

## La psicologia diffonde idee false sull'ipnosi

Una recente definizione dell'ipnosi da parte dell'APA (l'ordine degli psicologi americani) stranamente si è dimenticata delle ben più comuni trance spontanee (senza ipnotista), cioè in pratica inganna i clinici, i ricercatori, e il pubblico circa la reale natura dell'ipnosi.

## Psychology spreads lies about hypnosis

A recent definition of hypnosis published by APA (American Psychological Association) has weirdly forgotten to include the common spontaneous trances without the hypnotist, so it misinforms clinicians, researchers, and the public about the true nature of hypnosis.

Whither spontaneous hypnosis: A Critical issue for practitioners and researchers  
Am J Clin Hypn. 2005 Oct-2006 Jan;48(2-3):91-7  
Barabasz AF  
Washington State University, USA. arreed\_barabasz@wsu.edu

The critical aspects of recognizing that hypnotic responses are part of everyday life for those who are hypnotizable are considered. The failure of the American Psychological Association (APA) definition to include spontaneous hypnosis is discussed along with the resultant implications for misinforming clinicians, researchers and the public.

**La definizione di ipnosi da parte degli psicologi è scorretta e fuorviante perché si è dimenticata della trance spontanea**

Inoltre la definizione trascura ingiustamente anche le differenze individuali tra i soggetti, attribuisce all'immaginazione un ruolo assai discutibile, e poi sembra fatta apposta per tutelare gli interessi degli psicologi a scapito dei non psicologi, come si legge qui sotto.

In addition, the definition neglects unfairly also the individual differences among the subjects, it attributes to imagination a very questionable role, and it seems tailored to protect the interests of the psychologists at the expenses of the lay people (see below).

**La definizione di ipnosi trascura le differenze da una persona all'altra, e non considera la "lay hypnosis"**

Some polite applause for the 2003 APA Division 30 definition of hypnosis  
Am J Clin Hypn. 2005 Oct-2006 Jan;48(2-3):99-106  
Woody E, Sadler P  
Department of Psychology, University of Waterloo, 200 University Avenue, West Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G1. ewoody@uwaterloo.ca

The authors argue that the new definition of hypnosis by Division 30 of the American Psychological Association contains questionable information about the role of imagination in hypnosis, about the use versus omission of the word hypnosis in inductions, and about the nature of individual differences and their relation to the standardized scales. In addition, the definition appears to conflate formal and exemplar-based types of definition, and it does not seem particularly well-tuned to the interests of lay persons. The authors advance some suggestions for future definitional efforts.

Tentare di mantenere l'ipnosi nei limiti della psicologia significa negare la realtà, perché fin dagli anni '70 sappiamo che l'ipnosi ha una natura molto neurofisiologica (v. sotto).

The attempt to keep hypnosis within the limits of the psychology means to deny reality, because since the 1970s we know that hypnosis is mainly neurophysiological.

**Let's be honest with ourselves and transparent with the public**  
Am J Clin Hypn. 2005 Oct-2006 Jan;48(2-3):127-9  
Rossi EL

**L'ipnosi "psicologica" è finita**

**Bisogna essere onesti. L'ipnosi compete più alla neuroscienza che alla psicologia tradizionale**

[...] scientific progress has never been made by denying reality. [...] The general public and many professionals privately realize that "psychological hypnosis" is at a profound impasse at the present time. [...] The proposed DDH [current APA Division 30 search for a description and definition of hypnosis] is completely devoid of including anything new that we have learned about hypnosis during the past generation or two that could be of vital interest to the general public. Since the 1970s, most well-funded researchers have broken out of the limiting preconceptions of the psychological and behavioral level in the mental health fields by embracing the broader scientific discipline that is now generally called neuroscience.