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Introduction:

This update of Milton H. Erickson’s (1964/2008) classic paper, “Burden of Responsibility in Effective Psychotherapy,” contains commentaries by Ernest Rossi (In this bold purple font), which reviews how it is one of the simplest and clearest papers illuminating Erickson’s innovations as a psychotherapist. It is also one of Erickson’s earliest papers that initially awakened Ernest Rossi to recognize how Erickson may have been learning how to turn on gene expression and brain plasticity as the psychosocial genomic basis of psychotherapy at least a decade before neuroscience was organized a scientific discipline in the middle 1970s. This paper illustrates the apparently humble informality of the indirect approach to hypnotic induction that was so characteristic of Erickson’s naturalistic therapeutic technique. So subtle and apparently undemanding was his verbal technique, however, that most students have not understood the powerful therapeutic implications of his words. The authors of this update have commented on Erickson’s seemingly humble and unassuming trance inducing words with bold font so that students and clinicians can study them to improve their own empathetic and compassionate therapeutic effects. These three brief cases remind us that the locus of creative transformation in all forms of psychotherapy is within the patient’s own mind and body – not the therapist’s – the burden of responsibility for effective psychotherapy is the patient’s own inner work. How to facilitate the patient’s own creative inner therapeutic work is the burden of the therapist’s responsibility in effective psychotherapy.

The following case material is presented because it offers so concisely and clearly a modus operandi in hypnotherapy with the type of patient who has had a long experience in failing to derive desired benefits from extensive, traditionally oriented therapy. The three persons reported upon are typical of dozens of others that this author (Erickson) has seen over the years, and the results obtained have been remarkably good despite the fact that the patients were seen on only one occasion for an hour or two.

[Rossi, 2017, Introductory Comment: Immediately, right here within Erickson’s first two sentences, we witness his empathic, comforting and healing informality with the words “patients were seen on only one occasion for an hour or two.” Apparently, no big deal! It wasn’t until a few generations or later that neuroscience recognized that the range of “an hour two” embraced the typical time parameters of the Basic Rest-Activity Cycle and 4-Stage Creative Cycle of Therapeutic Consciousness and Cognition (Lloyd and Rossi, 1992, 2008; Rossi, 1982, 2002, 2007, 2012).]

In each instance hypnosis was used for the specific purpose of placing the burden of responsibility for therapeutic results upon the patient himself after he himself had reached a definite conclusion that therapy would not help and that a last resort would be a hypnotic “miracle.” In this author’s understanding of psychotherapy, if a patient wants to believe in a “hypnotic miracle” so strongly that he will undertake the responsibility of making a recovery by virtue of his own actual behavior and continue that recovery, he is at liberty to do so under whatever guise he chooses, but neither the author nor the reader is obliged to regard the success of the therapy as a hypnotic miracle. The hypnosis was used
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solely as a modality by means of which to secure their cooperation in accepting the therapy they wanted. In other words, they were induced by hypnosis to acknowledge and act upon their own personal responsibility for successfully accepting the previously futilely sought and offered but actually rejected therapy.

CASE 1
A telephone call was received in the office from a man who stated that he wanted an appointment. He refused to give any reason except that it was for a proper medical reason he preferred to explain in person. At the interview the man stated that he was suffering from Buerger’s disease, that he was a diabetic, and that he had cardiac disease and high blood pressure—” Too much for a man with a family the size of mine and only 50 years old.” He went on, “That isn’t all. I’ve been psychoanalyzed for eight months for five hours a week. During that time my insulin dosage has had to be increased, I’ve gained 40 pounds, my blood pressure has gone up 35 points, and from 1½ packs of cigarettes I have gone up to 4½ packs a day. I am still the psychoanalyst’s patient, I have an appointment with him for Monday, but he is paid up to date. He says he is slowly uncovering the psychodynamics of my self-destructive behavior. I myself think that I’m digging my grave with power tools.”

Then with utter gravity he asked, “Would it be unethical for you, knowing that I am another physician’s patient, to give me the benefit of two hours of hypnotherapy this afternoon? My analyst disapproves of hypnosis, but he certainly hasn’t done me any good.”

[Rossi, 2008, Comment #1: Note the client’s intuitive understanding that 2 hours will be required to accomplish his inner creative work. Today I hypothesize this is an example of our natural Basic-Rest-Activity Cycle (a so called “mind-body ultradian rhythm”) that usually requires 90-120 minutes in everyday life. While awake this is the natural rhythm of most life activities (work, play, seeing a movie, etc.). While asleep this is the natural rhythm of our Slow Wave Sleep and REM dream cycle for updating consciousness, memory, and behavior on all levels from mind to gene. We hypothesize this is the scientific rational for why Erickson utilized about 90-120 minutes as the length of his typical sessions of therapeutic hypnosis and psychotherapy with most of his patients (Rossi & Rossi, 2008, 2015a & b)].

The simple reply was made that, from my point of view, the question of professional ethics did not enter into the situation at all, that every patient, including mine, has the right to seek from any duly trained and licensed physician whatever proper help he desires, that medical ethics should properly be centered about the patient’s welfare rather than a physician’s desire to keep a patient.

He was then told to close his eyes and repeat his story from beginning to end, to do this slowly, carefully, to drop out the question of ethics and in its place to specify what he wanted from the author. This he was to do slowly, thoughtfully, appraisingly, and as he did so, the mere sound of his own voice would serve to induce in him a satisfactory trance in which he could continue to talk to the author, listen to the author, answer questions, do anything asked of him by the author and that he would find himself under a most powerful compulsion to do exactly that which was indicated.

[Rossi, 2008, Comment #2: These words in bold font are not a formal induction to hypnosis in the usual sense when patients realize they are being put into a hypnotic trance with monotonous and repetitive suggestions to “relax” and “sleep,” etc. However, we can now recognize how Erickson’s words are actually “trance-inducing” for this patient who is so interested in telling his own numinous story and getting help that it (1) focuses his attention with (2) high expectancy—the two
The man was taken aback at these unexpected instructions, but leaned back in his chair, closed his eyes, and slowly began his recitation with pertinent additions. Shortly his voice began to trail off, indicating that he was developing a trance, and he had to be told several times to speak more loudly and clearly.

[Rossi, 2017, Comment: “unexpected instructions,” indeed! Only now, about 10 years after the first publication of this update, do I realize that this simple word “unexpected” could imply what I call, the Novelty-numinosum-Neurogenesis Effect (NNNE) when any unexpected surprise could turn on activity-dependent gene expression and brain plasticity to facilitate new neural networks in the brain that would underpin new therapeutic consciousness and cognition (Rossi, 1973a & b, 2002).]

No mention was made of the question of ethics, but with a wealth of detail he outlined the therapy which he thought to be indicated. He was asked to repeat this several times, and each time he did so more positively, emphatically, and inclusively.

After four such repetitions the author pointed out that he, as a physician, had offered no advice or therapeutic or corrective suggestions, that every item in that regard had come from the patient himself, and that he would find himself under the powerful compulsion arising from within him to do everything that he thought was indicated. To this was added that he could remember any selected parts of his trance state, but regardless of what he remembered or did not remember he would be under a most powerful compulsion to do all that he himself thought to be indicated.

He was aroused, a casual conversation initiated, and he left.

A year later, in excellent physical shape, he brought in an old childhood friend of his and stated very briefly, “I eat right, I sleep good, my weight is normal, my habits regular, my diabetes is under good control, my Buerger’s disease has not progressed, my blood pressure is normal, I never went back to my analyst, my business is better than ever, I’m a new man and my whole family thanks you. Now this man is my boyhood pal, he’s got emphysema, a very bad heart, look at his swollen ankles, and he smokes like a chimney.

He’s been under a doctor’s care for years.” (This man was smoking one cigarette and had another out of the package ready to light.)

“Treat him the way you did me, because I told him you talked to me in a way that just takes complete hold of you.”

He left the office with the new patient remaining.
CASE 2
Essentially the same procedure was carried out, checking against the first patient’s file as this was done, and almost precisely the same words were used that were applicable.

At the close of the interview the man left, leaving his cigarettes behind him. Six months later a long-distance call was received from the first patient, stating, “Well, the news is bad but you should feel good. Joe died last night in his sleep from a coronary attack. After he left your office, he never smoked another cigarette, his emphysema was much better, and he enjoyed life instead of worrying all the time about running out of cigarettes and about the cigarettes making his condition worse.”

CASE 3
A telephone call was received early in the morning. A man’s voice said, “I’ve just realized that my condition is an emergency. How soon can I come in?” He was told that a cancellation had just been received and he could be seen in one hour’s time. At the specified time a 32-year-old man walked in, smoking a cigarette, and stated hastily, “I’m a chronic smoker. I need help. I’ve been in psychotherapy twice a week for two years. I want to quit smoking. I can’t. Look! I’ve got six packs in my pockets right now so I can’t run out of them. My analyst says I am making progress, but I was only carrying two packs a day when I first went to him. Then slowly I increased my reserve and emergency supplies until it is up to six packs a day. I’m afraid to leave home without at least six packs in my pocket. I read about you. I want you to hypnotize me out of smoking.”

He was assured that this could not be done, but that the author would like to have him retell his story slowly, carefully, with his eyes closed, and to give it in good detail, letting his unconscious mind (he was a college graduate) take over all dominance, and that, as he related his story, he was to specify in full and comprehensive detail exactly what it was he wished in relation to cigarettes, but that during his narrative he would find himself going unaccountably into a deep and deeper trance without any interruption of his story.

The procedure and results were almost exactly comparable to the two preceding cases. Two years later another telephone call was received from the same man asking for a half-hour appointment at noon and volunteering to pay an hour’s fee. He again declared it to be an emergency.

Exactly at noon he came striding into the office and remarked. “You won’t recognize me. You only saw me for an hour two years ago. I am Mr. X, and I had had two years of analysis for excessive smoking with only an increase in my smoking. I can’t remember what went on when I saw you, but I do know that I haven’t smoked a cigarette since then. It’s embarrassing, too, because I can’t even light one for my girl. I’ve tried many times, but I can’t.

“But I went back to that analyst, and he took all the credit for my stopping smoking. I didn’t tell him about you. I thought I needed to see him about what he called a character defect in me. Here I am with a college education, and the longest I’ve worked at a job has been three months. I can always get a job, but I’m 34 now, and four years of psychoanalysis has wound up with my last job lasting only five weeks. But I’m 34 now, and I’ve got the promise of another job with a future to it. Now I want you to do something about whatever is wrong with me because I’ve quit the analyst. I’ve had better jobs than the one coming up, but there is nothing to hold me to it. It will be the same old story. Now, hypnotize me and do what I should have had you do two years ago, whatever that was.”
His former case record was looked up to refresh the author’s memory. As precisely as possible the technique of the previous occasion was followed, and he was again dismissed. Two years later he was still at the “new job” but had been promoted to a managerial position which he has held for over a year. A chance meeting with him disclosed this fact and also that he is married and a father and that his wife voluntarily gave up smoking.

**SUMMARY**

Three of a long series of similar cases are reported here to illustrate the use of hypnosis as a technique of deliberately shifting from the therapist to the patient the entire burden of both defining the psychotherapy desired and the responsibility for accepting it. Often this is the most difficult part of psychotherapy. In all the patients this author has handled successfully in this manner, all had a history of a steady, persistent search for therapy, but a failure to take the responsibility of accepting it. Additionally, all such patients with whom the author has had a known success were of a superior intelligence level.

In traditional ritualistic and conventional psychotherapies much, often futile, effort is made to induce patients to assume adequately the responsibility for their own behavior and for future effort. This is done without regard for the patients’ consciously thinking and firmly believing as an absolute truth the futility of any effort on their own part.

But utilizing hypnosis as a technique of deliberately and intentionally shifting to the patients their own burden of responsibility for therapeutic results and having them emphatically and repetitiously affirm and confirm in their own thought formulations and their own expressed verbalizations of their own desires, needs and intentions at the level of their own unconscious mentation, facilitates the therapeutic goals becoming the patient’s own goals, not those merely offered by the therapist he is visiting.

That this procedure always is successful is not true. There are many patients who want therapy but do not accept it until adequately motivated. There are other patients whose goal is no more than the continuous seeking of therapy but not the accepting of it. With this type of patient hypnotherapy fails as completely as do other forms of therapy.

[Rossi & Rossi, 2008 - 2016, Comment #3: This is an example of the essence of Erickson’s original thinking and contributions. It is fundamentally different from previous concepts of “traditional ritualistic” hypnosis and most “conventional psychotherapies.” Erickson originally called this his “naturalistic and utilization” approaches to therapeutic hypnosis and psychotherapy (Erickson 1957/2008, 1958/2008).]

Another of Erickson’s most original contributions was his invention of “hand levitation” in facilitating the induction of therapeutic hypnosis and psychotherapy (Rossi & Rossi. 2008a). What was most innovative about Erickson’s hand levitation approach is that he replaced the traditional hypnotic induction via “passivity-inducing” suggestions for relaxation and sleep with the exact opposite: hand levitation is a rather paradoxical activity that usually requires an “active effort by the patient.” Erickson would typically offer positive suggestions for achieving positive therapeutic goals while the patient was experiencing the active effort of hand levitation.

Erickson (Erickson & Rossi, 1981/2014) frequently commented that successful hand levitation requires activating muscle tonus (the slight continuous contraction characteristic of a muscle at rest) on a deep
physiological level. Erickson's patients would often tremble, vibrate, shake, sweat and feel hot with the strain they were experiencing) – the opposite of the traditional passive hypnotic induction via quiet suggestions for relaxation and sleep. Erickson's hand levitation technique activated the patient's mind and body while they were receiving positive inspiring suggestions for therapeutically reconstructing themselves. Erickson, of course, did use the traditional passive eye fixation techniques with relaxation suggestions when they were appropriate but there was always a special twinkle in his eyes when he used his active hand levitation approach that he seemed proudest of – he got his patients to work and sweat just as farmers and laborers did! What was the patient’s work and sweat all about? There seemed to be some secret and unexpected therapeutic efficacy associated with activating the patient’s mind-body while administering positive therapeutic suggestions.

What could this secret be?

It was while searching for the source of this secret efficacy of associating positive therapeutic suggestions with hand levitation and thereby activating the patient’s mind-body that Rossi (1986/1993, 2002) accidently stumbled upon the concept of “activity-dependent gene expression and brain plasticity” in the new neuroscience of psychosocial genomics, The Basic Rest-Activity Cycle, etc. (Lloyd & Rossi, 1992, 2008). It suddenly seemed intuitively obvious that Erickson’s activating hand levitation approach was turning on what the molecular biologists and neuroscientists were calling “activity-dependent gene expression and brain plasticity.”

Could this really be the secret of the therapeutic efficacy of Erickson’s hand levitation approach?

Rossi (2002, 2004, 2007) simply generalized Erickson’s activity-dependent hand levitation approach to an ever growing potpourri of “novel activity-dependent hand mirroring approaches” to therapeutic hypnosis, psychotherapy and psychosocial genomics. A pilot study documents these therapeutic approaches are efficacious in turning on gene expression in the consulting room (Rossi, Iannotti, et al., 2008). The broader cultural and educational implications of such research is that all novel, fascinating, awesome, mysterious, and numinous psychological experiences of art, beauty, and truth turn on gene expression and brain plasticity when we are creatively engaged while awake as well as when we are updating and re-constructing our mind, memories, and well-being during our dreams when asleep. Current research on brain oscillations and diurnal variations in hypnotic responsiveness (Jensen, 2016, Jensen et al. 2015a, 2015b) continues to explore the role of activity-dependent gene expression, brain plasticity and the basic rest-activity cycle in the new neuroscience of psychosocial genomics (Cozzolino et al., 2014a 2014b; Lloyd & Rossi, 1992, 2008).]

Jensen (2016), for example, reviews the most recent research as follows:

If the absolute power of theta or the amount of theta power relative to other oscillations facilitates hypnotic responding as proposed by the theta hypothesis, then not only would we predict more hypnotic responsivity when theta tends to peak during the day (e.g., in the midmorning and late afternoon/early evening, on average) but we would anticipate that there would be times within each 90- to 120-minute cycle when individuals are more prone to respond to suggestions. As Green and colleagues (2015) point out, an ultradian pattern of hypnotic responsivity was noted by Ernest Rossi more than 30 years ago (Rossi, 1982). Rossi has also noted that Milton Erickson preferred to meet with clients for 90 minutes or longer and that Erickson was aware that people cycled in and out of receptive states. Erickson would then pay close attention to clients and simply wait until they became naturally more open to new ideas and suggestions during the session. His work did not always involve the
use of a formal hypnotic induction. Thus, Rossi notes, Milton Erickson was less a genius of manipulation “but rather a genius of observation” (Rossi & Nimmons, 1991, pp. 2–3). Given these considerations,

Green and colleagues’ conclusion that the midmorning may be the best time to be hypnotized might be qualified by saying that all else being equal, and on average, the midmorning might be the best time to be hypnotized. However, close observation of individual clients for signs of responsivity, even in the early afternoon, may be the best way to identify when an individual client or patient is ready to respond to hypnosis. (p. 140, Italics added here.)

Summary

In hindsight we now have a clear 20/20 vision of the major insights in the 200-year history of hypnosis from its pre-scientific sources before James Braid (Zilboorg & Henry, 1941) to the present in four steps.

1. Continuing case studies of Milton H. Erickson’s naturalistic approaches to therapeutic hypnosis as illustrated in this paper is fomenting evidence-based neuroscience and psychosocial genomic research on the mind/body nature of therapeutic consciousness and cognition (Erickson, 1958/2008, 1964/2008).

2. Ernest Rossi’s (1982) related 30-year-old question about the naturalistic basis of Erickson’s therapy, “Hypnosis and ultradian cycles: A new state(s) theory of hypnosis?” is now being evaluated as a hypothesis about a biopsychosocial model of therapeutic hypnosis by other research groups (Green et al. 2015; Jensen, 2016; Jensen et al., 2015a b).

3. More recently well documented scientific evidence for natural circadian (~ 24 hours) and ultradian (less the 24 hours) cycles and rhythms of responsiveness in human behavior, cognition in everyday life represents a new integration neuroscience, psychobiology and medicine as well as therapeutic hypnosis. The Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine in 2017, for example, was awarded jointly to Jeffrey C. Hall, Michael Rosbash and Michael W. Young for their discoveries of molecular mechanisms controlling the circadian rhythm of life and consciousness.

4. This leads us to propose that the ultimate foundation of therapeutic consciousness, cognition, hypnosis, meditation and virtually all the so-called alternative and complementary approaches to healing may be emerging in an integrated quantum field theory of the fundamentals of physics, math, biology and psychology (Rossi & Rossi, 2014 – 2016).
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