

# Speculative Realms

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 7, 2010

## Counter-Transferential Mirror Trance: Unidentified Flying Object Relations and the Self-Hypnosis of David Jacobs

By Gary Haden

"As Masserman (1941) put it nearly a half-century ago, '*it is a wise hypnotist who is continually aware of just who is hypnotizing whom* [citation omitted].'"—Michael Jay Diamond, *The Interactional Basis of Hypnotic Experience* (Emphasis supplied.)

"[I]m accused often times of using hypnosis to ... put things in people's minds. And ... I think ... it's the exact opposite. ... *They're putting things in my mind.* ... I never heard this stuff, or never even thought of it before, you know."—David Jacobs (mp3 file), from his nineteenth hypnosis session with Emma Woods, Section 360.2 of her *Complaint to OHRP, Part 3*, (Emphasis supplied.)

Should hypnotists have formal training? Are the elements that are missing in a practitioner, due to lack of training, important? Is it instructive to examine the flaws that are exposed in even trained practitioners?

For instance, if even a trained practitioner can routinely enter a trance while conducting hypnosis with a client, why should it be surprising that an amateur might also? If identity confusions develop between a trained hypnotist and her subject, even in spite of analytic intervention informed by training, why wouldn't they occur in hypnoses involving amateurs?

Why is there a magical exclusion for the amateur in the paranormal world?

It seems, from what follows, that trance and transference-countertransference, where identification with the other's projections occurs, are intimately connected. The difference between the trained hypnotherapist and the alien-abduction hypnotist in the Emma Woods case is that the trained hypnoanalyst possesses analytic models within which she can place into context the hypnosis and its contents.

Whereas the hypnoanalyst stands ready to examine his or her own emotional reactions and to analyze hypnotic content with an appreciation of the transference phenomenon that may generate that content, the alien-abduction hypnotist in the Emma Woods Case, lacking formal training in both hypnosis and psychology, applies no analytic framework to the hypnotic narrative at all. As a result, the practitioner seems to have entered into trance himself and identified with

the material that emerged from the hypnosis.

The **etiology** of that hypnosis casts suspicion over his previous work.

To state it differently, the hypnotist has identified with aspects of the abduction narrative to such an extent that those aspects represent, in perhaps an unconscious way, parts of his own personality. So it is that his own heavy investment of time and energy in the Emma Woods hypnosis is mirrored in a similar investment by Alien Human Hybrids in Emma Woods's abduction.

There are also parallels between David Jacobs's lack of empathy for Emma Woods and the moral depravity of the alien human hybrids. His "apparent" lack of awareness of the similarity between his attitude toward Emma Woods and the attitude towards her exhibited by the hybrids stems immediately from his lack of training in psychology (here taken to include psychoanalysis, psychiatry, and social work) and his refusal to analyze what is defined below as "the **countertransference**."

He is also seemingly unaware of the possibility that Emma's uneven characterization of the hybrids, i.e., as wanting to help her versus wanting to hurt her, might represent Emma's evolving attitude toward Jacobs's treatment of her in the hypnosis.

Of course, if he is aware of it and continues anyway, that would locate him at a deeper level in Dante's Hell than we consider here. Trance-related conviction might be mistaken for awareness and willfully performed acts of evil.

The reverse, of course, is also true.

#### *What David Jacobs Doesn't Know Can Hurt You*

"While there is no universally accepted conceptualization of *transference* (citation omitted)," says Michael Jay Diamond in *The Interactional Basis of Hypnotic Experience*, writing in 1987, "it is generally agreed that it is a usually unconscious, intrapsychic affective experience, largely determined by previous significant relationships. It is distinguished by an enactment of previously well-learned feelings, drives, attitudes, fantasies and defenses reflected in an emotional relationship between the subject and hypnotist which cannot be accounted for by the actual situation. Thus, it is the means of repeating the past in the present and can be positive, negative, or mixed." (Emphasis in original.)

In an early articulation of cultural contamination, Diamond goes on to state that the transference can predate the first hypnosis. We see here that, even in clinical settings, culturally contaminated transferences are common.

Given Emma Woods familiarity with the renown of David Jacobs as an alien-abduction researcher, it is possible she

entered into the hypnosis with what Diamond calls a “performed transference.” And if that is so, David Jacobs, possessed of a grandiose sense of his hypnotic omnipotence, and an intense urge to replicate his results, may have entered the hypnosis with a *performed counter-transference*.

“The transference may, of course, be strengthened,” Diamond writes, “by an individual’s ‘unconscious mythical beliefs’ concerning hypnotism resulting in intense performed transferences for both subject and hypnotist long before they meet for hypnosis (citation omitted). These performed beliefs are typically viewed as pertaining to an omnipotent, benevolent, or sadistic hypnotist and form the basis for what Morris and C.W. Gardner (1959) termed the ‘hypnotic transference neurosis.’ Such performed transferences are ubiquitous in clinical hypnosis and, as Fromm (1984) notes, tend to be *utilized* rather than *analyzed*.” (Emphasis in original.)

The prevailing psychoanalytic hypothesis at the time Diamond wrote *The Interactional Basis of Hypnotic Experience*, which hypothesis he found overly simple, was that “transference creates hypnotizability.” He states “hypnosis allowed Freud to discover transference” and cites an authority who held that transference and countertransference were essential to hypnosis:

“Macalpine (1950) conjectured that, in contrast to psychoanalysis, the hypnotic transference is ‘truly a mutual relationship existing between the hypnotist and the hypnotized (page citation omitted),’ because the hypnotist, unlike the psychoanalyst, has not been trained to modulate transferences and, thus, ‘counter-transference is obligatory in and an essential part of hypnosis ...(page citation omitted).’ Watkins (1963) supported this in suggesting that *hypnotic transferences occur earlier and are more pronounced*, possibly as a result of the *hypnotist’s own trance experiences*.” (Emphasis supplied.)

Transference and counter-transference, the reactions of the subject and the hypnotist to one another and the attendant identity confusions which may arise, are *structural components* of hypnosis. Whereas in hypnoanalysis identifications would be analyzed, in the Emma Woods hypnosis they are left to lay. This negligence covers up the source of the data.

As I have pointed out earlier, David Jacobs, in his doctrinal gabfests conducted within the hypnosis, is the source of the data in the hypnosis.

As David Jacobs evidences identification with the hybrids, he evidences the transferential process. As he counter-transfers in the Emma Woods hypnosis, it is reasonable to conclude that David Jacobs enters into trance himself.

Put another way, David Jacobs, in his sessions with Emma Woods, goes into self-hypnosis.

“It is well-documented,” writes Diamond in *Interactional Basis*, “that most hypnotherapists spontaneously experience trance when hypnotizing their clients (citations omitted).” Diamond noted at the time that the nature of the interactive trance was speculative and further research was required. For instance, he demanded deeper study of counter-transference.

“[H]elpful countertransference reactions enabling the therapist to be in tune with various aspects of the patient’s personality should be differentiated from the more antitherapeutic reactions wherein the *hypnotist becomes identified with the subject’s internal objects* and thereby is likely to behave as the patient feared (citations omitted).” (*Interactional Basis*.)

Jacobs’s implantation of the multiple personality diagnosis into Emma’s mind as a post-hypnotic suggestion situates himself in the position of the hybrids, people he defines, in his indoctrination of Emma in the hypnosis, as being able to do with abductees whatever they want to do. Clearly, he felt he could do whatever he wanted in the hypnosis, including risking his client’s sanity.

“[D]ifferentiating between normal and pathological countertransference -- by defining the latter as the failure of the analyst to comprehend when the patient begins to resemble an aspect of the analyst that the analyst still has not learned to understand - -brings the modern concept closer to the classical one,” say Vladimir Jovic and Nataša Cvetkovic-Jovic in *Torture in the Therapy Environment: Counter-transference in Working with Victims of Organised Violence* (pdf) from the book *Torture in War: Consequences and Rehabilitation of Victims*, “through the explanation that in the *pathological case the therapist is unable to understand the patient because of his/her own neurosis[.]*” (Emphasis supplied.)

A contemporary hypnoanalyst takes a more conservative approach to countertransference, not ascribing any positive value to it at all.

“Countertransference is very common in hypnotherapy and must be guarded against at all costs,” says Kevin Hogan, Psy.D in a [post](#) on his website. “It is probably safe to say that all hypnoanalysts have at one time or another fallen prey to the seduction of a client’s unconscious mind and ego states. When we treat the client as a child, a lover, a parent, or anything other than a client, we have allowed countertransference to take place. This must be rapidly corrected or the therapeutic relationship should be terminated.”

“Wolberg (1967),” says Michael Jay Diamond in his paper *It Takes Two to Tango: Some Thoughts on the Neglected Importance of The Hypnotist in An Interactive Hypnotherapeutic Relationship*, “saw the hypnotic relationship as a two-way feedback system wherein anxieties between the participants influence patient response and therapist technique. Both Watkins (1954) and Spiegel (1959) equated hypnotic trance with subject-hypnotist transference, a position Watkins (1963) later modified to suggest that the hypnotic relationship is largely determined by transferences which either inhibit or facilitate patient hypnotizability.”

“Lindner (1960),” Diamond continues in *Two to Tango*, “has reported that therapists attracted to hypnosis are particularly prone to the so-called ‘hypnotic phantasy,’ which is a dangerous countertransference reaction characterized by grandiose and omnipotent unconscious illusions linked to using hypnosis.”

Clearly, Jacobs’s use of the MPD diagnosis in hypnosis to evade capture by hybrids was a “grandiose and omnipotent unconscious illusion.” And it lacked skill.

“Hypnotherapeutic skill can ... be viewed,” Diamond states, “from an interactional perspective as a function of: (1) the hypnotist’s attainment of matured object relating and comfort with deeper levels of relationship; (2) empathic capacity; (3) personal and therapeutic trance skill; (4) integration of

healthy receptive, passive, and active cognitive and behavioral capacities; and (5) *the self-supervisory ability to deal effectively with one's own internal and counter-transferential reactions vis-a-vis one's patients.*" (Diamond in *Two to Tango*; emphasis supplied.)

In the Emma Woods hypnosis, the transference and counter-transference are not dealt with at all, much less "effectively." The material is simply accepted at face value, on the basis of faith, as evidence of alien abduction.

As I pointed out in the [Multiple Personality Disorder of David Jacobs](#), Jacobs's focus in the Emma Woods hypnosis is not on his client. I also stated that the situation seemed inescapably psychoanalytic. Had he training in client-centered therapeutics, however, Jacobs might have avoided transference altogether.

According to C.H. Patterson, transference is a phenomenon that should not happen in client-centered scenarios.

"The psychoanalytic transference does not occur in client-centered therapy," he says in [chapter 9 of Counseling and Psychotherapy, entitled Transference and Countertransference \(pdf\)](#). "The client-centered therapeutic situation is such that it does not foster transference. . . . Nor does the client-centered relationship foster an attitude of dependence in the client. The therapist does not assume, or imply, either by actions or words, that he is a superior or authority figure. The whole atmosphere of the client-centered situation encourages and fosters independence in the client, rather than dependence. . . . Wyatt [states]: 'Transference can only develop when the therapist has succeeded in showing that he understands the patient more effectively than the patient does himself.' This attitude, [Carl] Rogers feels (citation omitted), leads to loss of self-confidence in the client, and to a dependent relationship."

That dependent relationship, as Jacobs points out to Emma in the hypnosis, is a lifelong investment. It is not just that the hybrids have staked the success of their genetic hybridization program on the compliance of abductees like Emma Woods: *David Jacobs* has staked his life's work on their compliance with his theory.

Where transcriptions are quoted in what follows, the character of "Myself" should be understood to be [Emma Woods](#) (mp3 file):

Myself [Emma Woods]: I was scared, because I thought they were going to take me somewhere, and they were going to kill me, and that.

Dr. Jacobs: Right. Well, the chances of that happening are going to be really remote, because they have a *lifetime of investment in you*, and there's no reason to do anything bad to you.--Section 283.1 of Emma Woods's *Complaint to the Division of Compliance Oversight Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP)*, Part 2.

### *A Little Bit of Analysis Would Have Gone a Long Way*

In the following excerpts from Emma Woods's Complaint to the Office for Human Research Protections, David Jacobs first apologizes for "stirring up a hornet's nest" and then hears how the "hybrids" are warning Emma that he is going to hurt her.

Bear in mind that, in the fifteenth hypnosis session, Emma Woods, after receiving consistent indoctrination by Jacobs, while she (and *possibly while he*) is in trance, that hybrids sexually and physically assault people, *produced a sexual assault* in the hypnosis. What happens next, in the

which have occurred are his fault.

Or was it so dim?

The following is additional evidence that David Jacobs both identifies with the hybrids as a culprit, as seen by his professed guilt, and had insufficient training to properly analyze the artifacts of the hypnosis. He improperly analyzed the content of the hypnosis on faith-based grounds, i.e., on the basis of faith in what is commonly referred to as the “extraterrestrial hypothesis” (ETH) when more traditional analytical frameworks, such as the psychoanalytic model, would have exposed his personal participation in the creation of the material.

Of course, many maintain that David Jacobs is already aware of his personal participation in the creation of the material and *purposely avoids any analytic which would expose it.*

Emma Woods tells David Jacobs in the following that the hybrids warned her that he was going to hurt her. Without digging any deeper, Jacobs accepted the surface content of her report. But had he investigated his own guilt feelings and the previous hypnosis sessions a little more extensively he might have understood Emma’s hybrids as communicating her psychological status in reference to the violations, the simulated sexual and physical assaults, she endured in Jacobs’s care and her suspicions about his ability to handle the material.

To state it differently, the hybrids aren’t aliens. They are symbols of Emma’s reaction to what is being done to her. Understood psychologically, as symbols, they should have informed Jacobs that *he was hurting her*. Instead, blinded by faith, Jacobs completely ignores her pain and charges on with the ETH. And if Jacobs is in fact purposely avoiding that line of inquiry, then, of course, it proves him a sadist.

*(242.1) At the end of the sixteenth hypnosis session, [the previous session, Emma Woods was sexually assaulted by a hybrid in the hypnosis] after Dr. Jacobs had brought me out of the hypnotic state, he told me that he thought that he had “stirred up a homets’ nest” for me.*

[(242.2) Omitted.]

Transcribed from point 0:00:00 in [Hypnosis Session 16](#) (mp3 file)– Excerpts 2:

Dr. Jacobs: Well, I just – I feel so awful about all these things happening to you. ... *[[I]n a sense I feel it’s probably my fault. I’ve come in here and stirred up a homets’ nest for you.*

Myself: [Inaudible]

Dr. Jacobs: Well ... I don’t know.

Myself: [Inaudible]

Dr. Jacobs: Well ... they’re just making it harder on you is what it is. *If you were in just complete total compliance at all times, and you had never met me, or heard of me, or anything like that, then I’m sure they would be doing just as much as they’re doing now, but it wouldn’t be as awful as some of these things are.*

Myself: I don’t know. ...

Dr. Jacobs: Well, it’s hard to tell. I must say, it is hard to tell. Because ... I have seen some things that are pretty bad, even without me around, you know. ... people have recounted fairly strong sexual assaultive behavior before they – they - you know, they had anything to do with me. ... But ... still, it’s been ... a really tough week for you. A really tough week. [Section 242.1 of Emma Woods’s *Complaint to the Division of Compliance Oversight Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP)*, Part 2, Emphasis supplied.]

Jacobs’s guilt about Emma’s suffering in the hypnosis implies an internal identification with the hybrid’s actions. His confession also makes him a central character in Emma’s experiences.

In fact, had Emma never met Jacobs at all, her experience of sexual and physical assault, as played out in the hypnosis, would never have happened.

(252.1) While I was hypnotized during my seventeenth hypnosis session, I remembered a "hybrid" telling me that Dr. Jacobs was going to hurt me.

Transcribed from point 2:38:41 (mp3 file) in the hypnosis session:

Myself: I think he also said stuff about you. ... [H]e was saying that ... you were going to hurt me, and you were going to harm me, and stuff like that.

Dr. Jacobs: That I was going to hurt you?

Myself: Yeah.

Dr. Jacobs: Did he ... tell you how I was going to do this?

Myself: No, not really. Just ... a kind of sense of it, I think.

Dr. Jacobs: So, he's not specific on this, or he is?

Myself: No, I don't think so. It's kind of ... really hard to remember, but—I think he said that you had friends that were going to hurt me, and stuff.

Dr. Jacobs: I see. ... [S]o, he's trying to say that I've got — that I can extend my tentacles all the way across the world and ... get you.

Myself: Yeah. ... I didn't kind of click at the time, I don't think. But yeah, that must be what he was saying, because he said you had friends. God

Dr. Jacobs: It doesn't make any sense whatsoever. ... [S]o, he's trying to poison you against me, in some way. Make you fearful about me.

Myself: To make me scared, I think. Yeah.

Dr. Jacobs: Yeah. That's a new tact. ... You haven't mentioned that before. In other words —

Myself: No, I don't think so. ...

Dr. Jacobs: Yeah. Because ... the other tacks he's taking are not quite working. ... So, that's kind of a divide and conquer route.

Myself: Yeah, it probably is, hey. ...

Dr. Jacobs: Well, does he allow you to say anything? ... [C]an you respond to any of this?

Myself: No.

Dr. Jacobs: Okay.

Transcribed from point 2:44:22 in the hypnosis session:

Dr. Jacobs: Well, he's telling you all these bad things, and he's threatening you, and drop you into the sea. What the heck is all that about? ... [A]nd he's saying that ... I'm going to hurt you. *I mean, on the one hand, they're threatening to kill you, on the other hand, they're threatening to save you. I mean, they're ... offering to save you. ... they're acting like your benefactor, 'cause ... I'm the threat, not them.* They're not the threat, although two seconds before, he's threatening to kill you, you know what I mean?

Myself: I know.

Dr. Jacobs: There's something that's psychologically disjointed here.

Myself: Yeah. It's ... totally incongruent.

Dr. Jacobs: Well—right. It's like anything that will work. They'll say anything that will work. ... Try anything. Say anything, you know. [Section 252.1 of Emma Woods's *Complaint to the Division of Compliance Oversight Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP)*, Part 2, emphasis supplied.]

Psychologically understood, setting aside religious faith in abduction, the disjointedness Jacobs referred to would be symbolic of Emma's growing doubts and burgeoning awareness about Jacobs. The hybrid threats represent her internalization of Jacobs's projections. The hybrid warnings constitute her emotional response to Jacobs, characterizing him, through the hybrid's behavior, as "the threat." It represents an emotionally honest appraisal, considering the sexual and physical assaults Jacobs helped to bring about in the hypnosis.

(336.1) While I was hypnotized during my nineteenth hypnosis session, I remembered a "hybrid" telling me that Dr. Jacobs was going to hurt me.

Transcribed from point 00:23:40 (mp3 file) in the hypnosis session (the sound file contains material not included in the transcription):

Myself: They're saying that ... they're talking about you. And, they're saying that - I can't remember. But I just remember stuff. I think I was still quite scared.

Dr. Jacobs: Yeah.

Myself: I think that other guy said something to me at some point. ... I can remember him saying stuff. I think he said stuff about you.

Dr. Jacobs: What did he say?

Myself: He was saying ... that you're going to hurt me, and all that stuff.

Dr. Jacobs: That ... I'm going to hurt you?

Myself: Yeah. I shouldn't ... be communicating with you, and that. That you're going to hurt me, and all that.

Dr. Jacobs: Does he explain how I'm going to hurt you?

Myself: No.

Dr. Jacobs: Oh.

*Myself: I don't think so. ... I don't remember. But just a feeling of it. He's ... saying that you're bad ... a bad person, or something.*

*Dr. Jacobs: Well ... a lot of people would agree with that.*

Myself: Oh, no.

Dr. Jacobs: So ... I'm a bad person.

Myself: Yeah. ... I shouldn't communicate with you. ... And, the other guy was ... saying I should listen. 'Cause he was agreeing, kind of thing.

Dr. Jacobs: Yeah.

Transcribed from point 00:28:21 in the hypnosis session:

Myself: ... they were ... saying that I shouldn't listen to you. What you say. They think that you ... there're things that you ... almost like, you communicate to me, or something. And, I shouldn't listen, or -

Dr. Jacobs: Probably good advice. ...

Myself: He's saying that ... you're going to harm me, and you're going to harm them, and you're going to harm the baby. ... [D]on't do it. ... [J]ust to stop it ... [Section 336.1 of Emma Woods's Complaint to the Division of Compliance Oversight Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP), Part 2, emphasis supplied.]

None of this material appears to impact Jacobs's unshakeable faith in the ETH. It doesn't occur to him that his wounding of Emma Woods and her wariness of him are appearing in the hypnosis cloaked in the hybrids' warning to her. If it does occur to him, of course, then he is a sadist. The concept of psychologically understanding hypnotic material appears *alien* to him. It seems as alien to him as it is to the community he preaches his sermons to.

## Conclusions

David Jacobs is clearly identified with the alien human hybrids he claims objective reality for. Hypothetically, what apparently has happened is that, in his several years work in hypnosis, Jacobs entered into trance and in his heightened susceptibility, transferred the material into his psyche. He was *entranced* by the material. His identification with the hybrids is both introjective and projective. That is, he *psychologically owned* his clients' projections and he psychologically owned his own projections.

In the Emma Woods hypnosis, his behavior strikingly mirrors the behavior of the hybrid aliens he helps create in the sessions. That his behavior mirrors the hybrids suggests that he has internalized the transference in a way that a proper analysis might have prevented. Yet he operates from a faith-based, and not an analytical, framework. Not only has his lack of training wounded Emma Woods, but it has done harm to Jacobs himself.

The abduction symbolizes Jacobs's abduction of Emma Woods's experiences. It mattered not whether they were truly paranormal. They would be made paranormal. They would be hybridized.

Jacobs's creation of simulated sexual and physical assault in the hypnosis identifies him as a vicarious perpetrator. The hybrids mirror his actions in the hypnosis. They cross

boundaries as Jacobs crosses boundaries. Their lifelong dedication to Emma Woods mirrors his lifelong dedication to her narrative, a narrative he, after all, is the author of. The investment of time and energy in Emma Woods by the hybrids and David Jacobs is equivalent in intensity. The hybrids assert their entitlement to her in the hypnosis. David Jacobs asserts his entitlement to her in his rants to Emma about his wasted efforts.

She is a person of value to them.

What or who is "The Threat"?

Here's the what: David Jacobs's psychological identification with the hybrids, brought about by, it is hypothesized here, self-hypnosis. Another possibility is that Jacobs uses his identification with the hybrids to articulate *their* feelings, thoughts, and motivations, in his lectures in the hypnosis, thereby using his own behavior to create a mirror trance which then adds an objective dimension to the hypnotic subjectivities he is playing with.

Here's the who: David Jacobs is *The Threat*.

The question surfaces: If David Jacobs was in trance, was he responsible for what he has done? Well, if his clients were in trance, were they responsible for what they produced? If trance negates Jacobs's responsibility (which wouldn't happen in hypnoanalysis: the professional is responsible for his part in the interaction, trance or no), then trance would negate the data supplied by his clients, would it not?

David Jacobs seems to willfully create experiences of physical and sexual abuse and torture in the hypnoses of his clients. The question in an investigation would be, would trance absolve him of those crimes?

It would be a potential snag in Emma Woods's case but for the fact that much of Jacobs's maneuvering occurs outside the confines of the hypnosis. And there is demonstrable proof that Jacobs's himself doesn't believe in the hybrids as he remains comfortably situated in his well-appointed surroundings, unbothered by the looming alien threat.

His mirroring hybrid behavior may in fact be a kind of mirror trance, consciously conducted, intended to establish objective reality for his client's experiences. He behaves the way he does, this line of thought goes, to provide a real world parallel to hybrid behavior, counting on **source confusion** in his clients to give dimension to hybrid reality. (See Elizabeth Loftus's **Creating False Memories**.)

The objective reality of the hybrids, in terms of mirror trance, is the existence of David Jacobs.

This line of thought implies awareness on Jacobs's part of all that is happening and would establish malevolence on a scale far deeper than the one contemplated by the idea he was in trance or was unconscious of his identification with the hybrids and therefore was too stupid to know what was going on.

But David Jacobs has read the literature.

The one way of understanding the hypnosis, using hypnoanalytic analogies, places Jacobs's sanity into question. The other way of understanding the hypnosis, using a kind of method-hypnosis analysis, derived from **method acting**, where Jacobs performs a behavioral mirror trance to blend objective reality into the subjective reality of the material, establishes Jacobs as a truly evil person and a masterful gamesman. In the one case, Jacobs is the fool. In the other, he's the evil master.

Jacobs does not win either way. Both inquiries lead to the discovery that Jacobs is the hybrid.

He has gone to great lengths to create corroboration among his clients, linking them together in their hypnoses and playing them off one another in real life.

His own behavior and constant reinforcement of the threat posed by the hybrids give his project the feel of reality to his clients. His recent escalation of his themes has proved disastrous, however. The latest effort to link hybrid reality to instant messaging was Jacobs in his most intellectually embarrassing moment, certainly giving the lie to the idea of Jacobs as the master. Whether he is the fool or the evil genius, without the objective reality of the alien human hybrid, his equilibrium would be called into question.

*He must find objective reality for his children.*

His is a faith that has the unshakeable conviction of *deep trance*. A deep mirror trance. And in that looking glass Jacobs does not see the Alice of his defamation campaign.

He sees David Jacobs, alien human hybrid. Staring back at him.

### Sources

Michael Jay Diamond. *The Interactional Basis of Hypnotic Experience* (pdf)

C.H. Patterson, *Transference and Countertransference*, Chapter 9 of *Counseling and Psychotherapy* (PDF)

Michael Jay Diamond. *It Takes Two to Tango: Some Thoughts on the Neglected Importance of The Hypnotist in An Interactive Hypnotherapeutic Relationship* (PDF)

Kevin Hogan, Psy.D. [Hypnoanalysis and Dissociative Disorder Therapy: Creating Miracles with Hypnoanalysis](#)

Vladimir Jovic and Nataša Cvetkovic-Jovic. *Torture in the Therapy Environment: Counter-transference in Working with Victims of Organised Violence* (PDF) from the book *Torture in War: Consequences and Rehabilitation of Victims*

### Follow Ups

*Object Relations*

--See also *Object Relations Theory*

*Projective identification*

*Introjective identification*

Jeremy Hazel. *H.J.S. Guntrip: A Psychoanalytical Biography*. New York, London: Free Association Books, 1996.

Jill Savege Scharff. *Projective and Introjective Identification and the Use of the Therapist's Self*

Melanie Klein. *Envy and Gratitude*.

Michael Jay Diamond website

Lavinia Gomez. *An Introduction to Object Relations*. New York: NYU Press, 1997.

W.R.D. Fairbairn. *Psychoanalytic Studies of the Personality*. New York: Routledge, 2002.

[The Multiple Personality Disorder of David Jacobs](#)

[All Emma Woods Posts](#)

Stephen Wolinsky. [Trances People Live](#).

--See also book review for [Trances People Live](#)

--Wolinsky's [Beginner's Guide to Quantum Psychology](#) (pdf), which includes discussions of his ideas about trance.

--Wolinsky's website