

HYPNOTIC WRERS

AGE REGRESSION

Confirm the ISE

VIDEO LINK:

http://worksmarthypnosis.com/hypnotic-workers/age-regression/



AGE REGRESSION Revivifying vs. Remembering

JASON LINETT:

At this point we now want to confirm the ISE. We're gonna play detective. We will play detective but we wanna see where we are. Simplest way to do that it is classically taught, focus on that feeling, is it familiar or is it new? Familiar would basically be, I've been through this before." New, it's new. If we get familiar we basically now do our affect bridge backwards once again. As you focus on that feeling again, five, four, three, two, one, earlier experience be there now.

We rewind back to the gathering information phase and catch up to this moment again. That makes sense? That if we get an answer that it's familiar we branch affect bridge off of that current emotional state, follow that to an event, associate them into it, gather information, keep them in Riva vacation and then do the confirm the ISE moment again.

So if they say it's familiar, good, as I count from five to one follow that to an earlier time. If I get new, I've got to change my strategy. Because otherwise if they say new and I say follow that to an earlier event, I may be directing them to confabulate, to create, to manifest a false reality. So the simplest one is an action result. As Oddly enough what I've been doing more recently is very simple. And as I pick up the head and drop it, be there at the very first time you felt that way.

I'm holding back...this is a fun phrase, "I'm holding back the F word for when it counts." But in this case the F word is first. Because when they say it's new, I'm gonna check my math by now suggesting, "Go to the first time," but only after I've done the stair stepping process only after I've gotten it's new. As I pick up the hand and drop it, be there at the very first time you felt that way. Either one of three things will happen. They will go to an earlier event, no, it wasn't brand new, and you continue on as you were. Very frequent by the way.

Option number two they will just very overtly, consciously comment. It's the same event that tends to be the next most common and, again, maybe one or twice a year. You'll get the full replay of the exact same process you just did without any sort of conscious judgment that it's the same thing, as if you just rewound the movie and watched it again and you will nerd out of how awesome that was and you will email me and say, "It happened."



It's not very frequent but when it does, enjoy it. The question is if they say, "It's new, why do we have to go back and confirm?" Basically I'm gonna take when they say the word new as being perhaps like an 80% chance they're correct. Because that may be some conscious judgement creeping in, yet I'm gonna check my work by reconfirming it in a different method rather than take the very first new. Because in my experience a lot of times when they say it's new, there are still other events. There are still other experiences. There's still stuff before it.

So that's why we do that. That makes sense? Which in most cases you might just be confirming the same event. Okay, cool. We'll take that. They would very likely, if they go to another event, they're going to a completely other event, in which case, no, no it was not new, it was only familiar, to which my perception on that is they are applying a bit of a mind read, they're assuming that's new. But I'm checking it by changing my question. As I pick up the hand and drop it, go to the first time that you felt that way, but I'm holding back my F word for the moment that it counts.