

- The final negotiated fee for that crew's technology was \$8 million. Why? Because that's what it was worth. Win-win would never have netted what that technology was worth.

- When I was in the air force, I learned, first in the classroom and then by practice in the cockpit, decision after decision, mistake after mistake, that I could not directly control the actions and decisions of my adversary, but I could, through trained habits, better manage my assessment of my adversary and make certain that it was accurate.

- I focused on what I could control—the means—not what I could not control—the end. The focus of this book is teaching you how to do the same during negotiation, because too many negotiators do just the opposite. They focus on what they cannot control—the end—while losing sight of what they can control—the means.

- To repeat: Win-win is often win-lose because it invites unnecessary compromise, because it is emotion-based, not decision-based, and because it plays to the heart, not to the head. And one more thing: Win-win is not based on definitive principles; it's based on mush like the definition of a "wise agreement" I've already cited. A win-win negotiation is not controlled in a clear, step-by-step way. That's just one reason win-win gets slaughtered in the real business world, again and again and again.

- It is absolutely imperative that you as a negotiator understand the importance of this point. You do NOT need this deal, because to be needy is to lose control and make bad decisions.

- Harris slips and falls on a hillside—and the lion is on him in a flash! Harris manages to fire his gun and scare the lion away, but he doesn't shoot him, because he has always known and never forgotten that the lion is a predator, first and foremost, and will behave like a predator when given the opportunity and sensing weakness. Every animal trainer knows the same thing: with a predator, it's all about power.

- With experience they have learned that neediness can have—will have—a dramatic, always negative effect on their behavior. You must overcome any neediness at the negotiating table.

- Consider this appeal for an appointment: "Mr. Smith, this is Bob Jones. I'm with First Advantage Venture Fund, and I want to see if I could get ten minutes on your calendar so I can show you how we can work with you in the future." Remember, new companies aren't the only parties who can be needy. Some start-ups are well funded and choosy regarding any venture capitalist they may bring in. The investors can also get into the needy mode, just as Bob Jones did while more or less begging for this appointment. Bob should have said: "Bill, my name is Bob Jones. I'm not quite sure that we as a venture fund fit where you're going. I just don't know. What I'd like to do is meet with you so we can see where you're going and you can look at where we're going at First Advantage and see if there's a fit. When's the best time on your calendar?"

- You have no great expectations, that's for sure, and your discipline is keen. You start off by saying something like: "Well, Mary, I have no idea whether what we do has any relevance for your business. I just don't know, maybe it doesn't. If not, just tell me and I'll be on my way, but if whoever handles your market research ..." And off you go—or not. It doesn't matter. Your neediness is under control.

- When emotions run hot and heavy in negotiations, the high-pitched voice is a sure sign of need. The rushed delivery is another sure sign. While needy negotiators raise their voices, negotiators under control lower their voices. So lower your voice in times of inner turmoil. Slow down.

- I wasn't needy. She was. But if she had been a Camp-trained negotiator, she'd have asked me (setting aside the language problem), "Who are these for?" When I answered she would have whistled and said, "Why would you want to spend so much money on them? A lot of money for grandparents." She would have shown no need while building my need. She'd have laid a guilt trip on me—Money's not a factor when it comes to my grandparents!—and I'd have paid 1,000 piastres, or darned close to it, because I really loved my grandparents.

- Fear of rejection is a sign of neediness—specifically, the need to be liked.

- The serious negotiator understands that he or she cannot go out into the world spending emotional energy in the effort to be liked, to be smart, to be important.

- There are other wildebeests, other gazelles. Likewise, the trained negotiator has no needs, because it just doesn't matter. There are other deals. Turn the page on this one. Let it go. I mentioned in the introduction one of my ironclad rules: "No Closing." The context was a discussion of the dangers of win-win, and how win-win implicitly urges you to focus on what you cannot control—the end—while losing sight of what you can control—the means. Now I'll add the point that urgent closing betrays neediness on your own part. You need to close. No, you don't. But maybe your adversary does.

- More bad deals are signed and more sales are lost because of neediness than because of any other single factor. If there's any need in this negotiation it has to be your adversary's, not yours. You will never achieve the level of success of which you're capable until you understand and live this concept.

- But what happens if we simply substitute the word and the emotion "want" for "need"? The dynamics change. What picture comes to mind when you read the words "I want"? I see a bright red Porsche convertible, with a black top and interior. What is your picture? As good negotiators, the word "want" means something we work for, strive for, plan for, but it is never confused with "need." Sure I want this global alliance with Humongous, Inc., but I don't need

- The wise negotiator knows that only one person in a negotiation can feel okay, and that person is the adversary.

- By letting your adversary be a little more okay, you start to bring down barriers. By allowing him to feel in control, you, like Columbo, are actually in control.

- Surely you've noticed how every effective keynote and afterdinner speaker tells a self-deprecating story in the first few minutes of his performance. His first implicit message to the audience: You may be paying me ten grand to stand up here, and my suit may be more expensive than yours, but I'm no better than you, I'm just folks. And this is not gamesmanship. This is honesty, because, in the final analysis, everyone on this planet is just folks, one of the gang—a big gang, to be sure, but just a gang. We're all in this boat together. We're all human.

We've all made a mistake today and we'll make another one tomorrow, very possibly a whopper.

- If he likes to show off his glibness, let him. If he can't resist the opportunity to play to his charm, let him. If he likes to demonstrate his extraordinary grasp of the finest points of federal maritime law, let him. The trained negotiator is more than happy to let the adversary show off in almost any way he wants to, because that adversary's greatest strength will eventually become his greatest weakness.

- The tougher the negotiation, the more critical it is to understand that if someone in this room has to be unokay, it will be you and not your adversary. When your adversary feels unokay, the barriers go up much faster than you can break them down. But unokayness on your part breaks down barriers—like magic, often.

- In a negotiation, decisions are 100 percent emotional. Yes, 100 percent.

- facts do not win negotiations. Facts come later, because they mean nothing to the stomach.

- My system teaches us how to progress from emotions, which never produce deals that stick, to decisions that do produce deals that stick.

- Later in the negotiation (what else would you call it?), he followed up with a second request for certain coaches to tell him "no." To them he wrote, "Please tell me if you're not going to support my application through the admissions process. I'd appreciate knowing this now, because if you cannot support me, I'll move on to the other schools I'm interested in."

- I'm here to tell you that a good script that begins with a calm invitation to say no will generate about three good appointments for every ten calls, which is an unbelievable percentage, as I'm sure you'll agree.

- "Pete, I'm not sure that anything I do fits with you. I don't know. So if this doesn't make any sense, just tell me and I'll get off the phone. Is that fair?" If Pete invited me to proceed—and he usually did—I then asked, "Who do you have in your corner, Pete, who can assure you that your income will increase through coaching?" In those early days I worked with insurance companies and their sales staffs, and I could guarantee that after eighteen hours of training, a group of thirty salespeople would net ninety valid appointments with just two hours of calling apiece. That's an incredible return on investment of time, as anyone in that field knows.

- A negotiation is simply an agreement between two or more parties, with all parties having the right to veto.

- "Mrs. Smith, I have a little demonstration of what a water softener can do for you. Maybe it will interest you, maybe it won't. I don't know. If you'd like to look, I'd be happy to show you, and if you're interested, great, and if you're not, that's fine, too. I'll be on my way."

- Never "Save the Adversary" or "Save the Relationship"

- As will become quite clear, I advocate and coach respectful dealings and politeness with the adversary at all times. This is mandatory for my clients. But this practice has nothing to do with saving the adversary from taking responsibility for decisions, all for the sake of friendship

or for being liked or for feeling important. Most businesspeople, if they stop to think about this question carefully, will agree that friendships in business are the product of long-term effective dealings.

- Take responsibility for the bad decision, learn from it, embrace the failure, and soldier on without fear because you are only one decision away from getting back on track.

- Embrace “no” at every opportunity in a negotiation. Don’t fear the word, invite it. You do not take it as a personal rejection because you are not needy. You understand that every “no” is reversible.

- Nothing—absolutely nothing—is more important to a successful negotiation than for you to make as clear as possible from the very beginning that “no” is a perfectly acceptable response at this negotiating table.

- In the long run, “no” is really the safest answer. It does not tear down business relationships. It builds them. You want win-win? Saying and inviting and hearing “no” are the real win-win.

- How can you stay on track during a long negotiation or endeavor of any kind without a clear mission and purpose? There’s no other way. But if you do develop and adhere to a valid mission and purpose, how can you go off the track? It’s impossible. If you have a valid mission and purpose, and the result of your negotiation fulfills this mission and purpose, it’s a good and worthwhile negotiation.

- I teach and I preach that mission and purpose is the very essence of success. It must become as automatic as breathing. You must develop the habit of referring to it on matters great and small, because it gives you crystal-clear guidance in all cases.

- But as a president, Grant was a failure, taking bad advice, making bad decisions, dealing with a host of unsavory characters, mainly because he didn’t know why he was president and what he hoped to accomplish during Reconstruction. He didn’t have a clear mission and purpose.

- My mission and purpose is to help people see, discover, and decide to experience this world as a world of imagination and possibility and healing. We do this by sharing our stories and the model of our company, in a way that is sustainable now and into the future our children will inherit. Once he put this valid mission and purpose in place, my client could see clearly which of his subsidiary companies made sense. Once he had this clear vision, the decisions about what to keep and what to divest were easy enough. For years now he has done very well for himself and for many others by adhering to the spirit of this statement in all his businesses and negotiations.

- If you’re not working on behalf of your own mission and purpose, you’re working on behalf of someone else’s.

- When I read about such acquisition debacles, of which there are many every year, I automatically analyze the deal in terms of valid versus invalid mission and purpose.

- Another problem with concentrating on money and power as a mission and purpose is that you're scorekeeping, and scorekeeping means you're thinking about results over which you have no real control.

- Vince Lombardi of the Green Bay Packers did say, for commercial purposes, "Winning isn't everything, it is the only thing," but when I heard him address the football team at Ohio State during spring practice in 1965, I believe, he put the point somewhat differently: "Winning isn't everything, but the will to prepare to win is everything."

- Make that a valid mission and purpose. What is a valid M&P? First and foremost, it must be set in the adversary's world. For a politician and leader, it must be set in the world of his or her constituents. For a businessperson, it must be set in the world of the customer.

- My mission and purpose is to help people see, discover, and decide to experience this world as a world of imagination and possibility and healing. We do this by sharing our stories and the model of our company, in a way that is sustainable now and into the future our children will inherit.

- Your mission and purpose is to allow her or him to see and decide that you build and service the best machine for the task at a competitive price. It is not to sell ten thousand machines this fiscal year. By providing the best machine, you may sell the ten thousand, but focusing on them is putting the profit before the performance, your world before your adversary's. It won't work.

- As an interviewee for a job, your mission and purpose might be to help the employer see and decide that you are a person of great character and integrity that the employer's company must have in order to take its business to a new level.

- And what about Jim Camp, book author? My mission and purpose is to provide the opportunity for people to elevate their level of success, accomplishing this by means of clear, concise writing that presents in a systematic way the keys to decision-based negotiating.

- By now, the phrase "see and decide" in most of the mission and purpose statements presented above must be obvious. Why this phrase? Often, you want to create a vision in the other party that will move them to take action. Mission and purpose drives vision for all parties, and vision drives effective decision making for all parties. It's as simple as that. In short, you may want your adversaries to see and decide. From what perspective will they see and decide? From the perspective of their own world, of course. Therefore your mission and purpose must be set in their own world—the key criterion for a valid M&P.

- There are other criteria as well. All good mission and purpose statements are concise.

- You or your company may well have many M&Ps, because you have one for almost every major task you undertake, and for many seemingly minor tasks as well. You have the overall mission and purpose for your business or enterprise. You have a second mission and purpose for your negotiation with a specific adversary. Within that negotiation you have yet other layers of mission and purpose, each of which guides the decision making at that point. In complicated, high-stakes negotiations, my clients may have a written mission and purpose

for almost every phone call to anyone on the other side. No kidding. And each, of course, is set in the world of the adversary.

- Your mission and purpose can and perhaps should change.

- In his excellent book *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, and Practices*, Peter Drucker dedicates many pages to the issue of understanding what it is you really do—your mission and purpose. He writes, “Your business is never apparent. It requires in-depth questioning that gives you a process that provides constant refocusing of what you do.” You must continuously analyze and ask yourself: What is my business? What is my mission? What is my purpose? As you set a valid mission and purpose in place, you will discover that the picture of what you are trying to accomplish becomes crystal clear and you eliminate all confusion.

- Stop Trying to Control the Outcome Focus on Your Behavior and Actions Instead

- Our subject now is goals. Just as with mission and purpose, I believe in these tools but call for a very different approach from the usual one. My clients do not set sales targets, quotas, numbers, percentages. Never. Instead, they set goals they can control.

- the real answer to what we can control about ourselves: behavior and activity, or as I sometimes put it, an action or effort to an end. Your anger following an insult is not under your control, but your behavior is. You decide whether to strike back in some way or to turn the other cheek.

- Goals you can control, objectives you cannot. By following your behavioral goals, you get to your objectives. One last time: instead of trying to break par (or bogey, more likely), a result we cannot control, we concentrate on putting a good swing on the ball, an action we can control.

- Well, when this young man or woman checks into pilot training, one of the first items issued is the daily training folder. That record is carried at all times and reviewed by the instructor (coach) and the flight leader. It will be reviewed two or three times a day, with constant emphasis on reward for success and focused hard work on the failures.

- I ask my students to make a commitment to daily, active self-examination and assessment, to monitor their behavior and emotions as they affect the negotiating process.

- The critical assessment of daily actions and decision making pinpoints weaknesses, works with strengths, and develops self-esteem.

- The single most important fuel that you have, the most important behavioral goal and habit you can develop, is your ability to ask questions.

- In any negotiation, where do we want to spend as much time as possible? In the adversary's world.

- our decisions are, initially, 100 percent emotional. After we've made our emotion-based decision, we need time to get the clear picture, the clear vision with which to rationally judge that decision. Questions are the means by which the negotiator helps the adversary do this.

The adversary's answers to our questions build the vision that he needs to make decisions. No vision, no real decision: this is a rule of human nature.

- "Is this something you should do?" "Can you do this?" "Will you do this?" "Do you need this?" "Do you have five minutes to see me?"

- "What would you like me to do?" Well, this simple question is of a different sort altogether. This question spawns some interesting dynamics. Mainly, it is a very comforting question to hear. It demonstrates that you, the negotiator who has asked this question, has no needs at the table. You have opened an area for negotiation and shown no fear. You are making no assumptions. The adversary feels okay, because you are at her service. You are certainly not closing, attempting to confuse, or any of that negative stuff. Hearing this question, the adversary on the other side of the table has no reason to fear you. Just as important, this open-ended question does not have a quick answer. It cannot be answered with yes, no, or maybe. The necessarily more extended answer will have—well, may have—some information, or some emotion, or some telltale waffling, or some insight. It should have something you can work with, because, as we know, people have a weakness for talking.

- Likewise, when I ask, "How are you?" whose world am I entering? Whose world am I entering when I ask, "Now why did you invite me to this meeting?" Whose world when I ask, "What's the biggest challenge your company faces?" Have you noticed the main difference between these good questions and any of the previous bad questions? The good ones are led by an interrogative, not by a verb. "Who," "what," "when," "where," "why," "how," and "which": These are the famous interrogatives we all learned about in elementary school, I guess.

- the verb-led questions are almost all downside, while these interrogative-led questions are a key means of discovery.

- One good interrogative-led question to fit into an early discussion might be "How can you stay competitive without this technology?"

- No vision, no decision? Of course. And now I add, no interrogative-led questions, no vision, no decision.

- Keep It Simple Keep your questions short. Anytime a question has more than, say, nine or ten words you risk complication.

- We start off with a good interrogative-led question but then answer it for the adversary, or at the least throw out possible answers. I ask, "What is the biggest challenge you face?" and before you have a chance to answer I add, "Is it the national economy or your local labor problems?" One mistake on top of another: We answered the question for our adversary and in doing so our interrogative-led question turned into a verb-led question.

- ASKING GOOD QUESTIONS is the highest octane fuel we have. They are a key behavioral goal. Of the five other behavioral goals that I call the fuels of the system, four work in direct support of our questions. They help us control what we say. They help us use our words to our advantage. I call these four fuels nurturing, reversing, connecting, and 3+. The fifth fuel, unrelated to questions, is the strip line.

- Your ability to nurture will be the key to bringing the negotiation back to the table after a breakdown. Your ability to nurture your adversary, to put him or her at ease, is the key to assuring her that you are listening and that you value what she has to say.

- Nurturing should be part of your body language. When you're seated, refrain from a sudden forward movement. Lean back. Relax your neck, face, and hands. If you're standing, lean against the wall, lower your posture. No one is going to deal effectively with you if you're towering over them. This is common sense, and even an average negotiator would pretty much adhere to this principle. But a lot of average negotiators give out the wrong signals in less obvious ways. They lean forward and jerk their arms and smack the table. The truly comfortable, trained negotiator takes it easy. When in doubt, slow your cadence of speech, lower your voice.

- "How are you?" "Great. How are you?" That's a reverse, isn't it? And effective. But more often than not, for a variety of reasons, untrained negotiators aren't alert for the opportunity to answer questions by asking questions.

- "Jim, what will this option do for me?" "That's a good question, Dick. Before we get into that, what's the biggest challenge you're facing in this area?" Nurture, reverse:

- My son Brian now plays college football for a major program. He was not the high school recruit I mentioned in chapter 3, but when Brian was being recruited a couple of years ago, he was asked by the dean of students with arguably the most prestigious and respected football program in the country, "What do you think would be the most challenging part of playing football for this school?" Brian's answer was rather long, but it was a great reverse: "Gee, that's a great question. I'd like to toss it back at you because I've got so many things going through my mind. I'd like your help in understanding how you really see it, because you've got so much experience in this. What are the things I should really be aware of?"

- my son—had let the dean know that he wasn't a cocky, self-aggrandizing kid who thought he had all the answers. (There are a lot of these kids around, you know, and quite a few such adults as well.) The recruit also allowed the dean to be the most okay person in the room—always a plus. The dean was delighted to have a kid who actually seemed to respect his opinion, and he was a great source of insight into the way the campus worked and the unusual pressures on football players, since it is such a high-profile program. When we drove through the gates at the end of the visit, Brian said, "I don't want to go to school in a museum."

- In any negotiation, the reverse assures that you're dealing with an important question for you, thereby allowing you to gather more insight and information. Your job is to get information from the adversary by asking questions, not to provide information by answering questions. Reversing is nothing more than the lawyer's standard technique of clarification.

- As I've said in several contexts, we have a tendency to want to save our adversary, to be liked. This instinct can impel us into these three common negotiating errors,

- That little word "and," when asked as a question, is an excellent connector. "I don't like what I see, Jim." "Aannnnnnnd?" [This is drawn out, accompanied by a shrug. The adversary now

has to fill in the picture for Jim.] “I can’t get too excited about this until I see your competition.” Fine. You’ve learned something.

- “Wow. This is pretty much out of nowhere.” “Which means ...?” [Accompanied by a shrug.] “This isn’t going to happen unless you lose a zero.” Fine again. You’ve learned something.

- Profound, silent concern on your part can also serve as a connector.

- The connector, like the reverse, has helped get us to the real issue. “I don’t like your attitude.” “How can I help you?” “Your price is too high.” This is real progress. Your attitude was never the problem.

- Whether we use 3+ or 20+, we always give the adversaries the opportunity to go through this process in their own minds. The 3+ technique goes hand in hand with “never close.” The whole point of 3+ is to give the adversary multiple opportunities to look at their decision—to verify it, to justify it, or to change

- Avoid both the strongly negative and the strongly positive by staying in the calm neutral range, which is where we find the deals that stick. This is totally contrarian negotiating. You mean we don’t want the adversary to get all excited about this deal? No, we don’t, because the excitement won’t last; those inevitable second thoughts will come along sooner or later.

- Likewise in a negotiation: by stripping line you take the pressure off the adversary. It is an extremely effective tool,

- Brilliant negotiating by Redford. With the emotional pendulum set solidly in the negative area in the beginning, he used his hard, negative strip line—“You’re not buying this, are you?”—to insinuate himself right into the heart of that negative emotion. What was he trying to accomplish? Stabilization, that’s all. He wanted to wake up the jury to their bias and plant a second thought. By joining their decision of “no,” he had enticed them into shifting into the intellectual mode, if only for a moment. Remember that the value of the word “no” is that it is, unlike “maybe,” a real decision, and as a decision it has to be intellectually validated by the adversary—by the jury, in this particular negotiation. Redford has their full attention now. They were still negative, but at least they were thinking.

- what if he had used a strip line and said: “I’d probably switch companies too, if that happened to me. But before you do that, why don’t you let me give you a free upgrade and check out our coverage for ten days?” His negative strip line would have neutralized my harshly negative emotional state. Who knows, he might have hooked me for at least another ten days, and he might have saved the situation.

- Find a good opportunity to say, “Wow, this is bad. I don’t know if we can ever recover from this.” Quite likely, your adversary will then help you recover. It’s so much fun when this happens.

- Now, the positive strip line is just that: a way to bring the adversary back toward a more neutral position from a position that’s too positive—yes, too positive. The well-trained car salesman puts a slight damper on his customer’s excitement over the black car by saying, “Black is a powerful color for a sports car, but it sure shows the dirt. It’ll take work.” This brings

the positive adversary closer to neutral and at the same time urges him to validate his own enthusiasm for the color black—his vision of the color black.

- In all honesty, I could not name one instance in which a positive strip line ever backfired. It just never backfires. To believe that it might is to misunderstand human nature and your purpose as a negotiator. The lightest possible strip line is used to bring the adversary back toward neutral almost as the icing on the cake. It controls any neediness of your own, reinforces the adversary's right to say "no," lets the adversary be okay, and gets you deals that stick. Believing that the positive strip is dangerous reveals that you're stuck in a "rush to close" mode.

- "Before you sign this deal, are you sure this is something you really want to do?" "Yes, I've thought about it a great deal and it makes perfect sense."

- Your ability to blank slate is directly related to your ability to rid yourself of expectations and assumptions, two very bad words in my system of negotiation. Real taboos. By nature, we humans are chock-full of expectations and assumptions. As a negotiator, you must learn to recognize them and set them aside. They have less than zero value to you as a serious negotiator.

- Now what do we do?! Now what are our emotions? Now what good did all those positive expectations do us? If there is one classic maneuver played by large multinationals and shrewd dealers in all fields to take advantage of anxious adversaries, this is the one. Build positive expectations with pie-in-the-sky numbers, then start in with the ifs, ands, and buts.

- "Positive attitude" sounds great, but to me it's just another, more seductive way of saying "positive expectations." For the negotiator, even a positive attitude is dangerous. Yes, it's true. It can devolve quickly into neediness, into positive expectations. When I teach blank slate, I mean blank slate. And it's hard.

- Neither positive nor negative expectations have a place in my system. You blank slate and you negotiate, that's all.

- Once you really start using my system, you are so dedicated to goals over which you have control, so oblivious to anything over which you don't have control, and so free of neediness that expectations shouldn't even enter into the equation.

- We can also plant assumptions—and if the opposing parties let you, why not? Say you're asked how much your widget costs. "It's expensive," you say. Well, this word means very different things to a millionaire and to a man making \$30,000, and—here's the important kicker—each immediately assumes that you mean what he means, and you may well find him preparing to pay a price much higher than yours. In fact, people—negotiators—make offers higher than you ever dreamed they would because of such false assumptions on their part.

- Research is indispensable, but the best single, easy-to-use, foolproof tool we have at our disposal to blank slate is the simplest one imaginable: taking great notes.

- Most people can scribble down a few notes here and there in a conversation, but taking great notes takes lots of practice. The next meeting you go to, pull out your legal pad instead of your

business card. Next time the phone rings, pick up your pen, really listen, and take notes—even if it's your mother on the line. (That might be the ultimate challenge—trying to blank slate with a close member of your family!)

- That's the phrase I use for the mistaken revelation of information: "spilling the beans." When it happens the next time, just make sure it's from the other side, not from you. If you conduct many negotiations you will be the happy recipient of spilled beans. That's because many people knowingly spill beans as they fight for the feeling of self-importance.

- Often, officers looking for a new colleague feel they have to offer the package before asking for the commitment. They feel the package drives the negotiation. But what happens is that the candidate takes the spilled beans—the financial package offer—back to his current employer and uses it for leverage. Happens all the time. I urge a different approach. I urge my clients to say to the candidate, "We're going to commit to a financial package that will be at the top of the industry, but we're not going to reveal it until we have your commitment to take it or reject it. We don't want this package to be used to start a bidding war with your current company." This is a fair approach, but companies are afraid they'll lose the candidate, so they spill the beans, and then they lose the candidate because they spilled the beans when he uses the package for leverage and re-ups with his current company.

- have mentioned the cozy relationships that many corporate negotiators try to establish with their adversaries, for the sake of establishing a subtle neediness on the adversary's part. Another purpose of these "close" relationships is the opportunity they pose for collecting spilled beans.

- Before a negotiation, see that negotiation unfolding in your mind. Picture yourself asking the questions, taking the notes, and negotiating with perfect behavior. See yourself relaxed with no expectations, no need, and no fear—a perfectly blank slate. It works, even for a hard-nosed corporate negotiator.

- I'll say it again: no vision, no action. No vision, no decision. No vision, no deals that stick.

- A member of the audience asked how McColl had successfully negotiated over one hundred mergers and acquisitions, and he answered, "I really try to get inside their head before I ever get in the room with them." Exactly! And what was McColl looking for inside the adversary's head? The pain, to use my nomenclature.

- As I stated earlier, adhering to your mission and purpose will keep you from going seriously astray in a negative direction. Now you have a tool for keeping you oriented in a positive direction: your vision of your adversary's pain.

- My primary job in this negotiation is to create vision of your real pain, that this is the only machine for your purposes, that this technology is the future of this industry, and that without it your efficiency and your business plan will suffer. Meanwhile, my own pain in this negotiation is that my company has committed 60 percent of its resources to the development of this machine, and we want to establish it as the new industry standard. Our adversaries, if they're on top of things, will make sure that we know that they know that we've bet the farm on this machine.

- Of course, Winston Churchill and Abraham Lincoln were two of the greatest men who ever lived. Each understood in his heart, his gut, that all meaningful actions and decisions begin with a vision. Without the vision each painted with his incomparable words, there would have been no decisive action by the people.
- hidden behind this general emotion could be a host of particular circumstances, and it would be the particular circumstance, not the general emotion, that generates the deal in the end.
- So your challenge as a negotiator is to discover and paint for your adversary the clearest possible picture of their pain while always nurturing.
- The board member's wife was able to set up a meeting between the widow and my client. The mission and purpose of that meeting for my client? To get the woman to see and describe what was most important to her and her family in this acquisition. My client explained to her that the two companies were so far apart in price that the difference could never be overcome. He asked her what he could do. "How can I help you?" he asked. For a second time, the widow spilled the beans and told my client about her fear of her husband's legacy disappearing. My client asked her if she had ever thought of erecting a memorial on the grounds of his company to recognize and honor his achievements. She was absolutely flabbergasted. My client added that if he made this acquisition, his company would be pleased to establish and pay for the memorial. She could choose the artist and the material and design this memorial in any way that she wanted. She accepted this offer almost on the spot, and within six months the acquisition was completed.
- When you finally get to the right person in a negotiation, they will often spill the beans and reveal their real pain so that you can fix it. That
- You have nurtured, you have given the adversary permission to say no, and you will use the 3+ technique.
- If your doctor doesn't paint for you a crystal-clear picture of your case—your pain—will she ever be able to "sell" you this medicine or this outpatient procedure, much less this three-hour operation? Somehow I rather doubt it.
- You help create the vision, but you don't create the pain itself at all. The pain is just there. The doctor doesn't create your pain; she helps you see your case clearly.
- Their ignorance of their pain only puts everybody one down. If they don't know their own pain, they'll never make the deal.
- Often there is no more effective way to paint the adversary's pain than by asking them to tell you "no." When your adversary carefully considers exactly what this "no" entails, their pain becomes very clear indeed, and good things can happen for you.
- Since that day, that particular client has understood completely the power of asking questions as a way of painting the vision, the pain, so the adversary in a negotiation sees it for his own.

- During the conference call I mentioned earlier, the one involving the president of Network, Inc., he asked the adversary, “How do you think this problem can be solved?” An interrogative-led question, of course. In the end, the other company offered to pay Network an additional \$200,000 per machine: \$100,000 to reach breakeven, \$100,000 for profit. Moreover, they proposed to grant—not loan, but simply give—Network several million dollars in order to ensure its financial stability.

- Sometimes, one simple question can create a vision of the pain and quickly drive a decision. Recall the negotiation between my client and the doctors at the hospital regarding whether his baby girl would be transferred to the other hospital for surgery. My client thought this transfer was too risky. He and his wife wanted the doctors from the other hospital to perform the operation in the hospital where their baby already was. My client asked only one question of the head of the neonatal unit: How much risk are you willing to take with my child’s life?

- “Your greatest strength is your greatest weakness.” I quote these words from Emerson for the second time, because truer words were never written.

- Watching the clock only slowed them down and made it more likely that they would not beat the clock. Bottom line: usually it wasn’t the clock that beat them. They beat themselves with what I call invalid behavior.

- Never drive around town on cold calls. The great negotiator in any field won’t walk next door, much less get in her car or on the airplane, without a clear picture of the negotiation coming up—a clear picture of the adversary’s pain and a firm knowledge that the adversary has the budgets in time-and-energy, money, and emotion to pay—negotiate—to have this pain taken away.

- The great negotiator in any field must not lift a finger without a clear picture of the negotiation coming up—a clear picture of the adversary’s pain and a firm knowledge that the adversary has the budgets in time-and-energy, money, and emotion to pay—negotiate—to have this pain taken away.

- Time can be wasted in a one-hour negotiation. It can be utilized to the fullest in a one-year negotiation. Time spent tells us nothing either way about time well spent.

- In a six-month-long negotiation, a client received a call from the adversary, who wanted to review a letter my client had sent him. Even though the letter was on my client’s desk, staring him in the face, he told the adversary he’d have to put him on hold and go look for the letter. Only fifteen seconds, but if you’re worried about an issue, fifteen seconds is long enough for all kinds of thoughts to race through your mind. Meanwhile, those brief seconds gave my client time to collect and calm himself for the discussion to follow. My client was also making a subtle statement that he was not needy here, that he didn’t even have the letter in front of him.

- Ho Chi Minh just kept building and building and building the Americans’ time budget in Vietnam until we finally figured out that the war was never going away.

- For your own part, make certain that you do have “all the time in the world”—and if you don’t, be ready to walk away. Remember, you only want this deal, you do not need this deal.

- On the other hand, the old adage “Penny-wise, pound-foolish” is right on. We do want to spend energy in preparation and research, but the shocking reality is that many people won’t or don’t prepare for negotiations. They won’t spend the time or the energy required. This isn’t conserving energy, this is laziness, which inevitably wastes energy at a later stage of the negotiation. As I’ve said, my clients are often shocked by the poor preparation of some Fortune 100 companies.

- I’ll stick by my original calculus: time is 1x, energy is 2x, money 3x, and emotion 4x. Emotions have an extremely high value in any negotiation.

- Know your budget. Control your budget. Know their budget. Build their budget. These rules apply for time-and-energy, for money, for emotions. When you master them, you really can’t fail.

- The preparation of the agenda is a terrific exercise in and of itself, as well as a test of your ability to see the negotiation clearly and to assign priorities.

- Every negotiating session—even a telephone call or an e-mail, no matter how short, even one minute or one paragraph—requires an agenda. Maybe this sounds radical at first, but it’s really not. Every call and e-mail has some kind of purpose, doesn’t it? I hope so. So what’s the purpose? The agenda makes it clear. In fact, what can guide the day-to-day nuts and bolts of the negotiation other than agendas? You don’t have to be a control freak to enjoy the control offered by agendas that really work.

- The only agenda that is valid for purposes of negotiation is the one that has been negotiated with the adversary.

- “Joe, I’m not sure this information has any value to you, and if it doesn’t just say so and we’ll go no further. Fair? Okay. Then that’s our agreement. If it doesn’t apply we’ll go no further. If it does apply, we’ll move forward, okay?” With this agenda in place Bill isn’t going to feel blindsided or pushed to close. You’ve given him every right to say “no.” You’ve reiterated your point three times (3+). Your own emotions are under control. That’s some agenda!

- Agendas and mini-agendas not only make you comfortable, they make your adversary comfortable. By keeping your adversary comfortable, you maintain control and leverage.

- A valid agenda or mini-agenda has five basic categories: 1. Problems 2. Our baggage 3. Their baggage 4. What we want 5. What happens next

- How many people do you think are burdened by baggage related to gender, age, religion, education, appearance, attitudes, financial status, experience, or seniority? Whatever baggage you think will be a problem in the negotiation needs to be dealt with up front. Some new clients are surprised to learn that such issues properly belong on the agenda. They think of an agenda as dealing only with the big issues of the final deal per se: unit price, delivery dates, and the like. “Problems” they can see, after thinking about it, but “baggage”? My answer: Agendas and mini-agendas lay out everything that will significantly affect reaching that deal. Baggage is certainly in that category.

- “George, I’m new in this business. If my inexperience is going to be a problem in this deal, let’s talk about it now.” “Yes, now’s a good time. John, the only problem I have with your being new is that if we come up against something you can’t handle with confidence, I want your assurance that you’ll call in someone to help. Someone who really knows how to handle that problem. If that’s okay with you, I’m comfortable.” “That’s fine with me. Are you sure it’s okay with you?” “Yes, John. It’s okay with me.” “All right, that will be our deal. If I can’t handle something with complete confidence, I’ll call my boss to help. That’s our deal. Agreed?” “Agreed.” [Note the 3+, of course. George agreed three times. Sometimes an agenda item simply clears the air.]

- Or in a different situation your adversary might reply, “I like what you’ve shown me, Betty. Call me back in a few weeks and I’ll let you know my decision.” His unstated feeling: “Widgets are a man’s business. What can you know about them?” If Betty has run into such biases in the past, she must get the question out in the open immediately by saying, “John, I’m one of the few women in the widget industry. I know of one other. We’re rare in this field, let’s face it. Frankly, I’ve encountered resentment from some guys for this reason alone, that I’m a woman. What problems do you see here?” And then proceed with the 3+, no matter what John’s answer is. Perhaps he won’t be honest, but the fact that the question is now on the table might give him second thoughts about letting any bias affect his decisions.

- Knowing what we want out of each stage of the negotiation—what we want on each agenda—helps us make sure that our mission and purpose is clear. It guarantees that our goals are clear. It makes us think clearly how to proceed—A, B, C, D, E, and all the way to Z and a deal that sticks.

- If you can’t figure out what you want at a given point in the negotiation, figure out what else is missing. Is your mission and purpose in place? If you haven’t prepared for the negotiation session, how aware can you be of what you want from that session? Not very. But if you know exactly what you want, how are you perceived by the adversary? Effective. If you know exactly what you want and it’s valid, how early do you compromise? You don’t compromise early.

- A great exercise is to sit down and think about a “typical” negotiation in your field—if there is such a thing—and draw up a list of wants along the way. The really complete list will be pretty long.

- What does every want entail from the adversary? A decision, of course. This is almost by definition, because any progress depends on decisions. Therefore, I’d like you to consider each want in the negotiation in terms of the decision required of the adversary in order to fulfill it. And of course the decision may always be “no.” You allow every opportunity for your adversary to say “no.” And of course you are wary of any “yes” and extremely wary of any “maybe.”

- The greatest presentation you will ever give is the one your adversary never sees.

- A major tenet of my system is that you want the negotiation to take place—where? In the world of your adversary. To this end you ask interrogative-led questions, and your adversary’s answers create vision for him or her. You don’t tell anyone anything, remember. They have to

see it for themselves. But how do most presentations work? They try to tell the adversary not just anything but everything, and then hope against hope that the adversary goes along with what's been said. But the presentation, by definition, puts the adversary into the intellectual mode. When the adversary is in the intellectual mode, he raises objections, doesn't he? Think about this from your own experience. When someone presents to you, your instinct is to hunt for objections, quibbles, and mistakes, and you always find them. The classic presentation serves only to create objections, so you end up answering questions rather than asking them.

- "We need a presentation on your business." "Well, I don't have any idea how to do that. I really don't. If I had an idea where you stand, what you need, what you're interested in, then I'd be happy to address your concerns. That's what I'm here for. What's driving you to ask me for a presentation? I mean, why do you want my widget? You've been dealing with USA Widgets for seven years. You must have the best price in the world from them by now. How could we ever compete with USA Widgets? Why are you now interested in Widgets International?"

- the adversary finally asked us for our presentation of how much of our product they should buy at what unit cost, and so on. We suggested that it made a lot more sense for them to give us their thoughts and give us a good idea where they were going and what they were trying to do, and then we could respond with ideas tailored to their requirements. That's a good idea, they said.

- Finally—and I hope by this point in the book this statement almost goes without saying—always present in the world of the adversary. Granted, you're telling them things rather than letting them see, by the nature of the presentation, but at least tell them things about the issues that are driving the negotiation. Present only the information that addresses your adversary's concern, the information that addresses the adversary's pain—or what you know about it, which is probably not much, or you wouldn't be presenting in the first place.

- The way to find out is to ask the question this recruit asked of every coach: "How do you evaluate a player?" Isn't this question just common sense? Yes. But is it commonly asked? No. Our recruit found out that the answer varied from coach to coach and often seemed very limited. One coach was mainly interested in vertical jumping ability, another in speed, another in strength work (specifically, the bench press). One coach would not recruit a defensive back under six feet tall, and another would not recruit any players under six feet tall. In any event, no coach said or implied, Send me clips of your greatest plays. So our recruit tailored his videotape to the answers provided by each coach. He presented in the world of each specific coach, not his own world. He showed them what he had decided they wanted to see, not what he thought they should want to see, or what he wanted to see of himself. That approach took a lot of discipline and a lot of work.

- What is prep-end step? It's the reminder that your work in this negotiating session isn't over until you've either prepared the bridge to the next one by means of "what happens next" on the agenda, or until you have prepared a means of exiting the negotiation for good—ending it by fading away into the night.

- My father did not need the self-satisfaction of getting every last dollar out of every last negotiation. He wanted fair value. If he knew he was getting such value, he was happy to pay full price. I'm the same way. Paying full price, when justified, empowers me to ask full price, when justified. In this world we do usually get what we pay for, remember. We also perform to the level of our self-image.

- I suggest beginning this first test negotiation with a five-step process. First, you make certain you have a good, strong mission and purpose that's set in the world of your adversary, one that is designed to let the adversary see and decide that the benefits and features of your product or service or whatever are what they wish to acquire. (See chapter 4.) Second, you make sure that you know the adversary's real pain—the real reason they're negotiating. You ask questions, you create vision. (See chapter 9.) Third, you assess all the budgets involved—time-and-energy, money, and emotional investment—for both you and your adversary. You never forget about these budgets, you monitor them at all times, and you see how they seem to be influencing the decisions on both sides. (See chapter 10.) Fourth, you make certain you're dealing with the real decision makers. (See chapter 11.) Fifth, you don't make a phone call, you don't write an e-mail, without writing down an agenda for that phone call or e-mail. (See chapter 12

- The Thirty-three Rules