

# Avatar Update

Personal Opinion of Sofia Smallstorm

August 2014

email: avatarproducts@earthlink.net PO Box 698, Cardiff CA 92007

*Negative Space  
Trance-formation  
Mutually Confused  
Tele Trance  
Anchoring to Survive  
The Real Work of Imagery*

*A subscription newsletter  
to bring you bits and pieces  
that clarify understanding  
as I come to learn more  
in my own Rabbit Hole  
discoveries*

## *Negative Space*

Some years ago I met a nice man at the YMCA and we began a discussion about the state of the world. He was in his early 60s, I would guess, and got very interested in what I was saying. We talked about 9/11 being a false flag and the artificially engineered weather; I explained to him what chemtrails were and how the vaccines being given to children were actually harming them, not preventing disease. This man seemed delighted to learn so much and when he mused about how he was going to tell others without having to embark on months of study and digging to be able to explain it competently himself, I suggested he get some of my Independent Thinker's Fact Sheet cards and pass them around. He thought that was a great idea and gave me his phone number. I told him I would prepare a mix of the cards for a low price and he could meet me the next day while I was out and about and get them from me.

Although we talked the following morning and arranged to meet at a mutually convenient place later in the day, he was a no-show. So I called him again to find out if he was coming at all, and this is what he said: "After thinking about it and talking to some of my friends, I realized all this puts me in a very negative space, and to try to share this information with my friends – I couldn't do that to them. I've decided, after thinking about it, that I'm going to pass. I just can't tell my friends – I can't do this to them. It's too negative for me to tell them the truth, so I'm going to pass on the material." By this he meant my printed fact sheets.

I remember sitting in my car after this call. I wrote down his words on a scrap of paper and came across it the other day in my kitchen, stashed with miscellaneous business cards and notes. This scrap of paper is worth keeping forever.

In 1853 Herman Melville wrote a short story called "Bartleby the Scrivener." I remember reading this in college; it is a fascinating story in slow and painstaking detail about a copy-writer or scribe hired by a Wall Street lawyer (in the

days before Xerox machines, obviously). Bartleby, the new officer worker, refuses to do anything but copy documents: no errand-running, no assistance of any kind to anyone; he even bars his boss from entering the office on a Sunday morning because Bartleby is in the office himself, otherwise engaged. His standard reply to any request is: "I would prefer not to." Over and over he says this, and over and over his response—though baffling and highly inconvenient to the others in the office—is accepted.

It takes a very long time for the lawyer to dismiss (fire) Bartleby for non-cooperation, and yet he does not leave. So the lawyer decides to leave himself – move his office to another building. Bartleby continues to haunt the former premises, now sitting on the banister and hanging about in the hall. He is finally carted off as a vagrant and imprisoned, and it is in the prison yard, under a tree, that he curls up and dies. We learn that he used to be a clerk at the Dead Letter Office in Washington, deprived of his job due to an administrative change. The story ends with a two-sentence paragraph: *Ah Bartleby! Ah humanity!* and one leaves it with a sigh, for indeed, humanity includes some very odd ducks who do not want other people's help. The fact remains that we are all on this "boat" together (our Planet Earth) and if the majority of folks prefer not to wake up and start changing things, well then ... I will not finish this sentence.

## *Trance-formation*

Also some years ago I had a conversation with a woman who was a Christian Scientist and worked at the local Christian Science Reading Room. She told me that Christian Scientists believe that everyone who is not a Christian Scientist is *under a spell*. I was puzzled by this and asked what kind of spell, and learned that she was referring to a kind of trance or mass hypnosis. This I understood. While Christian Science (founded by Mary Baker Eddy in the mid-1800s) relies heavily on prayer for solutions to personal and wider-ranging problems, this particular follower was trying to express to me how much "other people" did not see in their world, how shut down they were, you might say, and

all this to their own detriment and misfortune. The “spell” or trance was blinding them.

A dictionary definition of trance is “a half-conscious state characterized by an absence of response to external stimuli, typically as induced by hypnosis or entered by a medium.” Example: ‘she put him into a light trance.’ Synonyms: daze, stupor, hypnotic state, half-conscious state, dream, reverie, fugue state; ‘He pretended to be in a trance.’” In hypnosis, the state induced is one in which the subject is actually in heightened, specific focus with distractions blocked out, making him extremely receptive to instruction or direction. It was this discovery of self-induced selective focus that turned a helpless young polio victim not only into a walking miracle but a medical doctor who introduced the world to the immense creative power of the unconscious mind.

Enter Milton Erickson. A farm boy in Wisconsin, born in 1901, Erickson was stricken with paralytic polio at age 17. (It would be very interesting to know if chemical pesticides were being used on his father’s farm, for children who contracted crippling palsy at that time—later called polio—lived near or in such places.) Bed-ridden, unable to talk, and given the dimmest hope of recovery by his doctors, young Milton could only move his eyes and register conversations with his ears. These two working senses revealed much to him about human behavior. From Wikipedia:

[A]lmost entirely lame in bed, and unable to speak, he became strongly aware of the significance of non-verbal communication—body language, tone of voice and the way that these non-verbal expressions often directly contradicted the verbal ones.

“I had polio, and I was totally paralyzed, and the inflammation was so great that I had a sensory paralysis too. I could move my eyes and my hearing was undisturbed. I got very lonesome lying in bed, unable to move anything except my eyeballs. I was quarantined on the farm with seven sisters, one brother, two parents, and a practical nurse. And how could I entertain myself? I started watching people and my environment. I soon learned that my sisters could say “no” when they meant “yes.” And they could say “yes” and mean “no” at the same time. They could offer another sister an apple and hold it back. And I began studying nonverbal language and body language. I had a baby sister who had begun to learn to creep. I would have to learn to stand up and walk. And you can imagine the intensity with which I

watched as my baby sister grew from creeping to learning how to stand up.”

He began to recall “body memories” of the muscular activity of his own body. By concentrating on these memories, he slowly began to regain control of parts of his body to the point where he was eventually able to talk and use his arms. Still unable to walk, he decided to train his body further by embarking—alone—on a thousand-mile canoe trip with only a few dollars. After this grueling trip, he was able to walk with a cane.

...

Much later, in his fifties, he developed post-polio syndrome, characterized by pain and muscle weakness caused by the chronic over-use of partially paralyzed muscles. The condition left him even more severely paralyzed, but, having been through the experience once before, he now had a strategy for recovering some use of his muscles which he employed again. After this second recovery, he was obliged to use a wheelchair and suffered chronic pain which he controlled with self-hypnosis.

Erickson seems to have put himself through a lot of intensely grueling self-training. His discoveries, however, paved the road to NLP (neurolinguistic programming), family therapy and medical hypnosis. He was criticized by many who objected to his clever, unorthodox methodologies. He is also known for something called Confusion Technique, which the Wiki entry is very skimpy on. I found more at another link, but it was too confusing for me to make sense of. From the little bit on the Wiki page:

In all my techniques, almost all, there is a confusion. A confused person has their conscious mind busy and occupied, and is very much inclined to draw upon unconscious learnings to make sense of things. A confused person is in a trance of their own making—and therefore goes readily into that trance without resistance. Confusion might be created by ambiguous words, complex or endless sentences, pattern interruption or a myriad of other techniques to incite transderivational searches.

Scottish surgeon James Braid, who coined the term “hypnotism,” claimed that focused attention was essential for creating hypnotic trances; indeed, his thesis was that hypnosis was in essence a state of extreme focus. But it can be difficult for

people racked by pain, fear or suspicion to focus on anything at all. Thus other techniques for inducing trance become important, or as Erickson explained:

... long and frequent use of the confusion technique has many times effected exceedingly rapid hypnotic inductions under unfavourable conditions such as acute pain of terminal malignant disease and in persons interested but hostile, aggressive, and resistant ...

The unconscious mind, as we know from enough familiarity with psychology, is our constant attendant, even when we are sleeping. Patients under anesthesia while undergoing surgery can register and even recall conversations being carried on in the operating room. The idea of quotidian “confusion” representing a kind of self-induced trance was one I found very interesting, for are we not all rushing around in the outside world—often in a preoccupied state—trying to get things done every day? However, Erickson had his own way of inducing confusion and then trance, with a certain kind of handshake followed by a question, a lingering look, etc. (You can read more about it at <http://www.lermanet.com/exit/confusion-technique.htm>)

### *Mutually Confused*

Then there is television and Erickson’s practice of “mutual trance,” which rang a bell for me instantly. Those MK Ultra anchors, spouting rubbish for news, could they be in a trance state (maybe always, given their profession), addressing a public also in trance thanks to flickering light, ticker-tape feeds and a barrage of carefully selected imagery? Watching TV, the unconscious mind certainly participates in what is an active information-planting (read: programming) process. *Mutual trance* and *confusion technique* may well be ingredients of our everyday lives. When you listen to people in the grocery store—for instance, two people who know each other and encounter by chance—you will hear a gobbledygook of senseless hellos and superficial questions that go absolutely nowhere; it’s a five-minute air-bubble exchange that leaves me shaking my head and now I know the word: *mutual trance*.

It’s because they are preoccupied with shopping, they didn’t expect to run into each other, they can’t make the effort to have a meaningful exchange. They are already each in their own self-induced trance. The bibble-babble they trade keeps them in trance and allows them to feel complete, as breaking the trance would throw off the momentum of the hour and the place. I am not a psychologist, but I have seen this

dozens of times and now I think I am able to explain it.

Pre-occupation itself is a curious thing. When I used to be an avid bicyclist, I often returned from a 20-mile or longer ride and had no recall of it when I got off my bike and opened the garage door. I knew I had been riding, and that it was glorious and wonderful – sweeping down hills and cranking up them – but I really did not remember much else, except the route I had chosen. Was it a kind of zen that one gets in, produced by “enjoyment endorphins,” perhaps, or was it amnesia? Overall, the realization left me alarmed, for I could have had any kind of mishap if indeed my mind was somewhere else while my body was busy pedaling next to cars and waiting at stop lights. So preoccupation might be *concentration* on a task or thought process, or it might be an *immersion* into something such that all else becomes secondary, even going unnoticed. Except, of course, by that always wakeful unconscious of ours. More from Wiki:

Erickson believed that the unconscious mind was always listening and that, whether or not the patient was in trance, suggestions could be made which would have a hypnotic influence, as long as those suggestions found resonance at the unconscious level. The patient could be aware of this or could be completely oblivious that something was happening. Erickson would see if the patient would respond to one or another kind of indirect suggestion and allow the unconscious mind to participate actively in the therapeutic process. In this way, what seemed like a normal conversation might induce a hypnotic trance, or a therapeutic change in the subject. According to [colleague Andre] Weitzenhoffer, “[Erickson’s] conception of the unconscious is definitely not the one held by Freud.”

I was surprised to learn from a friend that he had been a “hobby-hypnotist” in college, so good that fellow students would follow him around begging to be hypnotized. He said one of his specialties was to enable near-perfect memory retention, which was obviously a big plus when it came to studying for exams. How did he put people under, I asked, and the answer I got was a whirlwind of relaxation steps that brought on progressive stages of “sleep,” filled with imagery of beaches and clouds and idyllic hangouts. He said it all began when a hypnotist visited his college and did a “teaser” show in the cafeteria to get a buzz going. David was one of the volunteers in the cafeteria, positive that he would not be hypnotized and quite surprised that he was. During the teaser show, the hypnotist told his hypnotized subjects that if they were in the audience at the evening (official)

performance, he would bring out a lemon and that would be their cue to come up to the stage. David went to the evening show and deliberately sat in the center (widest) aisle, flanked by seats filled with people on all sides. Sure enough, the hypnotist casually brought out a lemon towards the middle of the show and began to roll and squeeze it. David, watching alertly, felt his mouth pucker. When the man cut into the lemon, David felt his body springing up. "I literally pushed and beat my way over people to get to the stage. I would have jumped over the orchestra pit but another guy was also thrashing through audience and he took a turn down the aisle so I followed him. Twelve of us from the first show were on the stage. He put us to sleep with a single word. After that I read every book on hypnosis that I could find."

### ***Tele Trance***

Another friend who is a professional hypnotherapist was emphatic in his emails to me (cobbled together here):

Hypnosis is not mind control. A mind control program is far, far more involved—e.g., mind breakdown via physical /emotional trauma, drugs, electric shock, sensory deprivation and then the application of hypnosis once the mind has been "readied" (see Ewen Cameron's MK Ultra de-pattern/re-pattern techniques). [In my practice] I do spend time dispelling client perceptions of hypnosis as mind control (from TV, movies, etc.). I focus on keeping hypnosis in a positive light because the benefits to a client can be huge.

I can tell you that I have spent time studying Erickson's approach and have found his techniques very effective. Erickson also taught (aside from 'indirect' suggestion) that a simple, small change in a behavioral pattern/cycle can have significant positive effects on resolving the larger conflict. I am very familiar with the confusion technique. But for people to attribute the creation of it to Erickson is overly simplistic. Erickson simply figured out he could utilize the technique to induce trance. Trance is a natural state of consciousness—there's nothing magical or mysterious about it.

I use [confusion technique] in my practice. It is very effective to induce hypnosis, especially with analytical types. The key to all of this, like anything else, is how it's used. With "confusions," what happens is the conscious mind essentially

relinquishes its primary presence as the conscious state. This happens because [inducing] confusion "tires" the conscious mind, resulting in trance. Once in trance, that person is now in a subconscious state—*which is very suggestible*. However, the sub/unconscious mind can reject suggestions (and will). This is why my approach is what I refer to as "interactive" (feedback via dialog with the client while in the trance state). The practitioner must be able to assess whether the suggestions are being considered/accepted/rejected. Hypnotists who only read scripts have a high degree of failure because as they read, with no client feedback, the unconscious can be rejecting the suggestions.

TV is a hypnosis box. It creates an alpha state of trance. The person watching the screen is bombarded with images. *The unconscious mind loves imagery*. Loves it. Take a cable news outlet. They run and re-run the same video loop over and over and over again (remember Bin Laden with the machine gun, the planes hitting the towers, etc.) and to reinforce the imagery (the looped video) the screen flashes the words **TERROR ALERT, BOMBING, WAR, MASS SHOOTING**. *Now the imagery is synched with the verbal suggestions*. It's all programming, as you know. Even the spinning logos at the bottom of the screen are hypnotic aids. The ticker tape at the bottom of the screen ... it's there to induce trance, not so you can get your latest stock price. This is referred to as *eye fixation*, which results in eye fatigue and induces trance. Some hypnotists will induce trance by asking a client to focus on the flickering flame of a candle. Same premise.

I read this friend's emails several times. The content seemed a little above my head until I decided to do what is above—combine them like pieces of a jigsaw puzzle. And what I got was *a giant new understanding*. Yes, I know that "TV is mind-control" but I really never understood why. One can assume that it is mind control from (1) the asinine content (e.g., there is now a show on Discovery called "Naked and Afraid" in which idiots from our society wander around the African savanna without any clothing, trying to figure out how to eat, make fires, find water and survive ... BTW their private parts are blurred so we can't ogle away) ... because why would anyone spend so much money on stupidity unless there was a plan to make us all stupid? (2) the quantity and prevalence of advertisements, and (3) the speed or bombardment of input, which you could call

“information” but is preponderantly misinformation, distortion and outright fiction or lies. But how does all that add up to mind control, I have always wanted to know ... and now, having come across this term “confusion technique,” I am beginning to understand.

TV operates, to make it simple, on the trick of *too much*. Overload. Too many channels, choices, programs, voices – a *kaleidoscope* of swirling, tumbling material that constantly interrupts itself (the unceasing commercials), with sound and tempo and mood continually and abruptly changing. The kaleidoscope is in other hands – not yours. This is an accord we have to accept upon simply turning on the set, a First Level of Acceptance: *You are not in control*. The content is going to be interrupted and switched *whether you like it or not*.

This rapid barrage of sensory input is both unnatural and next-to-impossible to keep up with. As my friend said in his email, it *tires the conscious mind*. So the conscious mind gives up on being our conscious presence, because it can't keep up with and is actually annoyed by the gibberish of the TV. *So we sit in trance*. This is the job of *confusion technique*. What is now happily lapping up the panoply of images and inputs is our *unconscious*, which, as my friend pointed out, delights in imagery and nonsensical ways of putting things together (think of your dreams). It turns out that the smorgasbord is not all helter-skelter: images and scenes are paired with words, things flash and are emphasized, repetition is used ... there is deliberate linking and synching that exploits our passive Alice-in-Wonderland state, for the PTBs know that we are now permeable and suggestible, like little children at a magic show. This is our Second Level of Acceptance.

We are all aware of how many people are soothed by and addicted to television, coming home after a hard day and falling on the couch with a cold drink, maybe dinner, ready to let the techno-screen do its free babysitting “because I can relax, I don't have to think.” This is an admission that they are turning their mind off, blissfully unaware that their unconscious is taking over and bringing surging rivers of influence with it. And all that influence will be buried, hidden away from personal assessment or scrutiny, *because they are relaxing, literally not paying attention*. (All the better to bathe your brain with! said the Wolf to Little Red Riding Hood.)

### ***Anchoring to Survive***

*The unconscious mind loves imagery*. How does all this imagery influence our beliefs? I asked my hypnotherapist

friend. “TV is a perpetual motion machine,” he said. “They never stop. They keep going at it. They synch up images and words – let's use 9/11 and Bin Laden as an example. You see ‘terror alert’ on the TV screen together with ‘Al Qaeda’ and you hear them talking about ‘Islamic terrorists’ over and over.” *Our defense mechanism is survival*, he explained. We all want to avoid danger so we can survive. Because TV pummels us with stories and warnings of so many dangers, it gets the attention, you might say, of our primal survival instinct, and we thus begin to create some very basic conclusions about how to survive. One of these might be *Trust in the Government: it has identified the Danger and has offered to save me*. Another might be: *It is worth giving up some of my liberties for greater security. Let the Government know what I am up to*. The way I look at it, these very simple conclusions, because they are formed with the participation of the un- or subconscious, take deep root in us. The bewildered conscious mind allows the rooting of these new survival equations because it cannot explain or follow the mess of information it is looking at. (And let's remind ourselves that this info mess is mostly false and/or highly exaggerated.)

My friend told me that he uses specific exercises or techniques while his clients are in trance. “When a person is deep in trance, they will be able to put a picture together,” he said. They can be guided to see certain things and be given suggestions so that they integrate the suggestions with what they are seeing, which is called *anchoring*. The use of imagery, then, becomes the platform on and into which you build suggestions or concepts. In beneficial hypnosis (as I will call it), this might be about modifying behavior or getting over personal limitations. While in trance, without the presence of the conscious mind, our basic structure can be much more easily changed, especially with our own agreement and participation. When you buy a TV set, install it, turn it on, sit down with relief to relax and watch it, you are definitely agreeing and participating. What you don't know is that you are also agreeing to have your conscious mind turned off by the hodgepodge of “info-tainment” and your soul to be imprinted with its macabre intent. We are *anchoring* the images and suggestions being tossed at us because our gatekeeper mind has shut down temporarily. I wish I could put this on a billboard or the side of a bus!

My hypnotherapist friend is also a reality-spreader and activist. “I see it all the time when I talk to people,” he said, meaning regular people, not his clients. “I try to tell them what's going on—we have constant chemtrails here, for instance—and they just shut down. *It's the conscious mind that has just given up*.” And now I too get it! When the glazed look descends and the eyes go blank and there is no

response as you rattle on about 9/11 or whatever, they are relying on their anchoring (programming) which was made in the absence of their conscious mind, and *the words you are using automatically shut this mind down because they evoke pictures/memories of time spent in front of the TV when the programming was done.* And that's why those teleprompter readers are called *anchors!*

### ***The Real Work of Imagery ...***

We operate in pictures. Our memory is in pictures: How many scenes from the past can you see in your mind? And here comes my segue into Samantha Khury and her remarkable ability to communicate with animals by way of picture exchange. Oddly enough, Samantha Khury used to live quite near me, only minutes away, but she is not easily located on the internet. Regardless, you can watch a lovely documentary on YouTube titled *I Talk to Animals, A Portrait of Samantha Khury*, well worth an hour of your time. (I sent a link around recently but that upload has been removed now, but it is on something called SnagFilms, or just keep looking for it on YouTube; produced by Peter Friedman.) In this film you will see her getting entire stories and scenes from the dogs and cats and horses she spends time with, mainly because their owners have made appointments with her due to their animals acting up or becoming depressed for unknown reasons. The following is from a segment in the film during which Samantha worked with a wrought-up little cat:

Samantha: What I did was, I worked with Tonga starting out [by] giving him pictures about biting. How you do this is, animals think in pictures, or visual images. In your mind, if you can give him a picture of what it is you would like him to do, he will be able to pick up your impressions or visual images very, very quickly. As I was working with him, I found that he has two things going – one, of a *fun* nature regarding hands, and one of a *terror* nature regarding hands. So I decided to activate the part about the terror and being frightened ... with somebody coming at him. So what happened is, we went back in time. I literally saw him being taken – he talked about it being a male that had picked him up and grabbed him – that particular incident is the incident that is traumatic for him. So he has a couple of areas on the back that he gets highly activated by when you pet him, and what it does is it continually triggers this uncomfortable memory. I have told him that he hurts us by biting, and that he has to quit that, and that hurts [us] as much as his back. Okay? Then he

started telling me about your shower curtain.

Client [laughing]: Yeah, what did he say about the shower curtain?

Samantha: He loves that shower curtain!

Client [nodding]: Oh yes, it's full of holes. And he likes the bathtub too.

That is one example from what you might call an “animal whisperer,” who had a full appointment book for years. She worked with racehorses, zoo elephants, even ants and little birds. But much more important than any whispering were the images. *She saw their images and gave them images.* So the question it kicked off in me was: Perhaps we humans are not using our image capabilities enough? We communicate mainly with words and, since we became literate, with text. While words can conjure images as they are delivered (e.g., if I were to describe to you what happened to me yesterday), perhaps this is only a feeble rudiment of communication. What if you can I could just beam images into one another's heads and get *movies* going? In fact, I think this is why the PTBs created the movies – to take the place of our own software (so to speak) in our own image-making minds! Now they feed us *their* images and have thus taken over our brains, leaving us with memory-making as our only remaining imagery function. What if ...?

What if images stored in memory are actually exchangeable from one person to another? What if this is a basic but long-lost function? Amazing how we recognize faces even if we have met them only briefly once before. *That person looks familiar.* Your image-bank tells you this, but your mind is slow to figure out who or why. If television is hurling pictures at us and mixing them with words such that our minds stop and our unconscious opens and new beliefs emerge in the entire population, then there is *definitely something going on.* What if we stopped relying on words so much and began to force ourselves to use pictures to get information to each other?? It might be a way of waking up a sleeping function. In fact, people mainly trade images on their phones now, using less and less text. Could this be an even greater encroachment on our essential mental functions—using [their] technologically created images to make and record our memories instead of our own much more elastic personal human software?

Try some telepathy experiments sending your pictures instead of your thoughts ...