

History of Freedom Seminar and Neuro-Semantic Programming Part III

by

Dennis K. Chong & Jennifer K. Smith Chong ©

In this article, all male pronouns will apply to either gender
The nominal pronoun will refer to the first author.
The spelling of words is in British English.

As we look back, we smile at what truly were the extra-ordinary beginnings of the Freedom Seminar, FS, in 1983. They were seemingly so singularly modest.

In those days we called it the General Orientation. We chose to call it so because of the story of what took place in a city in the United States when its el trains on a given turn of a switch became true subway trains. That night the police precincts were inundated with innumerable calls from a disturbed and concerned citizenry. However, the desk sergeants were not able to work out the criminal basis for the distress calls. An enquiry was set up to explore what happened.

The finding was that because of the significant diminution in the noise pollution once the trains went underground, people were unaccustomed to the new relative silence. As a result they became distressed and anxious. The enquiry described this as a general orientation that the public was undergoing.

In a commensurate manner, the FS generates a change in thinking that for the patient is a General Orientation. They get a significant shift in their thinking, but one that is according to them. Certainly once the two frames are taught, the individual faces a choice. It is either to stay in the semantic anomalies of the Blame Frame or shift over to the Non-Aristotelian language system.

The time came when we felt so sure that it was sufficient just to offer the FS as it was developed and that it would be the end of **A** in a person. Alas, we did not realize this at that time:

I shall not dwell on the martyrology of genius; the title of this section refers to the remarkable form of blindness which often prevents the original thinker from perceiving the meaning and significance of *his own discovery*.

Arthur Koestler: *The Act of Creation* Arkana, published by the Penquin Group 1964 page 216.

We did not know how truly blind we were about what we had discovered. It was in 1995 that a patient, Jo Kemp came to me and told me:

Thank you for the Freedom Seminar.
It helped me tremendously¹.
But I am still in the Blame Frame.

¹ It helped me tremendously:

It did so because she finally understood her widower father who came every Christmas from England. He was a Blame Framer. Now she knew how to respond to him. For her it was the most wonderful Christmas.

I could not believe what I was hearing. However she persisted. All I could do was to tell her that I would talk to Jennifer. Together we had to find out how it was possible that the language structures of **A** would still remain *in situ* in a person after all the excellent attested-in-experience changes by the FS.

We were to conclude that it had to be the imprints of the language structures of **A** that the FS could not remove.

Given that the semantic language structures of **A** had their natural opposites in \bar{A} , we immediately realized that all we had to do was apply the manoeuvre that we had been taught in NLP. It was that of collapsing anchors. It was a very simple matter to think out the format of what became known as the De-Imprinting Seminar, De-I. Its manual was created and we offered this seminar for the first time in 1997.

It was three years later, in 1998, when another student, Tom Wood came to me. He thanked me for the help from the FS and the De-I. However, he said, "I am still in the Blame Frame." I can still remember thinking **NO!** I felt such a shattering blow within me by the truth of Koestler's insight that I was truly **BLIND**.

Again, all I could do was to tell Tom that I would speak to Jennifer. I told her:

You won't believe this.

Even with the FS and De-I, they are still in the BF.

We had no choice but to accept that it was true. Our problem was to find out how it was possible. The answer came to us. The language structures of **A** are an integral part of the brain – seared into it. The brain and thus the mind was welded to **A**.

We knew that we had the antidote. It was \bar{A} . Then we realized that its effectiveness and efficiency could be buttressed by the Modified Meta Model, 3M. It was also clear that we had to teach our students, Informal Logic so that they could have the ways to deal with its formats. As a system Informal Logic is mostly semantically ill-formed.

It was therefore a simple matter to create this language seminar and its manual which we named the Power Seminar, PS. We named it so, because whoever mastered what we taught, we knew would thereafter have the language power over his life.

So in 1999 we put on the first PS.

It was soon after that we realized the place of the No-Y-ian Seminar, ~YS. It was the first seminar in a very long while that unfolded out of our wit and not by the gracious guidance of our students. He ~YS is based on this truth that it is one thing to know that something is semantically ill-formed. However, it is not true to conclude that this knowing carries the corollary that the person knows how to fend off or undo its imputations. One has to be taught what to do. In this way it is best to know how to defend against its imputations.

Today, it is clear that to study NSP one has to do:

1. the Freedom Seminar, FS
2. the De-Imprinting Seminar, De-I
3. the Power Seminar, PS
4. the No-Y-ian Seminar.

At this point we heaved a sigh of relief thinking there was nothing more to do. Then, in 2004 we came to a horrendous discovery. We had assumed that once we taught the languages that our students would be automatically fluent in their use. This was an insane conclusion.

It was insane because it was like a trainer giving you a four-day seminar about the principles of aeronautics and how to fly a Cessna, and then to expect you to hop into one, take off, fly around and land it. When was anyone ever able to learn a language system in four days and is, *ipso facto*, immediately thereafter be fluent in its usage.

This then was the beginning of the No-Y-ian Tutorials.

The students had to master *Science and Sanity*, *Don't Ask Why?!* and *Power and Elegance in Communication*, PEOPLE, PARADIGMS and Paradoxes.

In was whilst on the path of doing the tutorials that we knew that it was fitting to offer to our students the tests by which we could give them an:

[accreditation-of-competency over what they were learning.](#)

After two years I signaled to our students that they might let me know that they were ready to sit the examinations. None came forward. In the third year I again put it to them to step forward to do the examination. Again, none did. Then at the beginning of the fourth year, I urged them to. Nothing happened. Then half way in the fourth year I announced the date of the examination. The senior students had to do it. If they elected not to do it on the first pass in August they had a second chance in October. If they still did not register for it, then by their action they would end their relations with the No-Y-ian Tutorials.

It was interesting that under this pressure that two students stepped forward to do the examination and they passed. And for that we heave a sigh of relief. For the first time in human history there are accredited today Practitioners in Neuro-Semantic Programming.



They are now proceeding to the:

[Master No-Y-ian Tutorials.](#)

So, at this stage, we thought we had done all that we were to do.

However three years ago, it became so obvious that the Freedom Seminar could not be a thing that was to be reserved only for our office patients.

[It was something for all humankind.](#)

The business to take the FS out to the world was named the No-Y-ian Project. Three years ago, the Executive Committee of the No-Y-ian Project was formed. What is the mission statement of the No-Y-ian Project?

The mission statement of the No-Y-ian Project is to offer to this world a better and more powerful set of language structures than the impoverishing and crippling ones that people live by today.

For us all, is a deep knowing that this is a daunting task. However, we know that on the grounds of ethics and morality, we have to do our best-in-conscience in this endeavour.