
EDITORIAL COMMENTARY

JOHN GRUZELIER

Department of Psychology, Goldsmiths, University of London, UK

This is my swansong as editor of *Contemporary Hypnosis and Integrative Therapy* after more than a decade at the helm. With the new millennium came a dynamic decade full of challenges and innovation, culminating in an expanded title to reflect the main undercurrent — the transition from a journal of mostly experimental contributions to one of researcher and practitioner clinical contributions, along with research studies, case reports, reviews, and interviews. Theoretical perspective contributions saw an uprise in both domains — experimental and clinical.

The transition reflected a decline in university research on hypnosis which had typically had a predominantly socio-cognitive flavour. This perspective was on the wane as evidence of alterations in brain function, a state perspective, gained undeniable evidence from functional brain imaging. This has led to a more integrative approach between biological and contextual factors, and a more balanced intellectual climate. But brain scanning in its various forms is an expensive methodology, and for practical purposes is one that is less amenable to experimentation than standard cognitive and questionnaire methodology. This has led to a consequence that research productivity and publications have declined in this re-energised field, and also authors have targeted mainline neuroscience journals. Furthermore the dominant socio-cognitive perspective through the 1980s coincided with the rise of cognitive-behavioural therapy (CBT); if hypnosis is no more than words and rapport, why not use CBT? Interest in hypnosis by young practitioners declined.

The integrative approach was part of the new millennium's zeitgeist in all fields of science, especially neurobiology with its explosion of discoveries, inculcating a more flexible, open-minded orientation in scientists. This open mindedness more slowly permeated the clinical domain, but was plain to see in our journal contributions and conference presentations; see the titles of the Kraft and Kraft publications in the references below. 'Mind-body connections' was no longer considered esoteric, such that courses so described slipped seamlessly into medical school curricula.

The title expansion to include 'Integrative Therapy' had a particularly warm response from our Continental Board and readership, and inspired further contributions from their continental readership. The adoption of the Journal by the European Society of Hypnosis in Psychotherapy and Psychosomatic Medicine has been a significant advance for the Journal, and for the hypnosis community, one which has yet to fully mature.

Other significant changes included the growth through the decade of the Journal from a thrice yearly publication to become a quarterly; in the early stages not without a struggle to achieve publication on time. Special issue contributions with guest editors was a vital part of this process.

The decade also saw the retirement of the original publisher Colin Whurr in 2005, its adoption by Wiley, and following the takeover by Blackwell, the Journal found its current home with Crown House Publishing who have a specialism in hypnosis publications.

Turning to the final issue under my editorship it is fitting that, by chance it is admitted, the articles include four of the stalwart contributors during my time as editor.

Alastair Dobbin has published clinical trials on innovative self-hypnosis interventions for depression in general practice (Dobbin et al., 2004, 2009) and theoretical mind–body perspectives on hypnosis, as in the current issue (Dobbin & Ross, 2012). While mind–body courses may have entered the curriculum for medical students a decade ago, this advance has not yet filtered through to NHS practice, as the authors expound.

Katlin Varga together with her mentor Éva Bányaí and colleagues continue their exploration of the two-way relationship between the hypnotist and subject, termed interactional synchrony (Varga et al., 2006, 2008). Here they look at the impact of rapport on the formal hypnotic susceptibility of both parties concluding 'Since the hypnotist's hypnotizability scores, the scores obtained by the subjects, and the indicators of rapport are independent, rapport is not relevant to hypnotizability measurements and hypnotizability scales should be considered as reliable instruments for assessing hypnotic susceptibility'. (Varga et al., 2012).

David Kraft has followed in the footsteps of his late father and Editorial Board member Tom Kraft, both of whom have contributed frequently to the Journal with reviews and patient studies (e.g. Kraft & Kraft, 2007a, 2007b; Kraft & Kraft, 2010). Here in the creative family tradition he provides a fascinating case study of a one session smoking cessation outcome using split screen imagery, aversion, and suggestions to eliminate cravings (Kraft, 2012).

Mark Jensen provides another informative interview with a seasoned hypnotherapist, this time with Susy Signer-Fischer, from Basel. This well-received series began in 2010, and there are plenty more interviews in the pipeline.

Additionally John Mohl provides a commentary on Kirsch et al.'s (2011) 'Definitions of hypnosis and hypnotizability and their relation to suggestion and suggestibility: a consensus statement' published in the last volume. He views the conundrum from an historical perspective with suggestions for elucidation through research.

It remains for me to thank all who have contributed to the Journal through my tenure and the support of the British Society of Clinical and Academic Hypnosis, and more recently the support of both the European Society and Crown House Publishing. My best wishes to Edoardo Casiglia and the new editorial team and for a promising future for the Journal.

REFERENCES

- Dobbin A, Faulkner S, Heaney D, Selvaraj S, Gruzelier J (2004). Impact on health status of a hypnosis clinic in general practice. *Contemporary Hypnosis* 21: 153–160.
- Dobbin A, Maxwell M, Elton R (2009). A benchmarked feasibility study of a self-hypnosis treatment for depression in primary care. *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis* 57: 293–318.
- Dobbin A, Ross S (2012). Resilience and recovery: dumping dualism. *Contemporary Hypnosis & Integrative Therapy* 29(2): 136–155.
- Kirsch I, Cardeña E, Derbyshire S, Dienes Z, Heap M, Kallio S, Mazzoni G, Naish P, Oakley D, Potter C, Walters V, Whalley M (2011). Definitions of hypnosis and hypnotizability and their

- relation to suggestion and suggestibility: a consensus statement. *Contemporary Hypnosis & Integrative Therapy* 28(2): 107–115.
- Kraft D (2012). Successful treatment of heavy smoker in one hour using split screen imagery, aversion, and suggestion. *Contemporary Hypnosis & Integrative Therapy* 29(2): 175–188.
- Kraft D, Kraft T (2010). Use of invivo and invitro desensitization in the treatment of mouse phobia: review and case study. *Contemporary Hypnosis* 27: 184–194.
- Kraft T, Kraft D (2007a). An integrative approach to the treatment of hyperhidrosis: review and case study. *Contemporary Hypnosis* 24: 38–45.
- Kraft T, Kraft D (2007b). Irritable bowel syndrome: symptomatic treatment versus integrative therapy. *Contemporary Hypnosis* 24: 161–177.
- Mohl J (2012). Seeing the future by looking at the past: comment on Kirsch et al. *Contemporary Hypnosis & Integrative Therapy* 29(2): 169–174.
- Signer-Fischer S, Jensen M (2012). An interview with Susy Signer-Fischer. *Contemporary Hypnosis & Integrative Therapy* 29(2): 189–199.
- Varga K, Józsa E, Bányai ÉI, Gősi-Greguss AC (2006). A new way of characterizing hypnotic interactions: Dyadic Interactional Harmony (DIH) Questionnaire. *Contemporary Hypnosis* 23(4): 151–166.
- Varga K, Bányai ÉI, Józsa E, Gősi-Greguss AC (2008). Interactional phenomenology of maternal- and parental hypnosis styles. *Contemporary Hypnosis* 25(1): 14–28.
- Varga K, Bányai ÉI, Józsa E, Gősi-Greguss AC (2012). Phenomenological synchrony and hypnotic susceptibility. *Contemporary Hypnosis & Integrative Therapy* 29(2): 156–168.