



Landsiedel
NLP Training

Aikido rhetoric

The royal road of negotiation psychology

By Ralf Zunker



Imprint:

© 2018 Stephan Landsiedel
Friedrich-Ebert-Straße 4
97318 Kitzingen Germany
www.landsiedel-seminare.de

Publisher and editor: Stephan Landsiedel, Kitzingen Author:
Ralf A. Zunker

Ralf Zunker has sadly passed away. We wish his family, friends and acquaintances much strength!

The work, including its parts, is protected by copyright. Any use is not permitted without the consent of the publisher and the author. This applies in particular to electronic or other reproduction, translation, distribution and making available to the public.

AIKIDO rhetoric

The royal road of negotiation psychology

In this e-book you will learn,

an introduction to AIKIDO rhetoric:

- The physics of conversation
- How you guide impulses
- And the first strategies

Publisher Stephan Landsiedel hopes you enjoy reading and trying it out!

"WHO DANCES WITH THE WORD!"

I argue hard, but fairly!

I convince my counterpart with my good arguments. Every potential customer buys on the basis of my stringent, logical arguments ... I'm sure this also corresponds to your experience. Your son tidies his room on his own because of your rational reasoning and your partner takes the garbage outside, highly motivated and imbued with inner conviction. Right?

If rational arguments had this persuasive power, our world would look different. Although we repeatedly told the fairy tale of the factual level and common sense, this does not seem to be established in our reality. Strange, illogical and emotional communication styles present themselves to us and our negotiating skills are often put to a very tough test.

Admittedly, this may be true for our private lives, but not for everyday working life...

Right?

If our decision-making ability were based solely on objective reasoning, we would probably have had a shopping computer and a sales computer long ago

and delegated a large part of our negotiations.

Fortunately, that's not the case. It's still people talking to people: People talk to people, people negotiate with people, people trust people.

People communicate rationally, irrationally, factually, emotionally, contradictorily, illogically ... refreshingly human. If we want to reach people, we have to speak their language; it is precisely this aspect that is often overlooked, often ridiculed: the human factor.

In many areas of communication, attempts have been made to adapt people to a rational, reason-dominated style of communication. It is time to adapt our communication to people.

Today we know that persuasiveness is based on

- human closeness
- excellent timing
- and the virtuoso handling of the energies of the conversation.

Just as we describe forces in physics using vectors or know and use different directions of movement in martial arts we can

very specific energies can be captured during conversations and negotiations. Professional balancing and juggling with these forces leads to extremely high-quality persuasion potential.

AIKIDO rhetoric

The physics of conversation

To the forces within communication more clearly, it helps to take a look at our Asian neighbors and their martial arts. In every martial art, regardless of whether it is judo, taekwando, karate, jiu-jitsu or aikido, you take the energy of the other person and direct it in a direction that makes sense for you.

The energies of the conversation

In my seminars, I illustrate this by asking a participant from the audience to join me on stage and doing the following exercise with them: we both stretch out our arms and put our palms together.

Give impetus

Now we both press our hands together and try to push each other away. This corresponds to the situation of arguing with each other. We both push, our posture and our muscles

become firm, faces hard, movement freezes and becomes static. While everyone secretly hopes that they might be stronger after all and push the other away from their spot. This is how many negotiations go. We believe that we can push the other person into a position that is favorable to us, and even more so, we hope that the other person will even be happy to leave their spot.

"point of view", agrees with us and then naturally follows our impulses with great satisfaction. Every seminar participant recognizes immediately that this will rarely be the case. As a rule, there is a standstill.

Why? Because no one is willing to be pushed away. Everyone "stands their ground", pressure up, tension arises, it costs an immense amount of energy and the result is usually a balance of power.

In short: we don't move a millimeter. This is exactly how we often experience many discussions and negotiations. The negotiation gets bogged down or revolves around the argumentation point. When the pressure finally becomes too great, many a constructive conversation breaks down because the other party is so unyielding. This is the same with the energy of arguing.

Why do we push at all? Well, secretly we want to push harder (better arguments) in order to direct the other person to where we would like them to be.

When I try to do this in the seminar, this always happens

Same: Suddenly - almost as if by appointment - my partner presses against my hand with even more force and the result is the same again: standstill. When I ask him why he is pushing harder now, many people tell me that it happened almost automatically, almost as a reflex. Nobody wants to be pushed against the wall. It's human nature and at the same time a law of physics: stronger force requires (to a certain extent) stronger counterforce.

Of course, I still have the idea that I should be able to force my counterpart in my desired direction by expending more energy.

And if I succeed in doing this, the reaction of the seminar participant is always the same: He feels uncomfortable, feels like a "loser", he had to give up his point of view, didn't know which way to go because he can't see the path behind him, feels taken by surprise, ignored, etc. At this point, I try to something clear: I almost casually walk away from my exercise partner while continuing to communicate with the other participants.

What do you think my practice partner does instinctively during this time? He doesn't stay where I have directed him, but approaches his original starting point again almost imperceptibly. When I speak to him about this, it almost always becomes clear that it is

He didn't notice it himself, he just "somehow didn't want to stay where he was". As is so often the case in life, the receipt comes later: "You know, I've reconsidered the whole thing ..." (cancellation), inner resignation, etc. We can't win like this in the long run!

Take impulse

What other options are there? The other person could give in. It is noticeable that we often no longer enjoy the game if the other person always gives in immediately. In a way, we fall into a hole because our hand immediately follows the hand of the other person. This explains why people who always want to please everyone are rarely or never appreciated or respected.

Leave impulse

Another variant: I can switch to the side of my conversation partner. The pressure is suddenly relieved because there is no longer an opponent to push against. We share the same point of view for a moment. We don't move, nor do we give in, as we can change our position again at any time, but there is no more pressure and we are free. At the same time, we relax the system and make it more flexible. A phenomenon that is often observed in the seminar is that at the moment when I take the other person's point of view,

he unconsciously switches to my point of view. From my personal observation, this happens in around 65 to 70 percent of cases. Here, too, we find out in the subsequent questioning that my training partner was not aware of his behavior.

Forward pulse

Alternatively, my opponent could suddenly pull his hand away and send me flying into the void. No martial artist would stop the other person's fist with their face, and yet we very often do exactly that in our negotiations and then complain that we have been "hurt".

Describe impulse

I can also describe what is happening between us in a very matter-of-fact way. "You push against my hand, I push against yours." "Our points of view are here in room X and Y."

Edit impulse

I change the impulse of my counterpart in order to to "double-cross" them. This approach is the rule in martial arts, but is not in fair communication, where it is called manipulation.

Lead impulse

AIKIDO rhetoric

How about we give in? No, we don't give in, of course. The other person should give in.

Giving in means showing weakness. Giving in means going under, wasn't that the case? Unfortunately, we often have the winner-loser concept in mind during our conversations. And who wants to be the loser? Does giving in really mean losing? Conversely, does statically insisting on your convictions mean winning? Or are they both losing now? No, you might say, we've been through all that before. It used to be said *that "the wiser man gives in"* that ultimately means that the wiser man gives in until he is the stupid one. Let's take a more nuanced look at this approach: In our exercise, I now ask the participant to keep pressing under all circumstances, no matter what I do. What happens?

I go back, "give in". My partner pushes further and takes a few steps forward. I go back further and again my partner will follow.

If my partner keeps pushing, something surprising happens. I can set the course and let him follow, so to speak. Eventually, I give in more and more, can follow arcs, curves, loops or zig-zags, my participant becomes more and more

follow me willingly. Sometimes I can now direct him with just one finger with complete ease. The firmer his pressure is, the easier it is for me to take the lead.

This is physically very economical, because my partner acts as the driving force and I as the steering wheel, and although I give in on the one hand, can clearly set the course on the other and steer my partner where I want to go. That is the magic of "Yielding".

Let's expand the term "give in" and call **"going with the energy"**.

Does this mean that I should become a yes-man who always talks down to others? Absolutely not! Rather, it's about skillfully using the power of the other person, just like in Aikido. In this way, you save your own strength. You don't want to push the train, you want to set the course intelligently.

This form of guidance works until the other person realizes that they are being controlled or that there is no longer any counter-pressure. If he notices this, his efforts to push suddenly stop. This would also be a benefit, as we could now both consider how we want to proceed next. I can, of course, provide an impulse myself by applying gentle pressure.

Pushing, dodging, pulling, yielding - now a dance ensues.

That's exactly what we want! We want to dance with our counterpart. We want to move in order to find new, creative solutions together with momentum and ease. Let us all use the energies just mentioned: Pressure, counter-pressure, yielding, evasion, rhythm and vibration.

Let's dance in an expanded form of eloquent art. 40 years of stage experience with the audience, 30 years of direct didactic experience and the analysis and optimization of several hundred negotiations on all social playgrounds have taught me that this is exactly the way everyone "Knots" of hardened conversations can be loosened. Absolutely suitable for everyday use, intercultural and effective.

Let's take a first look at the energies of AIKIDO rhetoric:

Give impetus

The communication styles of arguing and confronting can be found here.

Argue

Arguing is divided into

- Suggest
- Justify

Confront

Confront has the subgroups

- Rate
- Demand
- Threat

Take impulse

These include Inviting
and accompanying

Invite

- Enter
- Listen
- Reveal

Accompany

- Visioning
- Match
- Analogize

Forward pulse Redirect

- Quick-wittedness
- Humor & wit
- Charm

By avoidance we mean areas such as

- Postpone
- Overhearing
- Tabooing

Describe impulse

- Summarize

Leave impulse

- Cooperate

Edit impulse

- Manipulate

Strategies for the colors:

Give impetus

The strategies that provide impetus are offensive approaches, in which one's own point of view is clarified and underpinned should be.

Argue

We often want to convince our partner with arguments and secretly hope that they will accept one of our arguments with conviction. But is this really the case? Do we really always want to convince or are we often already with influencing?

Is it really always important to us that the spouse is convinced and takes the garbage downstairs with inner enthusiasm, or is it enough for us that they simply do it? Do we really want to convince our employees or is it enough for us to get them to act? The moment the boss leaves the room, it is clear whether the employees are really convinced. Employees are often not convinced, they are often influenced.

If you want to use your rank less to influence, it is important to use arguments in such a way that they are convincing. Only use arguments that offer a clear benefit to your counterpart. Be sparing with examples and REASONS. For every example there can be a counter-example.

Sort your arguments into weak, medium and strong in terms of their persuasive power. Start with the middle one, then lead with the weak one and end with the strong one. Good arguments can be repeated. (Think of Cato the Elder:

"Carthage must be destroyed!")

Confront

Clarity of purpose:

Be clear about your goals. DEMANDS, EVALUATIONS and THREATS can be very harmful if they do not really serve your goal.

Stay in control of yourself and the negotiation. CLAIMS, ASSESSMENTS and THREATS always be clear and direct, but never aggressive. Separate person and action. Refrain from using softeners, subjunctives and relativizations.

Take impulse

Through the impulse-taking technique, you and your negotiating partner go through a joint thought process that can lead one of you or both of you to a new perspective.

Invite

Builds relationships and serves to obtain information. Pay attention to the absolute purity of this style. Including assessments or demands is counterproductive. Body language must be congruent with the content! Give the interviewer the opportunity to choose the course of the conversation. Selective consent allows you to keep control of the conversation. Separate the situation from the person. If you cannot agree with the other person on the facts, you may be able to agree with their emotions. Listen actively and signal this. Empathetic listening creates trust. Be careful not to use self-disclosure too early. In general, your self-disclosure can have a very disarming effect. Some negotiating partners use very perfidious negotiating techniques and surprisingly come up against

DISCLOSURE, which in many cases leads to the negotiating partner no longer being able to maintain his strategies and, to a certain extent, being forced into the cooperation is "forced". Self-revelations should be balanced between the parties in the long term. If there is one-sidedness on your side, stop in the long term. Break off immediately if the other side makes judgments or even demands. Stay true to yourself. Only agree to what you really want. Keep your emotions under control. Openly address your own mistakes. When attacking mistakes on your part → actively listen.

Accompany

Develop empathy. Show emotions. Pay attention to congruence of content, emphasis and body language. Find common ground. Use the "specific-vague" technique when visualizing. Use unspecific verbs, modal operators, redemptions. Open loops. Use the reciprocity principle of cooperation. Take the first step. Make an attractive offer to the other party or reach an agreement that is important for the negotiating partner and implement it immediately.

Dodge impulse

Use the "magic pause button". Use it whenever the situation threatens to get bogged down or

the feelings take on a life of their own. Use the Joschka Fischer technique against stress to the amygdala. Use humor in a partner-specific and targeted manner. This creates temporary distance from the subject and relaxes the situation. Always relate humor to the situation, never to the other person. Particularly elegant: relate the humor to yourself. Use the evasion technique constructively to engage in meta-reflection. If you want to end the contact temporarily, make sure that you signal to your listener that you are willing to resume the conversation. (If necessary, make an appointment straight away).

Describe impulse

Summarize

To summarize a situation, avoid hermeneutics. Present your subjective perception as such. Use facts. Put the result in writing and have it confirmed. Also record the reasons that spoke in favor of a certain result. You may have to justify your decision again afterwards.

First strategies

The opening

The first time I played chess with my life partner and made the very first move, she said very calmly, almost casually: "If you open like that, you'll be checkmated in twenty moves." She wrong! ... it was only nineteen.

How could she make such a prediction? Are there openings that maneuver us into such a determinable position from the outset? Can the entire game be determined by a more or less valuable opening alone? Absolutely in chess. Does this also apply to negotiations and negotiations? What could an effective and efficient opening look like?

What can a negotiation concept look like that also takes irrational behavior into account? How can I adapt to an interlocutor who may only be able to consciously comprehend part of his behavior? This is where the negotiation psychology of AIKIDO rhetoric comes in. First of all, it is important to the popular pitfalls. And that is why the first rule of negotiation psychology applies:

1. Never open the negotiation with an argument. The disadvantages at a glance:

- They build up pressure.
- You commit yourself and lose your flexibility.
- You don't yet know which of your arguments will be of interest to your interviewer.
- are of importance.
- You may overlook something essential for your negotiating partner because you take it for granted.
- You are gambling away your "pull effect".

But how do we know what is of decisive importance for our counterpart?

1. Write down everything the other person says.
Do not comment on what is said, except with short comments such as "interesting", "aha", "mhmm", etc. Make sure that you are as non-judgmental as possible and only utter one word or sound.
2. Ask open questions!
Open questions, if they do not have the character of an interrogation, help our counterpart to open up and give us the opportunity to gain an insight into his way of thinking and his decision-making behavior. It is then much easier to argue from his point of view. We call this **partner-oriented benefit argumentation!**

Dale Carnegie's quote also applies here:

"The worm must taste good to the fish, not the angler!"

However, many "anglers" prepare their hooks with Wiener schnitzel or cream cake. No wonder that no fish bite here.

However, there are other disadvantages to starting the conversation with arguments:

- They commit themselves too firmly and are no longer able to act flexibly enough later on.
- They do not respect the law of timing. An argument carries much more weight if it is offered at the right time. Some people have already exhausted their arguments before the other person even starts.
- Furthermore, any of my arguments can be qualified by follow-up questions, so that I am forced to provide further arguments without there being any need for my interlocutor to act in any way.
- From a psychological point of view, I don't give my partner much leeway if I've already made my point. The other person no longer expresses themselves so impartially if we have already told them how we see things.
- We dominance through our behavior and may even provoke contradiction.

Therefore, prepare yourself your negotiation and your negotiating partner in the best possible way. The better your preparation, the better your starting position.

2. Ask questions

What should a constructive questioning technique look like? Many of us have learned the phrase "He who asks, leads!" in rhetoric. Let's put this oft-quoted phrase to the test:

*Suppose your partner likes to go on vacation with you to Greenland every year. However, you have now decided that you would like to go to the Maldives. Confident of victory, because you learned in the rhetoric seminar "**He who asks, leads**", you start the conversation with the words: "Honey, where do we want to go on vacation this year?" Your sweetheart replies: "Oh, let's to Greenland again, it was always so nice there!" ... Hit sunk.*

Now you really have come a long way. If you ask, you don't lead! With this question, we have achieved for our partner exactly what we wanted to avoid with ourselves: he has himself argumentatively by making a statement. In doing so, he's pinned himself down and robbed himself of his own mobility. Moving him away from this position without losing face is likely to prove difficult.

Therefore please note:

Do NOT ask questions at the beginning of the conversation that are binding.

Don't ask closed questions: "*Do you want to go somewhere else this year?*", because at best you have a fifty-fifty chance, or questions of the kind where the partner commits to their point of view by making a statement.

At the start of the conversation, ask questions about your partner's motives, wishes, values, background, options for action and decision criteria.

Find out what is really important and significant for your counterpart.

One conceivable question could be: "*What is your important on your vacation?*", "*What do you need on your vacation?*"

For example, if your partner answers that nature is important to them, long walks with you, intimate togetherness, etc., then it quickly becomes clear that these needs can also be met elsewhere in the world. We have detached ourselves from the pure point of view and look for the goal behind the goal. Of course, some people may object: "*And what if she says that her snow*

and ice are important?" Well, then of course we have a problem with the Maldives. To make it very clear at this point: rhetoric is not a panacea and there will never be a phrase with which you will always and unfailingly be successful; and that is precisely what makes communication so interesting, because we never know how it will really turn out. However, it is certainly possible to give yourself and your partner more freedom, the freedom and the dance floor, so that we can move better together and perhaps find a solution that satisfies us both.

These were the first small insights into the negotiation aikido strategy. We hope we have been able to inspire and stimulate you and perhaps you would like to look into it in more detail. We would be happy to support you in this. You can find more information at www.zunker-academy.eu

For a long time, we believed that people had to adapt to rationally stringent communication instead of the energies of conversation serving people. For too long, we have seen arguments as a tool of persuasion par excellence and neglected the valuable balance of power. For far too long, we have submitted to the doctrine of scarcity and believed that there must be winners and losers in negotiations instead of using the scope for negotiation creatively and profitably.

expand. People want to be noticed. They need appreciation without judgment. It is more important to them to be understood than to be proven right. They act on the basis of emotions, values, benefits and their personal ethics. People are more human than we often think.

I wish you many enriching negotiations and discussions.

Ralf A. Zunker mag. art.