

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| "HOLY COW" - PSYCHIATRIST ON TRIAL UNDER SPECIES PROTECTION | 1 |
| A. SOURCES FOR THE EXEGESIS OF A SLOPPY REPORT | 2 |
| 1). Source #1 - the 1st expert opinion version | 2 |
| 2). Source #2 - the 1st supplementary comment..... | 2 |
| 3). Source #3 - the 2nd expert opinion version | 3 |
| 4). Source #4 - the 3rd expert opinion version..... | 3 |
| 5). Source #5 - 2nd supplementary commentary | 4 |
| B. CIRCULAR REASONING REINSTALLED | 5 |
| 1). Circular reasoning pepped up and retouched | 5 |
| 2). Jester's freedom in court: the relationship system is delusional..... | 7 |
| 3). Both columns broken off: Film á deux and exacerbation | 8 |
| C. FOR THE CONFUSION INDUCTION OF THE NEW FLASH DIAGNOSIS IN DETAIL | 9 |
| D. CONCLUSION | 10 |

"Holy cow" - psychiatrist on trial under species protection

Thies Stahl, 13.06.2018, update 17.01.2020¹

This short essay should help my lawyer to formulate the rather psychological aspects of our answer to the statement of defence of the lawyer of the psychiatrist Dr. Q.-S.², against whom I had filed an action for injunction at the Regional Court of Hamburg.³

Dr. Q.-S. had declared me to be crazy in a report⁴ on the complainant in the DVNLP commissioned by the Altona Local Court in the proceedings between the public prosecutor's office and the complainant (DVNLP)⁵ - briefly and incidentally and by

¹ 17.08.2018: update links; 20.09.2018: corrections, 30.07.2019: links corrected, 17.01.2020: link "Legal facts" new; 28.01.2020: corrections. On ThiesStahl.de this text and all documents linked to in this text can be found on the website <https://thiesstahl.com/texte-und-materialien-zum-dvnlp/>.

² In my communication-theoretical and hyno-linguistic analysis "*Psychiatric expertise - a gift for the pedocriminal perpetrator system and the DVNLP*" I anonymized her name with Q.-S.

³ Link: *Stahl-Dr.-Q.-S. pleadings and judgment*

⁴ The "occasional offence" was the alleged defamation of DVNLP Teaching Trainer XY, addressees of her DVNLP internal complaint. A short report on the trial before the Hamburg Regional Court can be found in *Legal Facts of the "Causa DVNLP"*. Here is the *psychiatric report of culpability*, which is based on manipulated official files and is clearly offensive.

⁵ See my texts "*The Perverse Triangle as a Recursive Pattern in the DVNLP*", "*Violence, Abuse, Double Morals and the Return of the Repressed in the DVNLP*", "*DVNLP Abandoned by All Good Spirits? predetermined breaking point fascistoid-totalitarian slips and loss of self-control*", "*The NLP and the madmen. The DVNLP corrupts its method*", "*My beautiful delinquent German Association! DVNLP completes perpetrator-victim conversion*", "*Perpetrator Association DVNLP - Silence, Denial and Repression*", "*DVNLP + GNLC hide suspected sex offender*" and "*Psychiatry. Not funny*" as well as *legal facts of the "DVNLP case"*, "*For which crimes is the DVNLP in the pillory*", "*DVNLP relies on lying managers*" and "*DVNLP lies. Chronic*". and "*Dossier Perpetrator-Victim-Return*".

remote diagnosis. As I was able to make clear⁶, this illegal diagnosis of my person was the only diagnostic support for her otherwise untenable report on the complainant, who was pathologized and psychiatrized by the DVNLP and the LKA.

After an intervention by my lawyer, Dr. Q.-S. removed the inadmissible passages about my person from the final report. The expert opinion versions, which contain the inadmissible remote diagnosis about my person, are still in the basement of the district court Altona after the discontinuation of the proceedings on 14.11.2018. It is an expert opinion that cannot be kept professionally, but due to the sacrosanct status of psychiatric experts before German courts, it is potentially highly toxic: The perpetrators, mediated by XY's lawyer, who was reported as an accomplice, have already tried to get it into their possession.

A. Sources for the exegesis of a sloppy report

In order to be able to adequately assess the expert opinion prepared by Dr. Q.-S., here is first of all a short overview of the versions and supplementary comments in which it is available, sources mentioned here. This is not *a* report that comprehensibly arrives at *a* psychiatric diagnosis of *a* person, but three versions of the report and two supplementary comments, i.e. five texts relevant to this report, which, with contradictory diagnostic arguments, arrive at *three* different (and all of them false) diagnoses of *two* people. Five sources must therefore be considered.

1). Source #1 - the 1st expert opinion version

The 1st source is the original version of its expert opinion⁷ of 11.06.2017, received by the Altona Local Court on 19.06.2017.

2). Source #2 - the 1st supplementary comment

In a letter to the Altona District Court dated 04.07.2017⁸, sent a few days before she submitted the second expert opinion version (source #3), which is identical in text, Dr. Q.- commentsSee her decision to delete the passages complained of by Mr Stahl's lawyer, referring to the sentence expressed in her expert opinion on page 53, *'In this context, it is also assumed that a delusional disorder [in the original] induced in Mr Stahl in the sense of a so-called Folie à deux (ICD-IO: F24)'* and corrects the Altona District Court: *"In the **preliminary** [emphasis and word order in the original] expert opinion, I did in fact inadvertently write the indicative in the relevant passage in the 7th chapter of the diagnostic assessment instead of the subjunctive (p. 53)"*.

⁶ *"Psychiatric evaluation - a gift to the pedocriminal offender system and the DVNLP"*

⁷ The 1st, 2nd and 3rd versions of the expert opinion submitted to the Altona District Court are *summarised* here in *one document*, with the corresponding markings of the passages deleted without replacement in the 3rd version.

⁸ Link: *Dr. Q.-S. to AG*

Very decidedly she then again points out the hypothetical and presumed character of this statement: *"Correctly, this passage should read as follows: In this context it is also assumed or can be assumed that Mr Stahl could be suffering from an induced delusional disorder in the sense of a so-called Folie à deux (ICD-IO: F24).*

In addition, Dr. Q.-S. emphasized to the court the waiver of this presumed and remote diagnosis relating to Mr. Stahl: *"I understand the objections of Mr. Stahl's lawyer and certainly I did not mean to offend Mr. Stahl in any way. I also see no problem in removing the above passage and the other passages concerned (pp. 57-58 middle) from the preliminary expert opinion".* This is followed by a third and fourth reference to the provisional nature of their opinion.

This subjunctive formulation, now explicitly marked as diagnostic conjecture, together with the other passages relating to Mr Stahl, is then no longer to be found in the third version of the expert opinion submitted to the Court of First Instance.

BUT: Neither in one of her supplementary comments (source #2 and #5), nor in her second and third expert opinion version (source #3 and #4) does Dr. Q.-S. comment on whether and, if so, what influence the renunciation of the "remote diagnosis" about Mr. Stahl has on the inner logic of her diagnostic argumentation regarding the delusional diagnosis, which she addresses to the DVNLP complainant in her expert opinion.

3). Source #3 - the 2nd expert opinion version

The 3rd source is the 2nd version of its expert opinion dated 11.06.2017, received by the Altona District Court on 12.07.2017. This version is a textually identical printed but newly signed version of the original expert opinion. It is included here as a "source" because the probably unconscious mistake of signing and submitting a text-identical but newly signed expert opinion can be seen as an expression of the decision, which Dr. Q.-S. presumably finds difficult to make, as to whether she should not actually, after the hypothesis of a co-madness in Mr. Stahl's case no longer applies, have to reconsider and revise the expert opinion in its basic logic of argumentation. The third and final expert opinion version then shows that it did not do so - not even in the beginning. Dr. Q.-S. has deleted the passages concerning me without substitution, without changing a single word or one of her extremely shaky diagnostic arguments.

4). Source #4 - the 3rd expert opinion version

The 4th source is the 3rd version of its expert opinion of 06.07.2017, received by the Altona District Court on 07.09.2017. It is identical in text to the first two versions, except for this change and these deletions:

1. On page 8 the page break has changed (the word "as" has moved from the bottom of page 8 to the top of page 9).
2. On page 52 (in all three versions), Dr. Q.-S. has added the subordinate clause *"..., her appearance seemed strange overall."* canceled. In so doing, it reacted to

a letter of⁹ 5 July 2017 from the complainant's lawyer to the Local Court Altona criticising the lack of quality of its expert opinion.

3. On page 53 (in all three versions): The sentence, *"In this context, it is also assumed that Mr Stahl is suffering from a [mistake in the original; source #1 and #3] induced delusional disorder in the sense of a so-called Folie à deux (ICD-IO: F24)"* was deleted without replacement - and not, as previously announced to the court (source #2), by *"Correctly, this passage should read as follows: In this context, it is also assumed or can be assumed that Mr Stahl could be suffering from an induced delusional disorder in the sense of a so-called "Folie à deux (ICD-IO: F24)"*.
4. On pages 57-58 (of the first two versions): the text was deleted without replacement from page 57 above *"With regard to the suspicion of an induced delusional disorder in Mr Stahl ..."* to page 58, centre, *"...which measures would be necessary and promising for the treatment of Ms... [the complainant]"*.
5. Completely removed on page 61 of the first two versions is the paragraph *"In her current relationship with Mr. S. (meaning Mr Stahl), who, due to the age difference and the special nature of the constellation of former trainer and trainee, is certainly psychodynamically also inherently father-transferred, it appears that the delusional convictions of Ms. ... [the complainant] have led to an induced delusional experience in Mr Stahl, which is ultimately responsible for his exclusion from his formerly renowned position in the society of the DVNLP.*

Nowhere does Dr. Q.-S. give any indication as to whether, and if so, how these (irreplaceable!) deletions change the inner logic, structure and statics of the diagnostic argumentation of her expert opinion. Finally, the questionable "Folie à deux" hypothesis in the original version of her expert opinion (Sources #1 and #3) was, together with the "exacerbation" hypothesis (see below), which could be refuted by objective facts, the mainstay of her argumentation "substantiating" an alleged delusion of the complainant.

5). Source #5 - 2nd supplementary commentary

Dr. Q.-S. had her lawyer present this supplementary commentary to the expert opinion in the submission of 29 January 2018.¹⁰ In it, the Commission reiterates the attempt, which it dared to make in its opinion before the deletion of the passages concerning Mr Stahl, to justify the complainant's (alleged) delusion by an (alleged) delusion on the part of Mr Stahl. To this end, it replaces the individual diagnoses of "genuine delusion" and "induced delusion", which are interrelated in its diagnostic argumentation, with the diagnosis of a kind of "delusion of the relationship system complainant-steel".

⁹ Link: *Lawyer from complainant to AG*

¹⁰ Link: *Stahl-Dr.-Q.-S. pleadings and judgment*

For such an assessment of a relationship system, however, she had (1.) no mandate from the Altona District Court and (2.) this systemic diagnosis is based on the same erroneous circular reasoning that was explicitly found in the untenable diagnostic argumentation of the original expert opinion (Sources #1 and #3) and implicitly in the final expert opinion (Source #4).

With this attempt at a "systemically" extended diagnostic argumentation, however, it cannot eliminate the weaknesses, contradictions and untenability of the double diagnosis on two individuals of its original expert opinion, which it implicitly retained despite its deletion and which has now been brought back into play.

BUT: Dr. Q.-S., because she is the defendant here in the Hamburg Regional Court and must be able to defend herself, is allowed to present *everything* - ludicrous theoretical constructions, which she would certainly not present to a specialist audience, and also slanderous-psychopathologizing attributions violating the personal rights of other people in the form of grossly false and inadmissible remote diagnoses.

B. Circular reasoning reinstalled

Before the Hamburg Regional Court, Dr. Q.-S. and her lawyer attempt to restore the "Folie á deux" diagnosis which she removed from the first expert opinion versions - by reusing the circular argument in the diagnostic argumentation of the first expert opinion version.

1). Circular reasoning pepped up and retouched

Dr. Q.-S. had already made the psychiatric diagnoses intended for the complainant and Mr Stahl in her first two versions of the expert opinion on the basis of a circular self-referral argumentation¹¹: Dr. Q.-S. justified the existence of a "real" persistent delusional disorder in the complainant with the existence of a delusional disorder "induced" in Mr Stahl - the latter in turn being used as the main reason for the former, the "real" delusional disorder in the complainant. In her "expert opinion supplement" presented to the Hamburg Regional Court, there is now an "upgrade" for both delusional disorders: In the case of Mr Stahl, the 'induced' delusional disorder becomes 'genuinely induced' and in the case of the complainant, the 'genuine' delusional disorder becomes 'induced genuine'.

Even in this "supplementary commentary" (source #5) on the final expert opinion, the circular argument used remains well hidden behind Dr. Q.-S.'s inconspicuous but grossly erroneous and unsubstantiated assumption that the fact that Mr Stahl had spoken to XY, who was accused by the complainant, was the reason for his exclusion from the DVNLP: In all three versions of the report (sources #1, #3 and #4) it says (on page 42): "*Mr. Stahl then spoke to Mr. XY, and referred mainly to the secret relationship between the trainer and the participant, but not to prostitution. The*

¹¹ See "*Psychiatric opinion - a gift for the pedocriminal offender system and the DVNLP*".

whole thing led to the fact that they were both excluded from the ... [so in the original] *German Association for NLP (DVNLP)*'. In this passage on this page 42 of all versions of the expert opinion, Dr. Q.-S. does not indicate in what way which "*whole*" exactly is supposed to have led to the exclusion of Mr Stahl and the complainant from the DVNLP. At this point she leaves that to the imagination of her readers.

Which direction did Dr. Q.-S. wanted to direct the imagination of her readers is made clear in the passage deleted without substitution from the final expert opinion version, which can be found in the previous versions (Sources #1 and #3) on page 61: "*In her current relationship with Mr. S. Stahl], who, due to the age difference and the special nature of the constellation of former trainer and trainee, is certainly psychodynamically also inherently father-transferred, it appears that the delusional beliefs of Ms... [the complainant] have led to an induced delusional experience in Mr Stahl, which is ultimately responsible for his exclusion from his formerly prestigious position in the society of the DVNLP.*

The cause of the exclusion of Mr Stahl and the complainant from the DVNLP, which was only hinted at on page 42 of her expert opinion, is, in Dr. Q.-S.'s view, the delusion of the complainant PLUS the induced delusion of Mr Stahl. In the final version of the expert opinion, due to the deletion of the passage concerning Mr Stahl on page 61, only this indication is still present on page 42. Their relevance for the diagnosis of a madness in the complainant is not made clear in the final version of the expert opinion, but may unfold as a cryptic suggestion in the imagination of the readers of the expert opinion.

This means that Dr. Q.-S. explicitly assumes an erroneous assumption in the first and only implicitly in the final version of the expert opinion, which she treats as a fact in each case: Mr. Stahl had been excluded from the DVNLP because the references he had presented and substantiated in his publications about the perpetrator-victim-reversion process in the DVNLP were not true, but were based on a delusion "*induced*" by him. This was, according to the complainant, "*foi á deux*" to the complainant's "*genuine*" delusion (which in turn - circular argument - had arisen as a result of the delusion "*induced*" by Mr Stahl, i.e. as a result of his perceptions and comments concerning the events in the DVNLP).

This false assumption is maintained, but now presented before the Regional Court of Hamburg, before which Dr. Q.-S. generously allows her to do so, because she must be able to defend herself in court as a defendant - to repeat her psychiatric remote diagnosis of me, the plaintiff, which violates her personal rights. To my disadvantage, and above all to the disadvantage of the complainant, she is also allowed to expand her diagnosis freely: With the *induced* delusion that has now *become "real" in my case*, I am supposed to have added an "*additional real*", i.e. "*genuinely induced*" delusion in the complainant, or to have made the "*already real*" delusion "*even more real*". "*Genuine fool's freedom*" as species protection for the endangered species of psychiatric consultants.

2). Jester's freedom in court: the relationship system is delusional

Dr. Q.-S. took up her circular argumentation, which had already been abandoned in the final version of the expert opinion (after the intervention of my lawyer), again before the Hamburg Regional Court. Not directly, however, by declaring the first version of its expert opinion to be the correct one and by officially reversing the deletion of the foil á deux passages concerning Mr Stahl.

No, Dr. Q.-S. instead indirectly declares the executed deletion to be annulled by once again accusing Mr. Stahl of "induced" insanity - somewhat more hidden behind awkward statements on the "Folie á deux diagnosis of a relationship system", which she presents to this court by her lawyer in the pleading of¹² 29.01.2018 (on page 4) as a systemic-psychological and psychiatric-diagnostic novelty.

This construction is practically-diagnostically and theoretically impossible to maintain. And above all, it is in no way supported¹³ by the specialist article submitted to the Court of First Instance by Dr. Q.-S. with the opposite intention. In this article there is no reference to attempts by the psychiatric community to arrive at the "systemization" of the slide á deux definition proposed by Dr. Q. -S. On the contrary: The authors (1.) strictly and consistently proceed from the clear distinction between "inductor" and "inducer" and (2.) in their theoretical discussions and practical examples they consistently speak of a respectively always unambiguous direction of the induction of delusion in one slide á deux: always of the inductor and the inducer.

The authors of this specialist article would certainly smile only mildly about the "innovation" of a slide á deux diagnosis as a quasi mutually equal induction event, i.¹⁴e. about this abolition of the unambiguous rule regarding the inductor-inducement relation, as presented in this statement by Dr. Q.-S. through her lawyer.

¹² See footnote #3.

¹³ Link: *The foil à deux -Psychic contagion or independent psychosis diseases? (from B. Jabs, K. Jabs, A. Reif and B. Pfuhlmann)*

¹⁴ Dr. Q.-S. has asked me with this annulment of the inductor-inducer relation of two individual delusional disorders and its replacement by a quasi-systemic foil á deux diagnosis as a "*diagnosed condition of two persons*" (page 4, 2.a, middle of the paragraph), i.e. as a mutual-interactive induction of two equal, both inducing and induced delusional disorders, with regard to the "occasional offence" of their assessment of culpability is promoted to the position of an accomplice who is incapable of guilt because he is "equally delusional". If this is not a trick to prevent these expert opinions from being proved to her as being false, i.e. if she actually believes what she is writing, she makes it clear that in her perception the "occasional offence" (of slander allegedly committed against XY) charged against the complainant was committed jointly by her and Mr Stahl - which is exactly in the spirit of the perpetrators inside and outside the DVNLP. And Dr. Q.-S. thus makes it clear that she did not regard the texts, materials and court decisions to which she had been given access as well-supported, real given facts and circumstances, but only as manifestations of my alleged delusion and the complainant's alleged delusion.

With the help of this apparently highly advanced, quasi-systemic diagnosis, Dr. Q.-S. apparently tried to save the "Induced Delusion" diagnosis of my person from her original report, which was objected to and already removed by her from the final report. Dr. Q.-S. certainly knew that the court would not allow her expert opinion to be discussed in the hearing. That means she also knew that I would not have the opportunity (which is how it happened) to professionally criticize her adventurous new diagnostic argumentation. Otherwise, she would hardly have had the audacity to present the court with a professional article which, with every line, makes clear the exact opposite of what she is trying to make the court believe with her absurdly "retouched" diagnostic argumentation restoring the slide á deux diagnosis. For the surprising premiere of such a quasi-systemic diagnosis "*delusional disorder of a relationship*" before this court, Dr. Q.-S. uses the very dialectical-systemic seeming construct of a "*real but induced*" or an "*induced but real*" delusion, which is probably not found in the psychiatric-diagnostic and the systems-theoretical-psychological literature.

Certainly Dr. Q.-S. knew that her expert opinion would be taboo before this court, i.e. its contents could neither be criticized or even rejected by the (inwardly perhaps head-shaking) judge nor by me, the outraged plaintiff. Dr. Q.-S. could assume that the Regional Court of Hamburg would not slaughter a "holy psychiatrist's cow" - not even one that was clearly recognisably sloppily explored and negligently and stupidly argued and thus in a perpetrator-friendly manner accepted expert collateral damage.¹⁵

3). Both columns broken off: Film á deux and exacerbation

As¹⁶I have already explained, Dr. Q.-S.'s diagnostic argumentation was based on a second main pillar in addition to the slide á deux hypothesis: the "exacerbation" hypothesis. This was the assumption that "*these delusional beliefs [of the complainant] seem to come to a head when the respective men turn away from her*" (on page 61 in sources #1 and #3, on page 59 in source #4). She submits that an exacerbation of the complainant's insanity had occurred at the moment when the NLP coach and alternative practitioner XY, who was in an abusive coach/psychotherapist/patient relationship with her at the time (as documented in the file), had turned away from her.

Dr. Q.-S. did not sufficiently explore the actual conditions or did not want to take note of the reports of her test person: It was not XY who turned away from the

¹⁵ The judge said, with a certain wink of the eye, that the Federal Court of Justice would not clarify the question of the limits of the privilege of psychiatric experts to express themselves. My lawyer and I understood this as an invitation to accept the verdict announced by her to my disadvantage and then to go through the instances with it. Since I have used up my financial resources in the fight against the criminal association DVNLP in the last years, I decided to let others take this overdue step.

¹⁶ "*Psychiatric evaluation - a gift to the pedocriminal offender system and the DVNLP*"

complainant, but YOU turned away from HIM - and that was one and a half years *before* she made the abuse accusations against him, i.e. one and a half years before the "occasional offence" which the complainant is said to have committed out of an "exacerbated" delusion. According to the information on file from his psychotherapist Cora Besser-Siegmund, XY had to undergo psychotherapeutic treatment after the complainant had separated from him because of a "*serious depressive decompensation*" that "*was triggered by this relationship* [with the complainant]". On 29 May 2015, XY has his lawyer appear before the Hamburg Regional Court: "*The "quite serious depressive decompensation" that is being dealt with ultimately means the processing of the failed relationship* [with the complainant] which lasted *about 6 months*."

ALSO: It was not on the complainant's side that there was an "*exacerbated symptomatology*" as a result of a separation, but on the side of XY: he had to undergo psychotherapeutic treatment to cope with the fact that the complainant had "*turned away from him*".

C. For the confusion induction of the new flash diagnosis in detail

Page 4, 2a; 2nd sentence: "*Within the scope of her expert opinion commission, the defendant has correctly diagnosed the induced delusional disorder in the accused woman ...* [the complainant] *in the criminal proceedings*."

In the first two versions of Mr Stahl's report, she diagnosed an "*induced*" and in the complainant's case a "*real*" delusional disorder! In the final version, she has refrained from diagnosing any "*induced*" delusional disorder in anyone at all.

Page 4, 2.a, 3rd and 4th sentences: "*Woman ...* [the complainant] *is the person from whom the psychotic disorder originates. With regard to the plaintiff, the defendant merely suspected an induced delusional disorder, i.e. that the delusional beliefs of Mrs. ...* [the complainant] *concerning him were only triggered (induced) by the psychotic disorder in her (i.e. her delusional beliefs)*."

One sentence earlier, the complainant was presented as *induced* delusional and now she is suddenly again the one from whom the "*psychotic disorder originates*", i.e. the one who is not *induced* but *genuinely* delusional.

Page 4, 2.a, 5th sentence: "*It is true that without the psychotic disorder in woman ...* [the complainant] *there would also be no possibility of an induced disorder in the plaintiff as a partner of woman ...* [the complainant]."

That is banal, but it obscures the fact that here, by repeating the foil á deux circular conclusion of the first expert opinion versions, the court, quasi-hypnotically¹⁷ by

¹⁷ It is as if the lawyer of Dr. Q.-S. said: "*Dear presiding and sitting judges, please do not take note of the content of the following sentence: 'The plaintiff is insane'. Thank you very much for your attention.*"

repetition, is accustomed to perceiving the plaintiff Stahl as delusional. Dr. Q.-S.'s lawyer will have known that she is allowed to say anything before this court as the defending defendant: she is allowed to diagnose and remotely diagnose - who, how wrong and how violating personal rights.

Page 4, 2.a, 6th-9th sentence: *"As is already inherent in the name "Folie à deux", the diagnosed condition always involves at least two people. It is true that in the course of time both disturbance patterns are mutually amplified. The pathological condition in the induced delusional disorder assumes a variable effect. It is a delusional disorder shared by two people with close emotional ties.*

Here, the classic slide à deux diagnosis with its clear assignment of *"real delusion"* in one partner and *"induced delusion"* in the other partner is softened in favour of a diagnosis of *"delusion of a relationship system"*. The classic slide à deux diagnosis, as Dr. Q.-S.'s specialist colleagues make very clearly clear¹⁸ in her article submitted to the LG Hamburg, does not know a diagnosed *"condition of two people"*, but only an *"inductor"* (real) and an *"inducer"* (induced delusion).

With the help of this quasi-hypnotic confusion induction, the court is repeatedly suggested that *"Mr. Stahl is delusionally disturbed.*

Page 4, 2.a, 10th sentence: *"Only one of the two suffers from a genuine psychotic disorder; the delusions in the other are induced (...) (Pocket guide to the classification of mental disorders, F24, for the court enclosed)"*.

Another repetition of the indirectly transmitted suggestion: *"Mr. Stahl also suffers from delusions!"*

Page 4, 2.a, 11th sentence: *"The diagnosis of one partner cannot therefore be ignored without the other reference person, in this case the plaintiff. The interactions shape the diagnosis."*

To think away? This semantically and syntactically daring formulation seems to point to a confusion of Dr. Q.-S.'s lawyer. Could it be that his client's *genuine* delusional idea has already caused him to develop an induced delusion?

D. Conclusion

Dr. Q.-S.'s lawyer has drawn the attention of the court to the fact that his client was in danger of having her expert opinion proven to be incorrect and then possibly being exposed to claims for damages.

This probably answers the interesting question as to why Dr. Q.-S. did not leave it at the status defined by the first four sources and did not simply explain to the court

¹⁸ *The foil à deux -Psychic contagion or independent psychosis diseases? (from B. Jabs, K. Jabs, A. Reif and B. Pfuhlmann)*

that she had removed the remote diagnosis of his person contested by Mr. Stahl from the final version of the expert opinion submitted to the Altona Local Court.

As is well known, psychiatric experts tend to depict the persons they once diagnosed as "disturbed" as disturbed with all the rhetorical and communicative-hypnotic means at their disposal: They "hypnotize" the court into the perception of seeing the person stigmatized by them as "disturbed" as actually disturbed¹⁹.

Dr. Q.-S., in the course of the rescue of her foil á deux diagnosis, apparently tried to avoid determining who should be the person suffering from a *real* delusion and who should be the one suffering from an *induced* delusion. To prevent this question, Dr. Q.-S. with her confused diagnostic derivation - which is, however, taboo for the court and may not be commented on - offers the court a simple solution: "*Both are delusional! The complainant and Mr. Stahl!*"

¹⁹ It can be assumed that Dr. Q.-S. has had hypnosis training. At least she applies the linguistic communication and hypnosis techniques of Erickson's hypnotherapy, which I have already described (cf. footnote #2) and which are mediated by her lawyer, also skilfully before this court. Half a page of text in her lawyer's brief (page 4) acts like a trance induction through confusion and indirectly conveys the suggestion: "*The plaintiff is delusional. Do not listen to him.*" Dr. Q.-S. leads the court to this "perception of reality" through the intermediate steps of "*mutual reinforcement of the delusion*", "*shared delusional disorder*" and a "*the interactions shape the diagnosis*" which sounds systemically clever but remains artfully vague.