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Abstract: The authors summarize personal, intellectual, and social influences on Campbell Perry’s (1937–2003) life and research on hypnosis. His education in Australia reflected the influences of a public primary school, a prestigious private high school, and undergraduate and graduate work at Australia’s oldest university. His approach to hypnosis was influenced initially by Gordon Hammer and Philip Sutcliffe, and his life generally was influenced by John Anderson, the leader of the Libertarian Society, the intellectual core of a broader group known as the Push. This group reflected in part the thinking of the pre-Socratic Greek philosopher, Heraclitus, who taught that change was the only reality. The article summarizes Perry’s work on hypnosis and memory, and his contributions concerning uncancelled hypnotic suggestions, pain and surgery, and imagery and hypnotizability are summarized.

It is a sad pleasure to participate in this tribute to Campbell Perry’s lifetime of research on hypnosis. Peter Sheehan sends his apologies for not being able to be here. We were friends, colleagues, and coauthors with Cam in various ways at various times, and our interconnections were highly interactive. Cam and Peter completed their undergraduate and graduate work at the University of Sydney (c. 1955–1966); worked...
together at the Unit for Experimental Psychiatry, University of Pennsylvania (c. 1966–1968); and Cam visited Peter at the University of Queensland (c. 1975–1976), where I was a student at that time. I worked with Cam at Concordia University (c. 1981–1983); and Cam visited me at Macquarie University (c. 1990) and the University of New South Wales (c. 1994 & 1998).

Consistent with Australian psychology generally (see Bochner, 2000; Cooke, 2000; Feather, 1985; McConkey & Bond, 1991; McConkey, Wilton, Barnier, & Bennett, 1994; Nixon & Taft, 1977; O’Neil, 1987; Sheehan, 1989; Taft & Day, 1988; Turtle, 1985), Australian researchers have often focused on methodological and experimental design aspects of research on hypnosis (see Sheehan, 1985; Sheehan & McConkey, 1982; Sheehan & Perry, 1976), and this can be seen in Cam’s distinctive journey along the intertwining themes of theory, method, and application in his important publications (see also Nadon, 2003). It can be seen, for example, in Cam’s very first scientific publication 40 years ago in the International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis (Austin, Perry, Sutcliffe, & Yeomans, 1963), as well as in our joint book, book chapter, and journal article publications with Cam. Those publications reflect shared interests in the theory and methodology of hypnosis research (Sheehan & Perry, 1976, 1980), the history of hypnosis (McConkey & Perry, 1985, 2002; Perry & McConkey, 2002), and particular hypnotic phenomena, processes, and correlates, such as posthypnotic amnesia, age regression, hypnotic hypermesia, dissociation and duality in hypnosis, interpersonal aspects of the hypnotic context, and imagery and hypnotic susceptibility (Nadon, D’Eon, McConkey, Laurence, & Perry, 1988; Nogrady, McConkey, Laurence, & Perry, 1983; Nogrady, McConkey, & Perry, 1985; Perry & Sheehan, 1978; Sutcliffe, Perry, & Sheehan, 1970).

Since leaving Australia in 1966, Cam maintained his Australian identity and connections both personal and professional with persistent enthusiasm. He worked fearlessly to ensure that the use of Australian slang (or Strine), the telling of dubious jokes, an encyclopedic knowledge of sports, and a love of grog and ciggies all helped to maintain a firm identity. In addition to his short- and long-term visits to Australia over the last 37 years, Cam made a point of publishing in the Australian Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis on many topics, including hypnosis and smoking cessation, dissociative phenomena of hypnosis, experimental investigations of hypnosis, hypnosis in the forensic context, hypnosis and memory, and the history of hypnosis in Australia (Marcovitch, Gelfand, & Perry, 1980; Perry, 1984, 1987, 2000b, 2001; Perry & Laurence, 1989). Cam also wrote about some intriguing and important events in Australia that involved hypnosis. His article on the infamous “Mr Magic” legal case in Sydney in the mid-1970s remains one of the most comprehensive, detailed, and compelling analyses of apparent hypnotic coercion and compliance that has
appeared in published work (Perry, 1979; see also Laurence & Perry, 1988; McConkey & Sheehan, 1995; Sheehan, 1977). Indeed, this article is an excellent example of his thoughtful, informed, and open-minded inquiry into difficult things (see also Karlin, 2003), as is the book by Laurence and Perry (1988) on hypnosis, will, and memory. Cam brought a sense of fresh experience and informed wonder to much that he approached (for a delightful invitation to the human value of wonder, see Fisher, 1999).

THE FLORIST’S SON

Campbell Weston Perry was born on August 15, 1937, in Sydney; he died on May 15, 2003, aged 65 years, in Montréal. Cam’s parents separated when he was a very small child. Cam’s father was a merchant, and his name also was Campbell Weston Perry. The Perry family can be traced to the early 1800s in Australia, and in the mid-1800s the daughter of a Major George Weston married a Campbell Perry and their son became the first in a line of several men named Campbell Weston Perry over the last 150 years. As far as we know, Cam was the last of that line. As an only child, Cam was raised by his mother, Jean, and his grandmother, Flo, who ran what was perhaps Sydney’s best known flower shop from the 1930s to the 1960s on Eddy Avenue at Central Station, Sydney. Cam’s mother married Ken Swirles in the early 1960s and moved into office work; Jean Swirles, now in her early 90s, lives happily in a retirement village in Sydney. Jean knows this symposium is occurring, and asked me to express her best wishes to those who were friends of Cam. Jean tells me that even as a very young child, Cam liked talking about “almost anything,” and he liked being at “the centre of a group of people who talked and argued about everything.” Cam’s relentless observation of life was present from the beginning (see also Laurence, 2003).

For primary school, Cam attended Coogee Bay Public School, and for high school he won a scholarship to attend Knox Grammar School, a prestigious private school for boys in Sydney. It was there that his love of the French language began, with that love perhaps inspired by a schoolboy crush on a girl he met during Knox excursions to French-speaking Noumea for immersion French courses. It was in the privileged environment of Knox that Cam began friendships with people who would grow to be leaders in their fields. Although Cam would probably want me to, this is not the time to recount one of his stories about group self-mutilation sessions at Knox. Cam’s verbal utterances ranged from mild to wild irreverence and usually displayed his essential characteristics of wit and humor (Bukowski, 2003; Linn & Manton, 2003; Rozycki, 2003); notably, jokes about sexual indulgence and indiscretion were among his favorite type.
Another characteristic of Cam was his personal loyalty. If Cam decided you would be a friend, then it would be a friendship for life, despite distance in time and space, occasional personal and professional disagreements, your own personal disasters and disappointments, and the inevitable difficulty of dealing with some of Cam’s behavior, especially around his smoking, verbal utterances (from time to time), and drinking. “Cam’s ashtray” remains in my house in Sydney, with Cam being the one and only user. On his visits, I quickly realized that his solemn promise to only smoke “out the back” in fact meant “most of the house.” Also, and perhaps this is more a reflection on me rather than Cam, shortly after arriving from the airport on his last visit, Cam proudly handed me a bottle of very expensive whisky as a gift and immediately suggested that we taste it. Some hours later, I was lying legless on my kitchen floor, and Cam was off to the Riverview Hotel to meet some of his “mates from the Push” for a few more drinks. The proximity of this famous watering hole to my house was possibly one of the reasons that Cam liked to stay with me in Sydney. He would say, however, that he stayed there because he took seriously the role that I gave him in the late 1980s of being in charge of my (then small) daughter’s “moral development and table manners.” I gave him that role in about January 1988 when he was gleefully disgusted as she vomited her food over him when we were having dinner, a topic he raised in most telephone calls to me ever since that time. Cam’s last telephone call to me was in early April 2003, and it began with his characteristic “G’day, ANZAC.”

THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

After high school, Cam won a scholarship to attend the University of Sydney, the oldest and one of the most prestigious universities in Australia. The 1950s and 1960s were golden years for psychology at that university (see Latimer & Michell, 1996; O’Neil, 1987; Sutcliffe, 1978). These years also saw the birth of the experimental investigation of hypnosis in Australia (see Perry, 2001; Sheehan, 1985) and the beginning of its acceptance as a clinical technique (Meares, 1966, 1968; see also Evans & Burrows, 1998). Hypnosis research began in earnest at that university in the mid-1950s and two major groups formed, one around A. Gordon Hammer (e.g., Hammer, 1961) and the other around J. Philip Sutcliffe (e.g., Sutcliffe, 1960, 1961). Hammer or Sutcliffe supervised hypnosis research by many people, including Margaret Austin, Fred Evans, Jean Jones, Cam Perry, Peter Sheehan, George Singer, Wendy Thorne, and Wendy-Louise Walker. Sheehan (1985) documented the diaspora of the students and grand-students of Hammer and Sutcliffe and their interactions with other hypnosis researchers around the world. It is interesting to note how the extent of that international
interchange has been relatively distinct in Australian psychology. Arguably, this has served to keep hypnosis research in Australia directly in touch with and influential on contemporary theoretical debate worldwide. Contemporary hypnosis researchers in Australia include Amanda Barnier, Richard Bryant, Rochelle Hung, Graham Jamieson, David Mallard, Kevin McConkey, and Peter Sheehan (e.g., Barnier, 2002; Barnier & McConkey, 2003; Bryant & Mallard, 2002, 2003; Cox & Barnier, 2003, Jamieson & Sheehan, 2002). The intellectual lineage of these researchers can be traced to Hammer and Sutcliffe, whose enduring influence Cam acknowledged very regularly (e.g., Perry, 2001).

Gordon Hammer (who died in December 1999, aged 85 years) had a Socratic style of teaching and supervising, often in the context of drinks and good times. He cared deeply that students argued their position well and defensively, even when the position was one that Hammer disagreed with strongly. He could and would disagree strongly but always with good humor and in the spirit of providing an intellectual challenge. The drinking, humor, and intellectual challenge appealed greatly to Cam, and I remember well the long conversation that Cam and I had shortly after Hammer died. As Cam pointed out, Hammer published very little, and it was only by being present when he spoke that one understood the depth and clarity of his thought and his charisma as a person (Perry, 2001). Cam and I had a similar conversation, albeit very different in content, shortly after Sutcliffe died. Cam was known for his lengthy telephone calls—or gum flaps, as he called them—to friends in Australia, during which he would discuss all manner of things, adding bizarre embellishment, sexual innuendo, masturbation jokes, and scatological hilarity to even the most serious of topics.

Phil Sutcliffe’s (who died in August 2000, aged 74 years) own research and publication spanned the areas of hypnosis, measurement, design and analysis, the nature of reliability, and taxonomy in psychology (see Sutcliffe, 1996). Sutcliffe was essentially a mathematical psychologist with a special interest in set theory; Cam’s quip about Sutcliffe was that he was the only person that Cam knew who thought that reality was a special instance of set theory (Perry, 2001). Sutcliffe’s (1960, 1961) articles on "credulous" and "skeptical" views of hypnosis remain models of clear problem statement, meticulous design, and precise inference; they also remain widely and regularly cited more than 40 years after publication. As graduate students, Cam and Peter were supervised by Sutcliffe, and in 1996 he commented that “it was Peter and Cam who continued with hypnosis research, when I gave it up to concentrate upon methodological questions of more general concern” (Sutcliffe, 1996, p. 263; see also Perry, 1996; Sheehan, 1996). As Sheehan and Perry (1976) pointed out in their book on methodologies...
of hypnosis (a book that Cam referred to as “metho-drinking in hypnosis,” and that he claimed was the best cure of insomnia he knew—a judgment not endorsed by Peter), one of the major strengths of the theoretical and methodological approach of Sutcliffe (1960, 1961) was that it acknowledged the importance of a hypnotic subject’s conviction about his or her experience while at the same time recognized that this conviction may be inaccurate. Sutcliffe was the mentor, and sometimes tormentor, of many in Australian psychology. He engendered a characteristic manner of questioning fundamental assumptions in a way that was thoughtful, incisive, and thought-provoking, and he insisted on clarity, integrity, and persistence in the pursuit of critical enquiry. Those virtues and that pursuit were evident in the work and life of Cam (see also Karlin, 2003; Laurence, 2003).

Martin Orne (who died in February 2000, aged 72 years) visited the University of Sydney in 1960, and Cam subsequently worked with Orne at the University of Pennsylvania. In a recent commentary on Orne’s (1962) famous article on the social psychology of the psychological experiment, Cam wrote:

I first met Martin in 1960, when he visited the Department of Psychology at the University of Sydney for 3 months as a visiting Fulbright scholar. I was in my first year as a doctoral student and was already having some vague misgivings about generalizations from the laboratory to the real world. To meet a recently graduated PhD who could articulate the experimental issues that then troubled me and who could propose a constructive solution to the problem was a truly remarkable experience. To me, Martin was zeitgeist, and all the more so because to many North American colleagues, he was an anarchic influence who was seeking to break down the fragile edifice of accrued scientific knowledge that then existed. (Perry, 2002)

None of us who worked with Orne at the Unit for Experimental Psychiatry were unaffected by that experience. Indeed, the many positive and the few negative aspects of that experience continue to exert their influence for most of us. Orne was extremely intelligent, highly motivated, well organized, and demanding of himself and others, and Cam was full of stories of his time working with Orne and of their subsequent relationship. Many of those stories, however, must remain within and could only be understood by the group that Cam, with his love of bad, sexually tinged puns, would call the “eunuchs for experiential psychiatry.”

THE PUSH AND THE EVER-LASTING FIRE

The 1950s and 1960s were golden years not only for psychology at the University of Sydney but also for public intellectualism, social
activism, and personal and cultural change. A significant figure in all of this was John Anderson, Challis Professor of Philosophy at that university, and an individual who arguably was the major intellectual force for change in Australia at that time (see Anderson, 1962; Baker, 1979, 1986; Barcan, 2002; Franklin, 2003; for relevant writings by Anderson and his followers, see http://setis.library.usyd.edu.au/oztexts/anderson.html). Anderson influenced Australian psychology both directly and indirectly through his friendship with Bill O’Neil, McCaughey Professor of Psychology at the University of Sydney. O’Neil is recognized as the father of contemporary Australian psychology because of the way in which he formed and shaped an attitude toward inquiry among generations of psychologists (e.g., O’Neil, 1953, 1978; Sutcliffe, 1978). As O’Neil (1987) pointed out, “John Anderson…was a thoroughgoing epistemological realist and a thoroughgoing proselytizer…[who] influenced a number of Sydney trained psychologists and the influence has remained strong (p. 132).”

Anderson had strong political commitments, and under the auspices of the Sydney University Freethought Society he often spoke out in a critical and radical way on social issues (Baker, 1975). The Freethought Society was the forerunner to the Libertarian Society, which was the intellectual core of a broader social group known as the Sydney Push, or simply the Push. The term *The Push* gives a historical nod to the famous Rocks Push (or gang) in Sydney in the 1890s, a hard, larrikin group made famous not only by their criminal and antisocial exploits but also by the Australian poet Henry Lawson (1900) in his poem, “The Captain of the Push,” a bawdy version of which is known as “The Bastard from the Bush.” Part of the bawdy version says, “‘Will you have a cigarette?’ Said the Leader of the Push, ‘I’ll have the flaming packet’, Said the Bastard from the Bush.”

Cam was an active member of the Libertarian Society, and he met Brenda Linn, the woman who was to be his wife for a time and his friend for life, at a meeting of that group in 1961; Cam and Brenda were in a relationship from 1963, married in 1967, went different ways in 1972, and remained good friends. Cam was a beloved figure in the Push, “a group of brave and spirited non-conformists who blended political analysis, social rebellion, sex and anarchy into a lifestyle that has become a Sydney legend” (Tranter, 1996, p. R9). The Push and the people once and always associated with it—including international figures such as film director Bruce Beresford (e.g., *Breaker Morant*, 1980; *Double Jeopardy*, 1999), feminist Germaine Greer (e.g., Greer, 1971; Wallace, 1997), historian and art critic Robert Hughes (e.g., Hughes, 1986), rock encyclopedist Lillian Roxon (e.g., Milliken, 2002; Roxon, 1971), and novelist Frank Moorhouse (e.g., Moorhouse, 1976, 1993)—are rightfully the stuff of legend. And Cam would want me also to mention many aging Push friends in Sydney, such as Jim Baker, Liz Fell, André Frankovits, Barbara Gillam, Arthur King,
Brenda Linn, Ian Macindoe, Marion Manton, Paddy McGuinness, Terry McMullen, Doug Nicholson, David Perry, Albie Thoms, and Alison Turtle. These friends continue to meet at various inner city pubs to talk, to smoke, to drink, and to laugh, often referring to their gatherings as meetings of the Push Senile Dementia Association; these and many others exerted significant influence on Cam and on Australian society.

In her sympathetic analysis of the life and death of the Push, Coombs (1996) commented,

Throughout the 1950s and 1960s the Sydney Push was a bohemian and anarchic network encompassing a huge range of people from the professions and the arts. To belong, you needed an inquiring mind, an adventurous spirit and a preparedness to spend hours leaning on the bar at the current Push pub. At its centre were the Sydney Libertarians, who liked the races, a game of cards and plenty of parties just as much as they loved a good argument . . . . And they lived out the sexual revolution a good fifteen years before it hit the rest of society.

It would be an unkind oversimplification, but not an entirely inaccurate one, to say that talking, smoking, drinking, and fornicating were the activity pillars of the Push. Cam would want me to say that he kept up his end on each of those pillars throughout his life as far as he was able. He would also want me to tell you about his role (as the butler, opposite Germaine Greer) in the Albie Thoms and Bruce Beresford film _It Droppeth as the Gentle Rain_ (1963) and of his role (as Dr Yes) in the Albie Thoms film _Blunderball, or From Dr Nofinger with Hate_ (1966); for an appreciation of the avant-garde, absurdist films of the time, see Zuvela (2003). Perhaps at another time, I will tell the story that Albie Thoms told at the Push “Wake for Cam” about their ill-fated attempt to make an avant-garde, absurdist pornographic film, which turned out to have disappointing exposure.

Much of the written record of the activities of the Sydney Libertarians and the Push from the 1940s to the 1970s is contained in the Sydney Libertarians’ _Broadsheet_, which Cam coedited from 1962 to 1964 and which he continued to contribute to after leaving Australia. This _Broadsheet_ is no longer, but it has been replaced by an irregular newsletter, _Heraclitus_, which is edited by Jim Baker and “published by some Sydney Libertarians, Pluralists, Realists and Critical Drinkers.” It would be an inappropriate and discomforting distraction at this time to mention that Cam referred to this newsletter as “Hairyclitoris,” and that his last published piece in it (in 1999) was entitled “Is Hilary Clinton a Lesbian?” Thankfully, the contents and the title were unrelated, and the piece was mostly about the reasons for the decline of the Push. A loving tribute to Cam appeared recently in _Heraclitus_ (Linn & Manton, 2003), and a gracious obituary appeared in the _Sydney Morning Herald_ (Rozycki, 2003). That these appeared even though he
left Australia 37 years ago and that more than 50 people attended the Push “Wake for Cam” at the Riverview Hotel tells us something about the enduring and engaged loyalty of the Push.

_Heraclitus_ is not only the title of the newsletter of the Push, but also it is a tribute to the influence and message of John Anderson. This Andersonian message reflected his own interest in and works on the pre-Socratic Greek philosopher Heraclitus of Ephesus (c. 535–475 B.C.). Heraclitus taught that change was the only reality and that fire was the essential source of all things (for concise statements, see Geldard, 2000; Graham, 2002; Heraclitus, 2003; Marvin, 2003). This is not the place to make a bad-taste joke about the circumstances surrounding Cam’s demise and its link to fire, although I’m sure that Cam would be telling it that way if he were here with us now. The surviving work of Heraclitus consists of around 100 epigrammatic fragments that together convey the essential argument that “everything is in flux” and that all we can do is to “expect the unexpected” (see Haxton, 2001; Kahn, 1981). In commenting on aspects of this message, we will quote from lecture notes and other material that Cam may have heard from John Anderson or his followers. These quotes can be found in John Anderson’s lecture notes and other writings that are held in the Australian Studies Resources at the University of Sydney Library’s Scholarly Electronic Text and Image Service (http://setis.library.usyd.edu.au/oztexts/anderson.html).

In his lectures, Anderson pointed out that

Heraclitus sets up a certain order among things (fire, air, water, earth) such that it is always the next one into and from which things pass. The life of any thing is therefore cyclical... While there is this cyclic character in man’s life, Heraclitus has no doubt which of the stages is better (waking than sleeping, life than death, work than rest, etc.) though they occur in relation to one another.... Heraclitus selected the element of fire as that by which all other phenomena could be explained.

Also, in his lectures, Anderson pointed out that

It must be admitted that fire occupies a prominent place in the theories of Heraclitus and that his insistence on its primacy leads him into a number of difficulties. But the theory of change and exchange which he formulates is quite independent of any special theory about fire and if we consider fire to have been simply a convenient illustration of his theory of exchange, we will be misrepresenting the position of Heraclitus less than if we present it in the form “All is fire.”

In other words, fire is both reality and metaphor for the change from one substance to another and the exchange from one state to another. This transubstantiation aspect of the teachings of Heraclitus links nicely with a satirical song by Tom Lehrer that Cam liked to sing and dance (both badly) called “The Vatican Rag” and which his former wife sang and danced at the Push “Wake for Cam” as a portion of her tribute to him.
One of the reasons that Heraclitus appealed to Libertarians was, as Anderson pointed out in his lectures,

The position of Heraclitus is that we can never know all about a thing. Any description of it that we give implies the possibility of further descriptions, any activity or tendency which we find in it has itself further tendencies or constituents. But this does not mean that we can’t know something about a thing. Allowing that further knowledge is possible we can still have definite and direct knowledge in the meantime . . . Indeed, we must always, in Heraclitus’s phrase, “expect the unexpected”; we cannot make the future safe for ourselves, any more than we can make the world safe for democracy. Struggle, uncertainty, risk, disappointment, are not accidental features of human life, remediable by the exercise of sufficient good will; they arise inevitably out of the general structure of things, including our own structure.

From this perspective, there is always another view and always other knowledge to be obtained and considered. This embrace of the uncertainty of views, including one’s own, is something that appealed to Cam and that he engendered in his students. Cam never regretted that he did not have the dubious wisdom of those who are sure that they are right. It would be about this time that Cam would insert a profanity into this presentation, suggesting that we were becoming far too serious; something like “Strewth, Bruce, you’re up yourself,” comes to mind. But in exercising his wit and his delight in the absurdities and paradoxes of our daily lives, Cam was living at least some of the message of Heraclitus, captured perhaps in Heraclitus’s notions of the everlasting fire of change and the intelligence of the fiery soul. It must be said, of course, that Cam was highly sensitive and easily hurt, and he too often took refuge in a whisky bottle. This distanced him from many and diminished him in the eyes of some, but amazingly it seemed not to detract from his intellect or incisiveness. As John Furedy (of the University of Toronto) said in comments read out at the Push “Wake for Cam,”

Cam and I were both beneficiaries of an undergraduate education in psychology that stressed intellectual freedom above all other values. Among the conceptual tools that we were given was what Bill O’Neil called the bullshit filtering machine. Cam’s bullshit filterer was powerful and precise, and through his life he put it to good use. (cited in Linn & Manton, 2003)

THE 37 YEARS IN NORTH AMERICA

Cam was awarded his Ph.D. in psychology at the University of Sydney in 1966, for a thesis entitled, “An Investigation of the Relationship Between Proneness to Fantasy and Susceptibility to Hypnosis,”
and he then went to the Unit for Experimental Psychiatry, University of Pennsylvania. In 1968, he moved to what was then Sir George Williams University in Montreal as an assistant professor, and in 1972 Cam was promoted to associate professor around the same time that Sir George Williams University became Concordia University. In 1978, he was promoted to professor, and he became professor emeritus in 1997 and distinguished professor emeritus in 2001. Bukowski (2003) provided a delightful memoriam about Cam’s time at Concordia University, and Karlin (2003), Laurence (2003), and Nadon (2003) will shortly tell us more about Cam’s 37 years in North America. We want to make two general points about Cam’s contributions over that time, and then we want to summarize three of Cam’s specific contributions to the understanding of hypnosis.

Cam took an interactionist view of hypnosis, in which both cognitive processes and contextual cues are considered to be important for its understanding (Perry, 1987; Sheehan & Perry, 1976), and Cam’s recent summary statement about hypnosis is notable, both for its style and its content. He said,

Hypnosis involves a person’s ability to set aside critical judgment without relinquishing it completely, and to engage in make-believe and fantasy. For some people this make-believe may be so vivid and intense that they have trouble differentiating it from reality. Indeed, they may not be able to do so. It should be emphasized that the experience of hypnosis has very little to do with the abilities of the hypnotist, and is mainly a matter of the abilities of the person hypnotized. The ability to conduct a hypnotic induction is acquired easily and rapidly by an individual who has at least moderate interpersonal skills, and who is able to establish a relationship of trust and an appearance of competence. Hypnosis in itself is not a science; its phenomena, though, have proven to be highly amenable to experimental research employing the methodology and procedures of scientific enquiry. (Perry, 2000a)

This statement is crisp, understandable, and correct; the “bullshit” has been filtered out in a way that John Anderson, Bill O’Neil, Gordon Hammer, and Phil Sutcliffe surely would have approved.

Cam’s work on hypnosis and memory (e.g., Laurence & Perry, 1983), his participation with families accused of sexual abuse by their adult children (e.g., through the False Memory Syndrome Foundation), his involvement with retractors of such allegations (e.g., see Macdonald, 1999), and his work in legal cases that involved “repressed memory” delighted some and upset others in our field. It is important to say at this point that Cam had a strong sense of the justice that should be handed out to anyone who did abuse children. In fact, one of the strangest comments that we heard about Cam’s activities in this area was that he was “protecting child abusers.” Cam certainly was not doing that; he had very strong views about what should happen to such
people. Cam thought long and hard about getting involved in any case involving hypnosis, memory, and allegations of sexual abuse, and we believe that his decision to become so actively involved in such cases was motivated by three things.

First, in Cam’s view the arguments that were being put in support of repressed memory were often based on “poor science,” and Cam experienced a deeply felt responsibility to correct this. Second, in Cam’s view, many of the media statements and the legal decisions in the early days of this issue were based on an uncritical acceptance of statements made “by authority of reputation,” and Cam felt that the media and the courts should be asking for “the evidence.” Third, Cam felt that he was at a stage in his career where his achievements and expertise could serve society in a broader sense. One can see the influence of Sydney University and the Push here, and the thoughtful actions of a person who was engaged in the society in which he lived. Cam evaluated all claims and statements in this area carefully and critically. This often caused much annoyance to those who believed that they spoke “with authority,” and who were affronted that a funny-looking, chain-smoking alcoholic with garish dress sense and a foul mouth should doubt them. Cam sometimes delighted in showing great disrespect to individuals who believed that everyone should show them respect. It needs to be acknowledged that Cam often enjoyed “sticking it up those in authority,” and John Anderson who was often accused of “corrupting the youth” of Sydney University surely would have approved.

In terms of more specific contributions to the field, we want to highlight Cam’s contributions concerning uncancelled hypnotic suggestions (Duncan & Perry, 1977; Perry, 1977a, 1977b), pain and surgery (Melzack & Perry, 1975; Perry & Laurence, 1983), and imagery and hypnotizability (Labelle, Laurence, Nadon, & Perry, 1990; Nadon, Laurence, & Perry, 1987, 1991; Perry, 1973; Perry, Nadon, & Button, 1992; Sutcliffe et al., 1970), although his contributions ranged across a number of other areas of hypnosis research as well (see Perry, in press). Again, as we must, we go serious in our comments here.

A common notion about hypnosis is that suggestions must be clearly and unambiguously cancelled. If this is not done, then it is thought the suggestions will persist posthypnotically and may have profound effects on subsequent behavior. In a series of elegant experiments on uncancelled hypnotic suggestions for analgesia, Cam (Duncan & Perry, 1977; Perry, 1977a, 1977b) tested these notions and reported that some of the persistence of uncancelled suggestions is due to the hypnotist cueing the individual that the suggested effects will persist indefinitely and that this persistence appears to be confined to a small percentage of high hypnotizable people; in fact, most high hypnotizable people either cancel the suggested effect themselves or the effect simply wears off. Underscoring the point that experiencing hypnotic suggestions takes
cognitive resources, Perry (1977b) concluded that “the effort and concentration of maintaining a hypnotic analgesia during hypnosis may be so great that once the hypnotist passes onto another item, either the Ss remove it themselves, or else it gradually fades with time.”

Setting aside Cam’s understandable fascination with various historical uses of hypnosis in pain and surgery (see Perry & Laurence, 1983), Cam’s favorite experiment on pain was one in which he appears only in a footnote because he was given the job of convincing low hypnotizable individuals that they were sufficiently responsive to hypnosis to participate in the experiment (McGlashan, Evans, & Orne, 1969). McGlashan et al. compared the effects of hypnotic analgesia and placebo on pain tolerance, and low hypnotizable individuals received an apparent demonstration from an independent experimenter of their ability to experience hypnotic analgesia. In a hypnotic session prior to the main session, these individuals were given an electric shock to the hand and were told that they would be given the same shock while hypnotized following a hypnotic analgesia suggestion. In fact, the second shock was only half the intensity of the first; postexperimental inquiries indicated that the low hypnotizable subjects had been convinced by the pseudoanalgesia. Although this experiment is somewhat complicated, it essentially demonstrated that response to placebo is distinguishable from response to hypnotic suggestion; only high hypnotizables in hypnosis experienced significant pain relief, a finding replicated by Spanos, Perlini, and Robertson (1989) in a very different setting. Cam was very proud of his role in that experiment and very proud also of another wonderful experiment that he conducted on pain (Melzack & Perry, 1975). In this experiment, chronic pain patients were given alpha feedback training methods in association with hypnotic training. This produced a substantial decrease (at least 33%) in both sensory and affective dimensions of pain in approximately 58% of the patients. The clear finding was that chronic, pathological pain could be reduced by a combination of alpha feedback training, hypnotic training, and placebo effects. Cam argued that it was the combination of the distraction of attention, suggestion, relaxation, and sense of control over pain that was central to this outcome (Melzack & Perry).

Throughout his scientific career, Cam was interested in the relationship of imagery and hypnotizability and the role of imagery in hypnosis (Labelle et al., 1990; Nadon et al., 1987, 1991; Perry, 1973; Perry et al., 1992; Sutcliffe et al., 1970). He pointed out that in addition to the place of imagery as an individual difference characteristic, there were definite cue characteristics in the hypnotic context that summoned people to involve themselves imaginatively in the message of the hypnotist (Sutcliffe et al., 1970). Although situational factors have been found to influence the relationship between imagery and hypnotizability, and Cam (Perry, 1973) himself reported a negative relationship between
imagery and hypnotizability, Cam’s essential conclusion about this relationship was that the vividness of imagery bears a heteroscedastic relationship to hypnotizability. In other words, individuals with good imagery may or may not be hypnotizable, but those with poor imagery are almost always unhypnotizable (Perry et al., 1992).

Consistent with an interactionist framework and with his view that a synergistic approach was needed to progress beyond either/or theorizing in hypnosis, Cam argued that hypnosis must be conceptualized in multivariate terms, and he used the multivariate general linear model as the basis for developing a general theory of hypnosis (Nadon et al., 1991; Perry, 1992). In one application of this approach, Cam (Labelle et al., 1990) illustrated how examining the combined effects of individual difference variables can enhance the understanding of the effects of hypnosis on memory. In this work, about 45% of high hypnotizable people and about 46% of moderate hypnotizables, but no low hypnotizables, accepted a hypnotically suggested memory as veridical (see also Laurence & Perry, 1983). Hypnotizability and imagery preference both measured on a continuous scale predicted significant variance in the dichotomous pass-fail measure of the pseudomemory item. Importantly, an interaction between hypnotizability and imagery preference indicated that people who scored high on both measures were most likely to report the pseudomemory. In contrast, low hypnotizables, even those who scored high on imagery preference, did not appear to believe their imaginings and did not report pseudomemories. Consistent with earlier work, in this experiment, imagination appeared to be one of the multiplicity of cognitive processes and skills that affected the seemingly delusional thinking of the hypnotized person (Perry, 1973; Sutcliffe et al., 1970).

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Cam was an endearing and exasperating mix of a person—irreverent, immensely likeable, and very insightful—who since his retirement referred to himself as being in his anecdotage. Nicely, his last scientific publication, which will appear just as his first did in the International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis (Perry, in press), asks the question “Can anecdotes add to an understanding about hypnosis?” and draws out inferences about what we know and do not know about hypnosis through a range of anecdotes.

With his quick wit, Cam was able to turn almost any situation into rampant humor, although it was sometimes easier to see the funny side if one was drunk as well. For all his capacities and his flaws, Cam was an erudite, scholarly, and gentle man who was utterly reconciled with the life that he chose to live, the contributions that he made, and the friendships that he formed. As his mother said to me shortly after she
learned that he had died, "Cam lived the life that he wanted to live." I know that Cam was concerned about some of the things happening in our field of hypnosis, but he accepted that change and knew that exchange was part of the flux in which we all lived—just as Heraclitus and John Anderson would have thought and said.

We move to end our comments with a quote. Recall that Cam was in a 1963 film, *It Droppeth as the Gentle Rain*. Cam loved to talk about this film with other members of the Push, partly because of its absurdist nature and partly because the title refers to the human quality of mercy as described by Portia in William Shakespeare’s *The Merchant of Venice*. “The quality of mercy is not strain’d;/It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven/Upon the place beneath. It is twice blest:/It blesseth him that gives and him that takes.” Cam was a man of merciful tenderness, and he had some intensely human qualities, including intelligence, integrity, and loyalty.

We began this paper by saying that it was a sad pleasure to participate in the tribute. We will miss Cam with a deep sadness, but we will remember the pleasure he gave. And we know the pleasure he surely would have had in this occasion.
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präsokratischen Philosophen Heraklit, welcher glaubte, Veränderung stelle die einzige Form von Realität dar. Der Artikel beschreibt Perrys Arbeiten zu Themen wie Hypnose und Gedächtnis, seine Beiträge zu nicht zurückgenommenen hypnotischen Suggestionen, zu Schmerz und Operationen sowie zum Vorstellungsvermögen und zur Hypnotisierbarkeit. Unserer Ansicht nach war Cam ein Mann von freundlicher Sanftmut, ausgestattet mit vielen besonders menschlichen Eigenschaften, darunter Intelligenz, Integrität und Loyalität.
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Cam Perry, Heraclito y la hipnosis: Una evaluación vital

Kevin M. McConkey y Peter W. Sheehan

Resumen: Los autores resumen las influencias personales, intelectuales, y sociales en la vida e investigación sobre hipnosis de Campbell Perry (1937–2003). Su educación en Australia reflejó las influencias de una escuela primaria pública, una escuela secundaria privada prestigiosa, y estudios de licenciatura y posgrado en la universidad más vieja de Australia. Gordon Hammer y Philip Sutcliffe influyeron inicialmente en su enfoque a la hipnosis. Su mayor influencia en relación a la vida en general fue John Anderson, el líder de la Sociedad Libertaria, núcleo intelectual de un grupo más amplio conocido como El Estímulo (The Push). Este grupo reflejaba en
parte el pensar del filósofo griego pre-socrático Heráclito, quien enseñó que el cambio es la única realidad. Este artículo resume las contribuciones de Perry a la hipnosis y memoria y sus contribuciones en lo que concierne a las sugestiones no canceladas, dolor y cirugía, e imaginación e hipnotizabilidad. En nuestro punto de vista, Cam era un hombre de ternura misericordiosa, con algunas cualidades intensamente humanas, como la inteligencia, la honradez, y la lealtad.
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