. & Grinder, J.; Frogs into Princes, page 36; Real People Press, Moab USA, 1979

\$6.50

frogs into PRINCES

Neuro Linguistic Programming™

Richard Bandler
and
John Grinder
live



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

ISBN: 0-911226-18-4 clothbound \$10.00
ISBN: 0-911226-19-2 paperbound \$6.50

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 616.8'914 79-13255

ISBN 0-911226-18-4

ISBN 0-911226-19-2

Other useful books from Real People Press:

TRANCE-FORMATIONS: Neuro-Linguistic Programming and the Structure of Hypnosis, by John Grinder and Richard Bandler. 251 pp. 1981 Cloth \$10.00 Paper \$6.50

REFRAMING: Neuro-Linguistic Programming and the Transformation of Meaning, by Richard Bandler and John Grinder. 220 pp. 1982 Cloth \$10.00 Paper \$6.50

A SOPRANO ON HER HEAD: Right-Side-Up Reflections on Life—and Other Performances, by Eloise Ristad. 184 pp. 1981 Cloth \$10.00 Paper \$6.50

NOTES TO MYSELF, by Hugh Prather, 150 pp. 1970 Cloth \$7.00 Paper \$4.00

WINDOWS TO OUR CHILDREN, by Violet Oaklander. 325 pp. 1978 Cloth \$10.00 Paper \$6.50

EMBRACE TIGER, RETURN TO MOUNTAIN: the essence of Tai Chi, by Al Chung-liang Huang. Illustrated. 185 pp. 1973 Cloth \$10.00 Paper \$6.50

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 relationships and communication with others.

organization, I don't have to destroy any choices they presently have to *add* to that. And that's our whole function as modelers. We assume since you all managed to scrape up whatever amount of money it cost you to come here, that you are competent, that you already are succeeding to some degree. We respect all those choices and abilities. We're saying "Good, let's *add* other choices to those choices you already have, so that you have a wider repertoire" just as a good mechanic has a full tool box.

Our claim is that you are using *all systems all the time*. In a particular context you will be *aware* of one system more than another. I assume that when you play athletics or make love, you have a lot of kinesthetic sensitivity. When you are reading or watching a movie, you have a lot of visual consciousness. You can shift from one to the other. There are contextual markers that allow you to shift from one strategy to another and use different sequences. There's nothing forced about that.

There are even strategies to be creative, given different forms of creativity. We work as consultants for an ad agency where we psychologically "clone" their best creative people. We determined the strategy that one creative person used to create a commercial, and we taught other people in that agency to use the same structure at the unconscious level. The commercials they came up with were then creative in the same way, but the content was totally unique. As we were doing the process, one of the people there even made a change in the strategy that made it better.

tsk, tsk, it's so true! Most people don't have a large number of strategies to do anything. They use the same kind of strategy to do everything and what happens is that they are good at some things and not good at others. We have found that most people have only three or four basic strategies. A really flexible person may have a dozen. You can calculate that even if you restrict a strategy to four steps there are well over a thousand possibilities!

We make a very strong claim. We claim that if any human can do anything, so can you. All you need is the intervention of a modeler who has the requisite sensory experience to observe what the talented person actually *does*—not their report—and then package it so that you can learn it.

Man: It occurs to me that in your work, the therapeutic goal of bringing clients to awareness is being replaced by giving the client a new pattern of response that they may choose to use.