

Hypnotism, a Perspective - 2008, Part VI

by

Dennis K. Chong and Jennifer K. Smith Chong ©

In this essay, the male pronoun will apply to either gender
The nominal pronoun will apply to the first author.
The plural pronoun will apply to both writers.

All hypnotists have used the language of Aristotle's language of cause and effect **A** in an intuitive manner and have been successful. This is similar to learning to play the piano by ear. There have been a few jazz pianists who reached the heights of their art just playing by ear. However, only one man had the distinction of conducting Mahler's most difficult symphony by ear.

It is for this that only those who possess an **incredible intuitive facility over A**, or have a unconscious flair over the \bar{A} and Informal Logic are able to rise above their confrères to become Hypnotism's greats. Of Hypnotism's greats, the name of Milton H. Erickson, MD comes to mind; it was a singular opportunity and privilege that he taught me. Then through NGH, I met Ormand McGill. Alas, both these men are now gone

Below these indisputable greats we have many in the second rank with varying distinctions and excellence. Below them we have many in the third rank. The question that must be addressed is how it is this way?

We respectfully submit that it has to do with the initial conditions that are set into the new student of Hypnotism by the form and style of the pedagogy of Hypnotism.

Thus, when we first started to learn Hypnotism in 1978, we as beginners were never taught the **language structures** of **A** and certainly we were never taught how to use and manipulate them in hypnotic work. We were handed the scripts for the classical inductions of Progressive Relaxation, Eye Fixation and so forth. We learnt these scripts by rote. This is no different from learning to play that great piano classic known as *Chopsticks*. Everyone who ever learnt to play the piano began with *Chopsticks*. Each of us was told where to place which finger on which keyboard. By following the instructions robotically, the music came from the piano. Even though I have not played the piano for quite a number of years, I know I can still play *Chopsticks* for you. This is the power of learning by rote. And once you learn the scripts by rote you are stuck with them as I am stuck with *Chopsticks*. Given this, how then can anyone hope to advance?

There were also certain presuppositions to this pedagogy that somehow in some mystical way we would know which script to use for which client for trance induction. By this same mystical way most clients would go into trance and those who did not were resisting.

What we did not realize at that time was that these scripts had semantic boundaries. In the way we were taught we were now trapped within these semantic boundaries. For example you can pattern any variation of sequences but in International

Ballroom dancing you will do so within its boundaries of what is kosher and what is not. You may think you are creating new variations, but you will be still stuck within the structural boundaries of Progressive Relaxation.

This pedagogy does not open the way for any Hypnotists to come up with ways of doing Hypnotism that is truly innovative and creative. Even all the apparently new, fast and rapid inductions have a common pattern to them.

We wonder if the ability to reach the level of the true greats of Hypnotism is because the original pedagogical boundaries that were installed into us continue to hold us *in situ*.

It is now 30 years later on and we find that the Hypnotism students of today²⁰⁰⁸ undergo training in Hypnotism in which they also end up with induction scripts! We wonder if it is in the power of a new student to do anything truly creative and innovative, or will the same old pedagogy support him or hold him back. Since it is left to the student's native linguistic skills, it is unfortunately circumscribed by the semantic boundaries inherent in the scripts he is given.

Of course some will do well, even extra-ordinarily excellently like my friends Kevin Hogan and Tommy Vee. However, we respectfully must wonder if in 2008 if this is the most satisfactory pedagogical way to teach the newcomer.

To compound the problem, we now know that there are 3 other distinct language systems with their unique language structures that have a place in Hypnotism. They are:

1. the inversions of the Modified Meta Model
2. Informal Logic
3. the Non-Aristotelian language system, \bar{A} .

What is the Modified Meta Model or its predecessor the Meta Model?

The Meta Model was the solution to a problem that faced all professionals in the fields of Psychiatry, Psychology, and the Therapies. Oddly none of the professionals in these disciplines knew that there was a unique problem that faced them. It was unfolded to them in the work, *CHANGE*:

Eventually we realized that this state of affairs was directly linked to the hierarchical structure of language, communication, learning etc. As we pointed out in Chapter 1, to express or explain something requires a shift to one logical level above what is to be expressed or explained. No explaining can be accomplished on the same level; a metalanguage has to be used, but this metalanguage is not necessarily available. To effect change is one thing; to communicate *about* this change is something else: above all, a problem of correct logical typing and of creating an adequate metalanguage.

Paul Watzlawick, John Weakland and Richard Fisch: Change PRINCIPLES OF PROBLEM FORMATION and PROBLEM RESOLUTION W. W. Norton and Co. 1974 page 79.

What this quote is saying is that to be able to truly and accurately understand what another is saying, you have to have a language about language. A language about language is a model of a language, a.k.a. a metalanguage. Given that their metalanguage was the first Meta model of language, Bandler and Grinder called theirs the Meta Model.

Richard Bandler, John Grinder and Judith de Lozier then published their works *Patterns of the Hypnotic Techniques of Milton H. Erickson, MD*, Vol. 1 & 2. In it they indexed that the inversions of the Meta Model was the basis of THE language of Hypnosis. We now know that this is not exactly accurate. It is one of the languages of Hypnotism but it is not THE language. Clearly today, Neuro-Linguistic Programmers have a second language of Hypnotism, viz the inversions of the language structures of the Meta Model to their clinical work. Those who are stuck with only **A** are therefore at some disadvantage.

We were to realize that the Meta Model was constructed in **A** and if it was to have any continuing value and worth it was clear to us that cause and effect had best be extracted out of it. This meant that certain structural deficiencies had to be corrected and were compensated. Due to these changes we renamed it the Modified Meta Model.

All the inversions of the Modified Meta Model constitute a very powerful language of Hypnotism.

Ever since the discovery by the ancient Greek philosophers, the high scholars, academics and philosophers of the universities in the West have always taught *Formal Logic*. Then in the late '60s it finally dawned on them that for all their teaching formal logic had no utility in the lives of ordinary men and women and children save for syllogisms, modus ponens and modus tollens. They realized that people operated by a totally different logical system for their daily exchanges, talking, speaking, arguing, debating, speeches, discourses and dissertations.

Formal Logicians then started to explore the logical system of ordinary men and women which became the field of Informal Logic. People know snippets of it such as red herring, *ad hominem*, *non sequitur*, improper, loaded terms, and improper appeal to authority, straw man and so forth.

Now, clearly Informal Logic has a language system of its own because the rule is that every logical system has its own language system and hence its own unique language structures. We now know that Informal Logic is to be included in the category of the Linguistics of Hypnotism.

The details concerning the language structures of the Modified Model and those of Informal Logic cannot be specified and dealt with in these articles. The reader is to refer to the works, *Don't Ask WHY?!*, *Power and Elegance in Communication*, PEOPLE, and PARADIGMS AND PARADOXES for the Modified Meta Model. For Informal Logic the reader is to refer to any of the many texts that are available on it.

Of the above 3, the language structures of \bar{A} are in our view a far more powerful language for Hypnotism and Hypnotherapy than **A**. The evidence is that the language structures of \bar{A} is the basis for the kind of unique and powerful hypnotic verbalizations by Milton Erickson and Ormand McGill.

In our next paper we will deal with the language system of \bar{A} .

References:

Frizof Capra: *Web of Life* A New Scientific Understanding of Living Systems Anchor Books, Doubleday 1996

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

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

Dennis K. Chong & Jennifer K. Smith Chong: *Power and Elegance in Communication*, PEOPLE, PARADIGMS and PARADOXES, C-Jade Publications Inc. 1993

Dennis K. Chong & Jennifer K. Smith Chong: *Knife Without Pain*, C-Jade Publications Inc. 1993
Alfred Korzybski: *Science and Sanity* AN INTRODUCTION TO NON-ARISTOTELIAN SYSTEMS AND GENERAL SEMANTICS The International Non-Aristotelian Library Publishing Company 1980 *Sixth Reprinting* page 8
Humberto R. Maturana & Francisco J. Varela: *The Tree of Knowledge* The Biological Roots of Human Understanding Shambhala 1987