

On 22 September 2014 at 12:44 Darrell Becker made the following statement on Facebook
<https://www.facebook.com/GnosticMedia/posts/10204818289886106>

*“As to avoiding a focus on the grammar and logic, I believe my sophomoric attempt at this exploration was when I made my first show with Brett Veinotte, which covered the essential grammar of the pursuit I was attempting. **The fact that this grammar was incomplete in the manner in which you've helped me see, Jan Irvin, is a humbling event**, something to show all of us that grammar work is never done, but that it can be returned to again and again. I explored the logic of the tactics I promote in the next several shows on the School Sucks Podcast, again, showing how there were aspects which could have been added, such as a mention of the possible hypnotic nature of these skills. **I would suggest that, perhaps or perhaps not, what I promote might actually be used to counter some aspects of NLP and certain applications of (so-called) NVC or even perverted versions of the Trivium. But I'm open to seeing how this might indeed not be so.**” (emphasis mine)*

The following is an example of how Mr. Becker's own words are an example of Erickson's techniques (the foundation of NLP, covert hypnosis and NVC.)

On 21 August 2014 at 2:00 Mr. Becker made to following statement on Facebook:
https://www.facebook.com/groups/trivium.edu/permalink/695680277168397/?comment_id=696062107130214&offset=0&total_comments=6&comment_tracking=%7B%22tn%22%3A%22R%22%7D

“... I used to try to start with showing evidence, presenting claims and conclusions (which people called "your Beliefs, [name removed]...") and found resistance, as I would guess you have seen, perhaps?¹ You might identify this as them being deluded², and I might agree³, but I have found it amazing what can occur when I stopped trying that method, and when I switched to using these tactics which I now promote⁴. So, by promoting these methods, I do not imply (ever) that this is the more correct way to proceed to communicate, but⁵ rather that I have seen evidence that these methods have been yielding me better results than my former procedures, and I invite you and others to try them out⁶. I hope this wasn't confusing, and I hope that you can tell that I never wish to be more than literal, and I very much am promoting an abundant perspective regarding communication choices (which I respect, analyze and measure, constantly)⁷.

So, the question.....

Have you ever had problems when you communicate your evidence and conclusions to people, and they refuse to investigate your claims and seem to desire to remain within their own conclusions (which you and I might call a "delusion")?⁸

1) *“...and found resistance, as I guess you have seen, perhaps?”*

Pattern interruption: The entire sentence, until the last word, reads as a declarative sentence. The reader passively collects the information. This is a receptive mode in the mind of the reader. The addition of *“...perhaps?”* changes the context of everything to this point from information to a question. This creates the transderivational search. The moment of adjustment the reader goes through, from listening to a declarative sentence (passive mode) to the question (active mode or the “search”) causes a moment of confusion. This creates a brief moment of suggestibility. What follows a pattern interruption is usually the suggestion or command.

2) *“You might identify this as them being deluded...”*

Suggestion, Odd wording: This statement is the implanted thought. It is an “invitation” to consider people who disagree with the writer as delusional. The statement is oddly and excessively worded. A more common clause to use would be something like “you might think they’re deluded” or even just “you might identify them as being deluded”. The verbosity of *“...identify this as them being deluded”* is another form of Erickson’s confusion technique.

3) *“...and I might agree”*

Rapport, Confusion, Obfuscation: This does a number of things, firstly, causes confusion. Why would the writer state they *“might”* agree when they are the one making the statement in the first place? This obfuscates their position on a statement which *they* have made, places the ownership of the statement on the reader in spite of the fact the writer is the one making the statement.

This creates another dynamic. It creates a distance between the opinion attributed to the reader and the obfuscated opinion of the writer. The implication of the reader and writer might be in disagreement essentially creates a very subtle tension between the writer and the reader.

This will become important later when the writer changes this dynamic from possible disagreement to agreement (releasing the tension). This is called Rapport.

Rapport is used to either drop the targets resistance or is used to reinforce the suggestion. When rapport is used to reinforce, it will be followed by the suggestion. We will see the idea of “agreement” and the suggestion of “delusion” come up again at the end of the passage.

4) *“You might...which I now promote”*. **Confusion technique - endless and oddly worded sentence.**

5) *"So, by promoting...but..."* **Obfuscation.** Use of the word *but*, tells the reader to disregard everything they just read. Essentially the writer is saying they would never make a recommendation - then goes on to do so.

6) *"So, by promoting...and I invite you and others to try them out"*

Confusion - Endless sentence, Rapport: *"I invite you"* is a form of indirect technique and rapport building; *"and others"* creates a sense of a crowd. The mind shifts from a one-to-one conversation and for a moment the room is filled with "others" - it is a shift of attention from close quarters and focussed onto the writer to a wider, broader less focussed view. It implies peer pressure of rapport with the group (you're not alone if you agree).

Instead of saying "try it, it works" the writer rambles along with excessive words, again Erickson's Endless Sentence technique.

7) *"I hope this...constantly)." Endless wording "I never wish to be more than literal"*. The meaning of the sentence is the writer intends to be clear and literal, however the sentence is written from the negation of a wish "I never wish" to defining the negative space (see MacLuan) of *literal*. *Literal* is the foreground in the statement, *more than literal* shifts the context to anything "around" literal (the negative space). This weird why of stating *"I wish to be literal"*, as a double negative, is an example of confusion technique. Very subtle, but reader must accommodate for this dynamic between positive and negative use of language to garner the meaning of the sentence. This causes a brief transderitational search.

The suggestion which follows is - *"I very much am promoting an abundant perspective"*. The odd use of *"I very much am"* continues the confusion technique into the suggestion.

8) *"(which you and I might call a "delusion")"*

Endless wording, Rapport, re-enforcing the suggestion. The last phrase aligns the writer and readers view on "delusion". This releases the tension initially created when the suggestion was implanted. By aligning the two views the writer is rewarding the reader with a feeling of rapport and relief (now the reader does not have to cause agreeability, we are now on the same page). This release of tension and sense of rapport, is what re-enforces the suggestion (see 3.) The suggestion is simply this. *You're delusional if you disagree with me.*

The preamble up to *"which you and I might call a delusion"*, is a situation in which anyone would answer "yes" - this is priming the mind for "agreement". In sales this is called soft-selling (have the person answer multiple irrelevant questions with "yes" increases the likelihood they will answer "yes" to the sales question.)