

## Hypnotism, Perspective-2007, Part III

by

Dennis K. Chong and Jennifer K. Smith Chong ©

In this essay, all male pronouns will apply to either gender.  
The nominal pronoun will apply to the first author.  
The plural pronoun will apply to both authors.  
The spelling is English English.

In Part II, we said we would present in Part III the Aristotelian linguistic system of Cause and Effect, **A**? However, as they say, in life, things are sometimes a little complicated.

In order to examine **A**, we need to offer a lead in to it.

We showed in Part II the place of linguistics in the construction of reality:

**We never see a naked, objective fact, only interpreted facts, and in every act of perception, we never stop interpreting.**

**Uta Ranke-Heinemann:** *Putting Away Childish Things* HarperSanFrancisco 1994 page 100.

All our interpretations are in language and hence our world is constructed in and by language.

**We are constantly interpreting reality: that is the only way we can process it, make sense of it constructively.**

**Donald Spoto:** *The Hidden Jesus A NEW LIFE* St. Martin's Griffen New York 1998 page 64.

It is because of our constant thinking by languaging that:

**We human beings are human beings only in language. Because we have language, there is no limit to what we can describe, imagine, and relate. It thus permeates our whole ontogeny as individuals: from walking to politics.**

**Humberto R. Maturana & Francisco J. Varela:** *The Tree of Knowledge* The Biological Roots of Human Understanding Shambhala Publications, Inc. 1987 page 212.

**Whorf as I read him makes two cardinal hypotheses.**

**First, that all higher levels of thinking are dependent on language.**

**Second, the structure of the language<sup>φ</sup> one habitually uses influences the manner in which one understands his environment. The picture of the universe shifts from tongue to tongue.**

**Stuart Chase:** *Language, Thought and Reality* Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf MIT Press 1979 page v.

---

<sup>φ</sup> there is a distinction between a language and the structure of the language. This is something that we shall examine and clarify.

We are clinical hypnotists and stage hypnotists only in language. The question is do we understand what is this incredible instrument that we are using –“ **the structure of the language**”. Certainly it is critical that we best realize this as hypnotists and psychotherapists:

**We dissect nature along lines laid down by our native language. The categories and types that we isolate from the world of phenomena we do not find there because they stare every observer in the face; on the contrary, the world is presented in a kaleidoscopic flux of impressions which has to be organized by our minds - and this means largely by the linguistic systems in our minds. We cut nature up, organize it into concepts, and ascribe significances as we do, largely because we are parties to an agreement to organize it in this way - an agreement that holds throughout our speech community and is codified in the patterns of our language. The agreement is, of course, an implicit and unstated one, BUT ITS TERMS ARE ABSOLUTELY OBLIGATORY; we cannot talk at all except by subscribing to the organization and classification of data which the agreement decrees.**

**This fact is very significant for modern science, for it means no individual is free to describe nature with absolutely impartiality but is constrained to certain modes of interpretation even while he thinks himself most free.**

**John B. Carroll:** *Language, Thought and Reality* Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf MIT Press 1979 page 211.

If this is true then, given the universality of the Aristotelian system of Cause and Effect, **A<sup>ζ</sup>**, it becomes critical to know what it is, because none us “**is free to describe nature with absolutely impartiality but is constrained to certain modes of interpretation even while he thinks himself most free.**” As a universal philosophy, it will play an incredibly powerful role in how our thinking, feeling, being and action will unfold. Our ontology is an inevitable function of **A**. As it turns out it is the most powerful driver of our ontology.

The question now becomes:

What is the origin of **A**?

It began when our species could metamentate<sup>ϑ</sup> and language. We could see that an object moved when we moved it = we are the cause. We could see that an animal died when we killed it for its meat = the hunters are the cause. We could see how we made others cringe in fear of us when we rose to our height with eyes red blood shot and chest heaved high with a large breath, lips thin, jaws jutting out, right hand tightening our grip on our club and our left fist clenched, our jaw muscles tightening, our forehead furrowed

---

<sup>ζ</sup> = it was Alfred Korzybski, the father General Semantics who suggested this cipher, **A**, to stand for the Aristotelian system of Cause and Effect in his seminal work *Science and Sanity*. We propose to follow what he indexed.

<sup>ϑ</sup> metamentate is the new term = to think because all thinking is about = meta something .

and our eyes narrowing and our cheeks flushed red and we took one threatening step forward = we are the cause. We could Cause these things to be. We could make them happen = this was sensory-based evidence. It was also by this method that we also arrived at these other conclusions:

the world was flat  
the sun rose in the east and set in the west  
what we stood on was stationary  
God is up there in the heavens  
and  
we were at the centre of the universe.

Of course, these sensory-based conclusions that we once had, have now lapsed – all, except Cause and Effect. They have done so not only because of new sensory-based evidence but also because they are matters that are considerations outside of us. Neuro-Semantic Programming, NSP, describes this in this way = the considerations are meta to the person. We could therefore divest ourselves of them when the contrary evidence was discovered. However, **A** is an integral part of us. NSP says that **A** is mesa to us. Thus, even in the face of contrary evidence, people are simply not able to divest themselves of it<sup>x</sup>.

So, **A** was already a universal thinking long before that famous Greek Aristotle, the tutor of Alexander the Great, came into the picture to propose his philosophical formats about it. Our understanding is that over the centuries his original propositions have been modified but its core is still essentially the same. Until Aristotle, **A** was and is still the underpinning of our Natural Language = our spoken language.

Then in 1777, there was a slight turbulence in the ether about **A**. Boldly it was David Hume who proposed it:

**But when one particular species of event has always, in all instances, been conjoined with another, we make no longer any scruple of foretelling one upon the appearance of the other, and of employing that reasoning, which can alone assure us of any matter of fact or existence. We then call the object Cause; the other, Effect. We suppose that there is some connexion [sic] between them; some power in the one, by which it infallibly produces the other, and operates with the greatest certainly and strongest necessity.**

**It appears, then, that this idea of a necessary connexion among events arises from a number of similar instances which occur of the constant conjunction of these events; nor can that idea ever be suggested by any one of these instances, surveyed in all positions. But there is nothing in a number of instances, different from every single**

---

<sup>x</sup> simply not able to divest themselves of it:

The proof of this is to be found in the work, *Structure of Magic*. This book was the foundational work to the field of Neuro-Linguistic Programming. In it Richard Bandler and John Grinder offered one of the most powerful and devastating arguments against **A**. Notwithstanding this, they and the entire community of NLP-ers of the world continued to operate by, in, with and through **A**. The consequences of this has been horrendous as evidenced by the final war between Bandler and Grinder in a Santa Cruz law court.

instance, which is supposed to be exactly similar; except only that after a repetition of similar instances, the mind is carried by habit, upon the appearance of one event, to expect its usual attendant, and to believe that it will exist. This connexion, therefore, which we *feel* in the mind, this customary transition of the imagination from one object to its usual attendant, is the sentiment or impression from which we form the idea of power or necessary connexion. Nothing further is the case.

**David Hume:** *Concerning Human Understanding and Concerning the Principles of Morals* Clarendon Press 1979 page 74 - 75.

If Hume had written this in the middle ages of Papal supremacy this questioning of Aristotle would have earned him a BBQ - him in the fire pit. In those days no one ever questioned Aristotle and no one questioned **A**. However, it was 1777 and he was in Protestant Britain.

Needless to say the world of scholarship ignored Hume.

However, this whiff of criticism became an urgent blast when in *Science and Sanity*, Alfred Korzybski was to say that **A** was “unsane.” He even had the audacity to declare that he rejected it!

As noted in the footnote above, it was a blast that was supported in a powerful and devastating way by Richard Bandler and John Grinder in their work, *Structure of Magic*:

**We have generalized the notion of semantic ill-formedness to include sentences such as:**

*My husband makes me mad.*

**The therapist can identify this sentence as having the form:**

*Some person causes some person to have some emotion.*

When the first person, the one doing the causing, is different from the person experiencing the anger, the sentence is said to be semantically ill-formed and unacceptable. The semantic ill-formedness of sentences of this type arises because, it, literally, is not possible for one human being to create an emotion in another human being thus, we reject sentences of this form. Sentences of this type, in fact, identify situations in which one person does some act and a second person *responds* by feeling a certain way. The point here is that, although the two events occur one after another, there is no necessary connection between the act of one person and the response of the other. Therefore, sentences of this type identify a model in which the client assigns responsibility for his emotion; rather, the emotion is a response generated from the model in which the client takes no responsibility for experiences which he *could* control.

**Richard Bandler & John Grinder:** *The Structure of Magic* Science and Behaviour Books Inc. 1975 pages 51 - 52.

Richard Bandler and John Grinder unfortunately missed the logical extension of their conclusion = if **A** is semantically ill-formed then its invert system would be semantically well-formed. As a result they never applied their undoubted genius to find out what it was. Alfred Korzybski on the other hand realized this and in *Science and Sanity*, he firmly set out to discover the Non-Aristotelian system,  $\bar{A}^{\sigma}$ .

$\bar{A}$  = inverse **A** = system for human sanity.

Critically, Korzybski realized that it was the linguistic system of **A**, that was the underpinning of human insanities and that in turn it is the linguistic system  $\bar{A}$  that is the harbinger for human sanity<sup>ψ</sup>. We are sure that it is the *structure* of these respective linguistics systems that determine our understanding of ourselves, others and the world in which live and in turn drives our ontology.

Korzybski admitted in *Science and Sanity* that he was not able to work out the entirety of the linguistics of  $\bar{A}^{\beta}$ . However, what he did not realize was that he had never worked the linguistics of **A** either.

For those of you who have read the article, *Linguistics of Hypnotism* that was published in the *Journal of Hypnotism*, December 2006, Volume 21, Number 4, you can now understand that because the linguistics of **A** is essentially insane or semantically ill-formed that when we can use it on the stage it is possible to get people to do insane or semantically ill-formed things. If you use sane linguistics, you will get sane responses.

Clearly, if we think by the insane linguistics of **A** in our daily lives, we shall be at risk. Without realizing it, we may live any one of an infinite number of different variants of its possible insanities or semantic ill-formednesses. We now know that whatever they may be, they will all share these common denominators. The insane life of **A** will in the be one of:

fear and anger  
anguish and frustration  
pain and suffering  
and  
woe and tears.

However, the problem is that if you live such a life, you are mesa to it and therefore, you will have completely adapted to it, habituated to it and accommodated to it. You will barely feel these anomalies in your life. You will barely be aware of it. And if you are challenged about it, you will automatically have a whole slew of explanations,

---

<sup>σ</sup>  $\bar{A}$  was the cipher that Alfred Korzybski proposed = Non-Aristotelian system. We intend to follow what he indexed.

<sup>ψ</sup> linguistic system of **A** the basis of the language of Hypnosis.

But the linguistic system of  $\bar{A}$  can be used to evince Hypnotism. A student of Hypnotism is best to have systems.

<sup>β</sup> he was not able to work out the entirety of the linguistics of the  $\bar{A}$ :

The result of this is that today, if you read the articles in the journal of Institute of General Semantics, *The Bulletin*, you will find that they are replete with the linguistics of **A** – the very linguistic system that Korzybski, the founder, had rejected.

reasons, justifications and counter arguments for it - to the point where you are in fact in total denial that you are well entrapped in its pit.

It was only 1991 that in the work, *Don't Ask WHY?!*, after some three and half years of intensive research that the entire structure of the linguistic system of **A** was unraveled. In doing so, we could then see right in front of us the probable inverted linguistic formats of **A** that constituted the linguistic system of  $\bar{A}$ . It was to take some 18 months to work it all out and it was then published in the work, *Power and Elegance in Communication*, PEOPLE, PARADIGMS and PARADOXES.

By this introduction, we are now in a position to examine the actual structure of the linguistic system of **A**. Now, you only have an intuitive mastery over it. But when you know what it is then you can manipulate it in a premeditated way cognitively. It will be a boon because as per the article on the Linguistics of Hypnotism, the linguistic structures of **A** = the language of hypnosis.

We shall do this in Part IV.

#### References:

**Richard Bandler & John Grinder:** *The Structure of Magic* Science and Behaviour Books Inc. 1975

**John B. Carroll:** *Language, Thought and Reality* Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf MIT Press 1979

**Stuart Chase:** *Language, Thought and Reality* Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf MIT Press 1979

**Dennis K. Chong & Jennifer K. Smith Chong:** *Don't Ask WHY?!* C-Jade Publications 1991

**Dennis K. Chong & Jennifer K. Smith Chong:** *Power and Elegance in Communication*, People, Paradigms and Paradoxes, C-Jade Publications 1993

**Uta Ranke-Heinemann:** *Putting Away Childish Things* HarperSanFrancisco 1994

**Alfred Korzybski:** *Science and Sanity* The International Non-Aristotelian Library Publishing Company 1958

**Humberto R. Maturana & Francisco J. Varela:** *The Tree of Knowledge* The Biological Roots of Human Understanding Shambhala Publications, Inc. 1987

**Donald Spoto:** *The Hidden Jesus A NEW LIFE* St. Martin's Griffin New York 1998

**David Hume:** *Concerning Human Understanding and Concerning the Principles of Morals* Clarendon Press 1979