

THE NEWEST CODE OF NLP

L. Michael Hall, Ph.D.

The *First Code* of NLP according to Judith DeLozier was the original *coding* that Richard Bandler and John Grinder created along with their original practice group of associates in Santa Cruz (Dilts, DeLozier, Cameron-Bandler, Gordon, Pucelic, Lewis, McClendon, Gilligan, etc.). That *First Code* about the structure of expertise in communication involved the Meta-Model, the Representation systems, sub-modalities, strategies, the separation of intentions and behaviors, and the techniques that followed (six-step reframing, change personal history, anchoring, phobia cure, etc.)¹

The New Code

Then some 7 to 10 years later, in 1983, Judith DeLozier and John Grinder brought out a *New Code* for NLP. And in that year, they provided some new distinctions for the field of NLP, distinctions which are now pretty much part and parcel of what's considered basic or foundational NLP.

What was that 1983 New Code? Judith says it was state (best states and know-nothing state), conscious and unconscious relationship, balance of practice and spontaneity, perceptual positions, and multiple descriptions.¹

And why did they create the New Code? What was the need or problem that they wanted to address with the New Code? They developed these distinctions as a response to concerns they had about many people in NLP “*doing NLP on people*,” not applying NLP on themselves which meant a high level of incongruency among NLP Practitioners, a ritualistic way of using NLP, and the failure of NLP that made the practice of NLP mechanistic, to be seen in a larger historical perspective.²

To these problems in the field, they asked themselves, “How are we going to get people to start thinking about where is the wisdom?” Judith explained in 1993 to an NLP group in London, “That is how *Turtles All the Way Down* got written in 1984.”¹ John also said that he was motivated to create the New Code as an attempt to “correct its initial design flaws” as a solution

to the most significant problems in the classic code of NLP.³

Today all of this means several things. First and most obvious is that *the New Code is no longer new*. I have previously written articles asking, “When will the *New Code* no longer be new? How many years have to pass before it can be called an *Old Code*?” If the *New Code* was introduced in 1983, it is now (in 2008) 25 years old. And given the state of the field of NLP today, it is probably about time for another new code. In fact, given that the *New Code*¹⁹⁸³ has not significantly affected the ability of NLP people to be more congruent or to “apply NLP to oneself” as John Grinder admits, perhaps it is time for the next level of a new code. And given that the field of NLP is today much more fragmented than it was in 1983, and even further from creating a united field, could it be that the time has come for the newest code. So with this as background, here is my 2008 introduction of *the Newest Code of NLP*.

The Newest Code

What is the Newest Code? This is the *code* that I first introduced to NLP in 1994 with the Meta-States Model—a creative model that has since re-modeled most aspects of NLP. When it first appeared there were many NLP Trainers who felt that the Meta-States Model would eventually embed NLP within itself. One NLP Trainer wrote a review of the book *Meta-States* said that Meta-States would be the model that would “eat” NLP.⁴ Discovered in 1994, the Meta-States Model has outframed many aspects of NLP while simultaneously reframed and remodeled other aspects of NLP. Now because many people don’t know *how* Meta-States offers an entirely New Code for NLP and addresses many of the design flaws of the First Code and the New Code¹⁹⁸³.

I have written this article as an explanation of the pervasive re-modeling power of Meta-States for NLP. As Grinder said that he created the *New Code* to correct some of the design errors of classical NLP, *the Newest Code* continues in that tradition.

The Newest Code — Distinction #1

Higher Levels of States

NLP, as a communication model, focused on states, on neuro-linguistic states as an integrated mind-body system. As such it connected the way we communicate to ourselves through creating our representational movie to the states that the communication evokes in us. Using the sensory-systems of what we see, hear, and feel, we make internal movies and then use the meta-representational of language. From these processes we enter into various states, some resourceful, some unresourceful. These distinctions were modeled from the way Fritz Perls, Virginia Satir, and Milton Erickson used language which facilitated more resourceful and healing states.

NLP also made a few distinctions in states beyond resourceful—unresourceful. It distinguished *uptime* states of sensory awareness and *downtime* states of trance or hypnosis. NLP identified the *temporal* states wherein we live in the past, the future, or the present.

In the *New Code*, Grinder and DeLozier made distinctions of first-position states (experiencing the world from one’s own eyes and ears), second-position states (seeing and hearing from another

person's perspective) and third or meta-position states (stepping out to a position to see the system). As the 1983 New Code offered the Perceptual Positions which enriched NLP, it actually contained two meta-states within it, one of which even John Grinder has grudgingly acknowledged in his book *Whispering in the Wind*.⁵

The Newest Code offers even more distinctions about states, the most critical being the layered nature of states that arise from our self-reflexive consciousness. When we bring one state to another state we create a meta-state. This enables us to now experience *joy* about our *learning* state and to create a *joyful learning* state. We can experience *fear* of our fear, *fear* of our anger, *fear* of being rejected, and a thousand other fear states. We can experience *intentional playfulness* and we can bring curiosity, wonder, love, respect, firmness, etc. to all kinds of first-level states. And so the mixing of states initiates states higher and more complex than *primary states*, we can create all kinds of richly resourceful *meta-states*.

Beyond primary and meta-states, however, is yet another distinction, *gestalt states*. These states emerge as states that are “more than the sum of the parts of other states.” Here the layering of states initiates a systemic response. So in *courage* we have fear at the primary state, but then perhaps commitment, passion, responsibility, etc. at the meta-levels and as they mix together, they generate what we call “courage.” In fact, most of the richest human states are gestalt states as also are the most painful distorted forms of personality disordering.⁶

The Newest Code identifies three kinds of states from these levels of states which enable us to now model such complexly layered states as creativity, leadership, self-actualization, charisma as well as schizophrenia and other painful states. (See *The Structure of Personality*). This corrects the design flaws of NLP's first code and the New Code that essentially ignored the complex states created by our self-reflexive consciousness.

The Newest Code — Distinction #2

Levels

The Meta-States Model not only initiated new distinctions of the levels and kinds states in NLP, but modeled more thoroughly the unique kind of consciousness characteristic of human consciousness—*self-reflexive consciousness*. This initiated a new richness in the idea of “logical levels” that had been introduced NLP.

From the beginning, NLP had a few distinctions about levels. There was the levels of representations, at the primary level the sensory systems and then language and symbolism as the meta-representational system. Then Leslie Cameron-Bandler and Richard Bandler introduced the meta-levels inherent in Meta-Programs as they began examining a few perceptual filters. In the 1983 New Code, perceptual positions introduced levels of perceptions. Then Robert Dilts introduced the Neuro-Logical levels of five meta-levels (beliefs, values, identity, mission, and spirit) above the primary level (behavior, environment, capability).

Now in *the Newest Code*, we have a much more thorough modeling of the infinite process of self-reflexivity (or as the philosophers describe it, “the infinite regress”). Returning to Alfred

Korzybski's original work in neuro-linguistics and neuro-semantics (terms he originated) and his levels of abstraction, I incorporated his distinction into the Meta-States model. This means we can map things at multiple levels and that with every abstraction we make, we can step back to make yet another abstraction. Korzybski said that the process itself is infinite and described this as the process by which we create our human psycho-logics—our unique meanings which become our contextual frames.

Korzybski created the idea of our *psycho-logics* by putting a hyphen in psychology to recognize that our kind of reasoning (our “logics”) more often arise from the thoughts-and-feelings that we create as we reflect on our previous reflections. This structure gives rise to our beliefs, decisions, values, understandings, memories, imaginations, expectations, etc. and explains how these states are formatted. In the Meta-States Model each next *layering of thoughts-and-emotions*, as a state, follows our reasoning so we abstract or draw conclusion, however sane or insane that reasoning. As this creates our subjective psycho-logics, it simultaneously structures our next “logical level.”

This corrects the design flaw in NLP about “logical levels.” After all here are two nominalizations linked together to create a pretty vague concept and they are generally presented as if hierarchical. When we use the Meta-Model and denominalize this vague phrase, we find two verbs in “logical levels.” First we have the verb of *layering* one level of thought or feeling upon another. And we do this as we *reason* (the second verb, “logic”), that is, draw conclusions, make generations, delete data, etc. as we create our own unique model of the world as our mental map. So in Meta-States, the *logical layering* is fluid rather than hierarchical and infinite rather than a few steps.

The Newest Code illustrates this dynamic fluid swirling and spiraling of thinking-and-feeling by with a spiral. With *the spiraling* of the meta-stating process, we can now more effectively model positive upward spiraling of states and negative downward spiraling. So when we spiral around in our thinking and emoting, we can now model this wild swirling of our states.

A design flaw within the original NLP code was the confusion of “going meta” with dissociation. Because we *step out* of one state when we transcend to another, Bandler and Grinder, Dilts and the other original developers all used the term “dissociation” and made it equivalent to the term “meta.” But these are not the same at all. *Whenever we go meta, we step out of one state we simultaneously step **into** another.* This means we are always in some state. The term “dissociation” is just a metaphor, a way of talking about a certain feeling.

The Newest Code includes a new understanding of how we create meta-programs in the first place—we create meta-programs by the coalescing of meta-states. They arise as the solidification of meta-states, that is, meta-states that have become embodied. When we mind-to-muscle some meta-states, they get into our eyes as meta-programs.⁶ If you meta-state a state of being specifically detailed, you create the detail meta-program. So with matching or mismatching or any other meta-program distinction.

The Newest Code — Distinction #3

Frames

From Gregory Bateson, the developers of NLP received the idea and terminology of frames and framing. This gave NLP its first frames: the relevancy frame, outcome frame, the as if frame, the meta-frame, etc. Accordingly, there were two forms of framing in traditional NLP, deframing and reframing. Via using the Meta-Model we are able to de-frame vague phrases and especially nominalizations. And via reframing, we are able to create the transformation that comes along with new meanings.

The New Code changed the original ideas of framing from Bateson and mixed it with the hypnotic processes of Milton and ended up with a fairly convoluted pattern—“6-step framing”—creatively called this because there are six steps to the pattern (!). John Grinder seems to still think of it as some kind of magical pattern created by his unconscious when he was sick and feverish while Richard Bandler dismissed it in the late 1980s as “just a pattern to trick therapists to do hypnosis with clients.”

The Newest Code of NLP takes frames and framing to a whole new level. How? By recognizing that a frame is *the mental context* that we set through meta-stating new empowering psychologies. In fact, the first remodeling of NLP that I did with Meta-States resulted in *the Mind-Lines model*. Mind-Lines remodels the old “sleight of mouth” patterns to create a more conscious and structured way to reframe. It did that by specifying seven directions for sending a brain: deframing, reframing, counter-framing, pre-framing, post-framing, outframing, and analogous framing.⁸

Another design flaw of the classic model of NLP, continued in the New Code, is the false labeling of the cinematic features of our movies. These cinematic features which we edit in the movies in our mind are not *sub* at all, but *meta*. The Newest Code corrects this mistake to show that the so-called “sub-modalities” are actually meta-modalities. By showing the interface between the language of the Meta-Model, the perceptual filters of the Meta-Programs model, the state and layers distinctions of the Meta-States model, and the cinematic features as editorial framing. (See *Sub-Modalities Going Meta*). As a result, this explains why some Meta-Model distinctions are also meta-programs as well as the so-called sub-modalities. Sub-modalities could not be “sub” if they can also be found as distinctions in these other *meta*-level models.

Many have tried to create a systemic model of NLP. Systemic NLP according to the Newest Code is an integration of *the processes* of cognitive-behavioral psychology with *the content* developments in developmental psychology. This generates the creative combination of content and process of *the Matrix Model* (2002). This systemic model brings into one format every pattern, model, process, and distinction in NLP and Neuro-Semantics so that we can “follow a person’s energy” through their mind-body system and know what to do, when, and why.

This systemic model also works with frames and embedded levels of meta-frames to distinguish our inner games as our models of the world and our outer games—the actual things we say, do, and perform in the world. From this has grown numerous books and trainings that model

specific things like wealth creation, business excellence, health and fitness, courage, accelerated learning, leadership, coaching, etc. (see *Winning the Inner Game*, *Games Slim and Fit People Play*, *Games for Mastering Fear*, *Games Business Experts Play*).⁹

The Newest Code — Distinction #4 Meaning

As NLP began with a modeling of the transformations of meaning in people's communications and states, it analyzed meaning in terms of the sensory representation systems. This was the original genius of NLP as Bateson noted in his Preface to *The Structure of Magic* (1975). To this NLP contributed linguistic meaning as it detailed the interface between words and the deep structure of the sensory information. The New Code addresses this briefly as it sought to bring a broader and wider "wisdom" into play through perceptual positions and multiple descriptions.

The Newest Code takes this much further by recognizing the infinite progress of self-reflexivity in creating multiple layers of frames and states and with each new one, new levels and kinds of meanings. Beyond representational and linguistic meaning, however, there are many other kinds of meanings: perceptual, intentional, metaphorical, contextual, evaluative, cultural, etc. And all of these interface with each other to create the multi-layered nature of our mental maps—a Matrix of meanings.

The Newest Code explores *the meaning scale* and uses it to create the Meaning/Performance Axes which is the structural framework of the Self-Actualization Quadrants. This development enables us now to model self-actualization as a process of adult development. In the new Self-Actualization model, as well as in the Matrix model, this gives us *the Construct* for meaning-making and the many new patterns for expanding one's ability to create meaning, suspend meaning, quality control meaning, etc. (*Unleashed*, *Coaching Change*).

It also gives rise to the Crucible process for an unlearning strategy. This is for suspending old meanings that have become so integrated and unconscious that they are now in neurology and part of our very fabric of reality.

The Newest Code — Distinction #5 Outside-of-Consciousness

From the beginning NLP addressed that which is generically called "the unconscious mind." And it did this in several ways. Most obvious was the original modeling of Milton Erickson and his hypnotic language patterns. In the classical code this resulted in the Milton Model for using hypnotic language patterns, process patterns (pace and lead), etc. A less obvious development was the Strategies model that updated the original Miller, Galanter, and Pribram TOTE model for making explicit the "unconscious" processes occurring in the "black box" between stimulus and response.

John Grinder, however, writes,

“When the classic code was developed, there was no explicit reference to the unconscious mind and no formal means of engaging with it. This has been rectified in the New Code and is an essential element.”¹⁰

Actually, I don’t think that John is accurate in this statement. After all, 6-step reframing is in *Frogs into Princes* (chapter 3, pages 137-160) and that book was published in 1979 so that would make it part of the classic code, not the New Code. Of course, in the New Code¹⁹⁸³ there is also no clear and precise definition of what John, Judith, or Carmen mean by this vague phrase, “the unconscious mind.” And while they present the code correction of the New Code¹⁹⁸³ as a “conscious / unconscious interface” at the very same time they also make “the unconscious” as the preferred choice.

“The intent for unconscious uptake is to prevent students from making conscious links between what they think they are learning and what they know already that they think relates to it. Ideally, students learn unconsciously, then allow the patterns to generalise and be expressed unconsciously until sometime later, the students starts to gain conscious awareness. ... The new code promotes unconscious competence which may be followed by conscious appreciation.” (pages 6, 9)

Because this has led many in NLP to *devalue conscious awareness* and to believe all kinds of mythological things—like skillful competence of procedural knowledge can be installed unconsciously without going through conscious learning, the Newest Code of NLP seeks to make a code correction of this design flaw. We do this by using the reflexivity of the Meta-States Model to recognize and accesses our higher levels of awareness. These higher levels or frames are outside-of-consciousness and operate like the mental atmosphere within which we live and operate. This is one of the usages of the term “unconscious.”¹¹

The difference between the First Code¹⁹⁷³, the New Code¹⁹⁸³, and the Newest Code of Neuro-Semantics 2008 is that we have put the emphasis back on *conscious mindfulness* so that people can “run their own brains.” The assumption of both Bandler and Grinder is that “the unconscious” (whatever that means) is the most powerful, the most creative, and the most important part of human nature. John expressed this in an 1996 interview in this way:

“The structure of the unconscious –easily the factor most influential in our success in life – or more correctly said, the relationship which we have with our unconscious is easily the factor most important in our success in life...” (page 8)¹²

Summary

- C If you liked the First Code, and then the New Code of 1983 as I do, then you will love the NLP Newest Code of Meta-States which is the foundation for Neuro-Semantics. It will give you the most cutting-edge new code for working with the structure of subjectivity and for modeling complex subjective states.
- C Working with self-reflexive consciousness, the Meta-States model has remodeled NLP in many ways to give it a new form. It makes NLP more systemic, completes the contributions of Bateson, Korzybski, and Maslow to NLP as a model of actualizing one’s

highest and best resources. And it makes the model more systematic as a whole.

	The Newest Code	Design Flaw
1) <i>States</i>	Kinds and levels of states beyond primary states, meta-states and gestalt states.	No recursiveness or self-reflexivity, the term “meta” falsely equated with “dissociation”
2) <i>Levels</i>	The psycho-logics of the rich spiraling of our mind. Infinite layering of levels.	Logical levels viewed as rigid and hierarchical
3) <i>Frames and Games</i>	Seven directions of reframing, the infinite progress of outframing. Embedded frames that create the Matrix Model, systemic NLP	Cinematic features of our inner movies framed as “sub-modalities” Lack of a systemic model
4) <i>Meaning</i>	The kinds and levels of meaning, the scale of meaning, the Axis of meaning.	Only two levels, no recursiveness or self-reflexivity
5) <i>Out-of-Consciousness</i>	The reflexive layering of levels via Meta-States enabling us to access our higher levels of awareness outside-of-consciousness.	The de-valuation of the conscious mind, Futile attempts to “install” competencies through unconscious methods.

References:

1. Judith DeLozier’s presentation at to The Central London NLP Group, 1993, “Mastery, New Coding and Systemic NLP,” edited by James Lawley, published in *The Model*, BBNLP Target Printing, UK. 2005.
2. See the 1996 interview with John Grinder, Ph.D. on www.inspiritive.com.au.
3. Sometime later John has claimed that the New Code as also developed by Carmen Bostic St. Clair. In his 1996 interview on www.inspiritive.com.au there is only him and Judith DeLozier mentioned.
4. Graham Dawes, Ph.D., NLP Trainer, review of *Meta-States* (1995) in both *NLP World* and *Anchor Point*.
5. John Grinder and his co-author of *Whispering in the Wind* acknowledged that the third perceptual position was a meta-state and a useful one. As for the Meta-States Model, Grinder questioned “why this proliferation of meta-states?” And expressed difficulty understanding the meta-levels that Robert Dilts and I have mapped out. See www.neurosemantics.com for an extended series of responses between myself and Grinder.
6. This explains the question John Grinder raised in *Whispering in the Wind*, namely, why the need for the proliferation of meta-states?
7. See the book, *Figuring Out People* (2006) for a list of 60 meta-programs and a chapter describing how

we meta-state meta-programs into existence.

8. See the book, *Mind-Lines: Lines for Changing Minds* (2005).

9. See *NLP Going Meta*, a book on using meta-levels in modeling.

10. From “New Code of NLP,” by Chris Collingwood, www.inspiritive.com.au.

11. See the article, “Which Unconscious Mind do you Train?” on www.neuro-semantic-trainings.com which specifies five usages of the term “unconscious” mind.

12. See the 1996 interview with John Grinder, Ph.D. on www.inspiritive.com.au.

THE NEWEST CODE REVOLUTION OF NLP

Facets of the remodeling of NLP by the Meta-States Model of Neuro-Semantics.

NLP Domain	Facets of the Model 1972– 1985	The Meta-State Revolution 1994 to the present
1) The Meta-Model of Language	11 distinctions <i>Structure of Magic</i> (1975)	21 distinctions <i>Communication Magic</i> (2001)
2) Meta-Programs	14 distinctions	60 distinctions <i>Figuring Out People</i> (2006)
3) Sub-Modalities	“Down” metaphor	“Up” metaphor: Cinematic Features <i>Sub-Modalities Going Meta</i> (2005)
4) Modeling Subjectivity Strategy Model	<i>NLP Volume I</i> (1980) Horizontal modeling	<i>NLP Going Meta</i> (2005) Vertical Modeling
5) Reframing patterns	14 distinctions <i>Sleight of Mouth</i>	26 distinctions <i>Mind-Lines</i> (2005) <i>Winning the Inner Game</i> (2006)
6) States Resourceful States, Genius states	<i>Frogs into Princes</i> (1979) <i>Strategies of Genius</i> (Dilts)	<i>Meta-States</i> (200) <i>States of Equilibrium</i> (Burton, 2003) <i>Secrets of Personal Mastery</i> (1999) <i>7 Steps to Emotional Intelligence</i> (2003) (Bridoux) <i>Instant Relaxation</i> (Lederer) <i>In the Zone</i> (Goodenough, Cooper, 2007)
7) Resourcefulness Self-Actualization	Best States Strategies of Genius	Self-Actualization Model Self-Actualization Quadrant <i>Unleashed</i> (2007), <i>Self-Actualization Psychology</i> (2008)
8) Time-Lines	“Lines” for time 2 time experiences 3 time zones	<i>Adventures in Time</i> (1997) 16 kinds and levels of time “Circles” for time
9) Personality Therapy		<i>Structure of Personality</i> (2001) <i>Dragon Slaying</i> (2000), <i>Games for Mastering Fear</i> (2001)
10) Patterns		<i>Meta-State Magic Patterns</i> <i>Sourcebook of Magic</i> , Vol I and II <i>User’s Manual of the Brain, I and II</i>

11) Business
Coaching

Games Business Experts Play
Meta-Coaching Series: I, II, III

Old Code

Meta-Model
Representation Systems
Sub-Modalities

Strategies
Pattern
Presuppositions

New Code (1983)

States: Best States
Know-Nothing States
Conscious - Unconscious relationship

Balance Practice and Spontaneity
Perceptual Positions: 1, 2 and 3
Multiple Descriptions

Newest Code 2008

Higher levels of states
Meta-States
Levels: Psycho-logics
Mindfulness, Reflexivity
Frames: 7 framing processes
Meaning: kinds, levels, scale,
Axis of Meaning