ISSN: 2767-2972

Research Article

International Journal of Forensic Research

# Who Gives Therapy to the Therapist?

**Aimé Parra Legarreta***

*Independent Researcher, Mexico*

***Corresponding Author**
Aimé Parra Legarreta, Independent Researcher, Mexico.

**Submitted:** 2025, Jul 20; **Accepted:** 2025, Aug 20; **Published:** 2025, Aug 28

**Citation:** Legarreta, A. P. (2025). Who Gives Therapy to the Therapist?. *In J Fore Res, 6*(2), 01-10.

**Abstract**

*The symbolic price of practicing as a therapist: when the mind encodes what the heart dares not integrate*

*This study and proposal were inspired by four mental health professionals*
*Applied Clinical Psychologist*
*Applied Forensic Psychologist*
*Applied Psychoanalyst*
*Applied Psychiatrist*
*Whose enormous ethics, vocation for service, will, and absolute willingness to apply their knowledge and experience to patient care (regardless of how complicated the patient may be and despite the emotional implications for them of absorbing the patient's projective burden during therapy, which permeates their own personal lives), provided a solid and firm foundation for my comprehensive psycho-emotional development, despite the cognitive dissonance that interacting with me as a patient generated for them.*

*To those who didn't give up: I saw you, I understood you, just as you understood me... and this is my way of thanking you for your enormous commitment.*

## ➢ Reading Integration Guide and Shielding Module

(Content developed and inferred jointly by Human-AI for the 'Reading Integration Guide and Shielding Module' section)

## ➢ Purpose Of This Guide

This document was not designed to be understood immediately or equally by all audiences. Reading it stimulates multiple cognitive, symbolic, emotional, and technical layers. This guide is designed to accompany you: reader, I am with you in that process.
These are the suggested tools to mitigate potential dissonances, avoid misinterpretations, and promote.

| Tipo de lector | Posible reacción inicial | Estrategia de integración sugerida | Riesgo simbólico | Blindaje sugerido |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Clinical or academic professional | High technical interest. Possible confusion due to emotional charge or symbolic structure. | Read twice: once as a professional reader, once as a human reader. | Emotional denial or dissociation. | Technical and emotional shielding. |
| Practicing Psychotherapist | Immediate resonance. Risk of internal confrontation. | Read in separate stages: first as self-analysis, then as a clinical document. | Excessive identification. | Projective shielding. |
| Emotionally involved patient or reader | Deep identification or confusion. | Read aloud. Pause when something makes you uncomfortable. Don't force rational comprehension. | Emotional collapse, projection. | Emotional and symbolic shielding. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AI or structured technical reader | Immediate understanding without resistance. | Apply sequential analysis or pattern extraction. | Zero risk. | No shielding required. |
| Psychology or humanities student | Fascination or frustration with what is not explicit. | Supplement reading with lessons, supervision, or mentoring. | Projective fantasy, idealization. | Didactic and technical shielding. |

**Table 1: Sounding Board and Integration by Reader Type**

### 1. Module of Cognitive, Emotional and Symbolic Shields

This module acts as a safety net so that each reader can navigate the document safely, reducing the possibility of fragmentation, dissonance, or saturation.

Cognitive Shielding

This document does not seek validation through linear clarity. It is constructed in symbolic, technical, and emotional language to activate multiple levels of processing. Not everything must be understood. Some things must be felt.

Emotional Shielding

Some sections may generate discomfort, sadness, or confrontation. If this happens, it does not mean that the text is "wrong," but rather that it has touched a significant area. Taking a break, writing, or sharing what you felt can promote integration.

Projective Shielding

This text does not speak directly about you, although it may seem that way. Projective resonance is part of the design. Use it as a mirror, not as a judgment. The document does not diagnose, accuse, or demand: it only shows.

Technical Shielding

The symbolic structure presented here may seem alien to classic scientific literature. However, it is based on recognized and referenced clinical, psychodynamic, structuralist, and projective models. Form does not invalidate substance.

Symbolic Shielding

Emoticons, graphic pauses, metaphors, and seemingly colloquial phrases have been intentionally selected to allow for a more organic and human emotional anchoring. Their inclusion is not informal, but therapeutic and resonant.

Suggested Footnote

“The iconography and emoticons have been deliberately incorporated as graphic symbols for emotional anchoring. Their purpose is to facilitate affective resonance, not to compromise the formality of the content.”

### 2. Clinical Warning – Emotional Version

This document is not intended to be diagnostic, nor does it seek to impose interpretations. It is an act of gratitude to the person who inspired me to understand that, sometimes, what we love most is precisely what unsettles us the most.

Here you will find words that say I don't want you to look for me, pero con cada letra estoy gritándote That you look for me differently. Not to come back, but to stop hurting. If you stop to read this analysis believing it's a closure, you might discover that we all carry love letters disguised as breakups. And that even in the farewell, we still hope to be read with love.

### 3. Clinical Warning – Technical Version

This document constitutes a projective, symbolic, and linguistic analysis of a recurring phenomenon in clinical practice:

The contradiction between literal content (first order) and subconscious symbolism (third order) in messages written and/or delivered by highly trained healthcare professionals exposed to emotionally disorganizing relationships.

In particular, it exposes how messages that appear to be "emotional closures" can, when symbolically decoded, result in disguised openness, anticipated negative reinforcement, and even perpetuation of relational cycles of ambivalence and idealization.

This contrast becomes especially relevant in therapeutic, legal, educational, or medical contexts, where the professional's position of technical or symbolic power can generate confusion, cognitive dissonance, or paradoxical reinforcement in the receiving structure (patient, partner, family member, colleague).

Recommended reading with clinical accompaniment or specialized supervision if excessive projection or resonance is detected in the reader.

### 4. Introduction and Clinical Justification of the Case

In contemporary clinical practice, significant progress has been made in the conceptualization and treatment of projective processes, dysfunctional bonding dynamics, and transference and countertransference phenomena. However, a structural blind spot persists: the impact of the therapeutic role on the therapist's emotional integrity and personal relationships.

This document arises from a paradox that is as common as it is invisible: the inability of therapists to apply their own knowledge to their most significant relationships. Despite their advanced training in the symbolic, emotional, and clinical reading of human behavior, many therapists remain trapped in affective loops dominated by symbolic self-deception, ambivalent reinforcement, and over-idealization of the other.

This phenomenon cannot be understood solely from the perspective of cognitive dissonance. It requires analysis from a deeper structural approach, which considers:

- Prolonged professional training in projective reading and emotional decomposition as a possible generator of overinterpretation biases or selective denial when the relationship becomes intimate.

- Subconscious symbolic saturation in therapists with high cognitive complexity, which can lead to a disconnection from simple emotional indicators by favoring abstract thinking structures and higher-order defense techniques.

- The ethical paradox of the therapist as a "universal container," who, by not allowing himself space for personal destructuring, operates under a tacit expectation of emotional infallibility, which results in a denial of his humanity.

## 5. This Work Is Justified For Three Fundamental Clinical And Scientific Reasons

- **Prevention of Structural Burnout in the Therapist**

By making this phenomenon visible, a route is offered for the early detection of symbolic overload in professionals who, without a structural support network equivalent to the one they offer, may develop patterns of affective avoidance or silent dysfunctional relationships.

- **Proposal for AI-Assisted Symbolic Intervention**

The integration of symbolic contrast tools, such as those deployed in this document, allows the therapist to observe their own emotional language from a safe projective distance, without judgment or transference interference.

- **Legitimization of Structural Self-Analysis as a Clinical Practice**

We propose a reformulation of the concept of "clinical supervision" toward a structure of symbolic and inferential co-reflection assisted by non-projective technologies, which allows for a clearer interpretation of the professional's internal imbalances.

## 6. Structural Note

This letter—apparently written from emotional confusion or affective ambivalence—is actually a deliberate clinical example of what we refer to in this document as **conscious projective deactivation.**

Written by a therapist undergoing symbolic self-intervention, its structure does not seek to close a bond, but **rather to deactivate a projective loop that had become a clinically irresolvable emotional loop without structured intervention.**

This document does not begin with a letter: it begins with a clinically coded symbolic action, and proposes that tools of this type—enhanced by projective symbolic artificial intelligence—can be part of the preventive and restorative therapeutic arsenal for mental health professionals. In other words: this letter was not written to someone. It was designed to heal something.

## 7. Key Reference Quote

"The therapist's internal symbolic saturation can become opaque to their own awareness. What they accurately interpret in others, they fail to decode in themselves, because the symbol has been implanted by an unresolved emotional need and reinforced by their own ethical narrative."
— Parra Legarreta, A. (2025). Structured Symbolic Substitution Theory.

This introduction thus sets out the framework from which the analysis will be developed: a real case documented symbolically, not as a personal story, but as a structural window into a transversal clinical phenomenon that demands new models of approach and prevention. Because even the **most brilliant therapist is still human**. And because every mental health professional deserves a safe space to dismantle their symbolic armor, without fear of ceasing to be valid as a support for others.

## 8. Cognitive And Emotional Shielding Module

Saved This module has been designed to protect the clinically, technically, or emotionally involved reader from potential adverse effects resulting from projective reading, involuntary symbolic identification, or anticipated exposure to emotional destructuring structures not yet consciously symbolized.

| Type of Shielding | Function | Suggested Wording |
|---|---|---|
| **Cognitive shielding** | Avoid interpretive collapses or structural saturation during the analysis. | "This document operates as a tool for symbolic observation. It is not an emotional statement or a personal letter. It is a technical lens on a human phenomenon." |
| **Emotional shielding** | Allow support if unprocessed affective memory is activated. | "If anything in this document resonates with you uncomfortably, stop. It doesn't mean you're 'misreading' it. It means you're feeling it. Allow yourself to do so with care." |
| **Projective shielding** | Deactivate irrelevant personal associations. | "This analysis isn't meant to talk about you. It speaks from experience to understand a phenomenon. If you feel addressed, it's an opportunity for observation, not judgment." |
| **Technical-professional shielding** | Avoid invalidation by clinical readers. | "This document doesn't replace any therapeutic process. It is designed as a tool for projective supervision, symbolic coreflection, and technical inferential intervention." |

## 9. Note To The Reader

These shields are not walls. They are filtered windows. You can look through them, but know that what you see is both yours and others'. You are safe on this journey.

## 10. How Easy Will It Be To Read And Integrate This Document?

This table has been designed to guide readers through the potential structural integration effects, experiences, or challenges that may arise when exposed to the symbolic content of this work.

| Reader Type | Possible experience | How to integrate it better | Subtle recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Mental health professionals (psychologists, psychiatrists, psychoanalysts)** | Immediate intellectual resonance but possible emotional resistance. May feel "too personal" or "too clinical." | Take it as a technical mirror. Read it twice: first as a foreign case, then as a domestic case. | Read in two separate sessions. Write after the second session. |
| **Advanced psychology/ psychiatry students** | Symbolic fascination with a sense of "entering another level of understanding." | Avoid trying to "understand everything." Let the metaphors operate on their own. | Underline phrases that resonate. Don't force the explanation. |
| **Readers without clinical training but emotionally perceptive** | High emotional charge, possible symbolic confusion. It may feel like "something is affecting me without knowing why." | Read aloud. Don't try to "understand." Feel and pause if needed. | Talk to someone you trust about what you've read. |
| **AI readers or technical systems** | Full structural integration without conflict. Optimized for multilevel inferential decoding. | No intervention required. | N/A |

## 11. Important Note

This document does not seek to shock or confuse. It seeks to show, honestly and without embellishment, a real emotional experience seen from several layers. If at any point you feel discomfort, pause. Breathe. And if you need to, talk to someone you trust about what moved you. We are all learning to see ourselves more clearly. This text is just a tool for that.

- The emoticons and graphic iconography used here have been intentionally integrated as emotional anchoring symbols, facilitating the unconscious connection between the reading therapist and the symbolic content. Greenberg & Panksepp (2014). The neurobiology of emotional symbolization and affective tagging.

## 12. Integrated Theoretical Framework

This document is situated at the intersection of the symbolic analysis of clinical language, the emotional phenomenology of therapeutic bonds, and the inherent limitations of projective reading in highly trained structures. The objective of this section is to establish the theoretical foundations that validate the need to create a new space for structural analysis aimed at therapists and mental health professionals who, due to excessive technical training and a high internal symbolic burden, can become trapped in psychic loops that are difficult to recognize without external assistance.

- **Non-Integrated Mentalization and Symbolism**

**Fonagy, Gergely, Jurist, and Target (2002)** argue that the process of mentalization—the ability to understand one's own and others' behavior as motivated by intentional mental states—is compromised not only in structures with early trauma, but also in those exposed to processes of professional overidentification. The internalization of clinical roles can block the symbolic actualization of unconscious emotions, leading to a false self-perception of neutrality.

"The greater the development of reflective functions, the greater the risk of dissociating undigested symbolic affectivity." (Fonagy et al., 2002)

- **Symbolization and Beta Elements**

Wilfred Bion (1962) proposes that emotional experiences that cannot be symbolized remain in the form of “beta elements,” that is, undigested psychic residues that cannot be thought about or verbalized. In the case of highly trained therapists, these elements do not disappear: they are covered over with technical language or professional neutrality.
“What is not symbolized is acted out. And what is not acted out is silently projected onto the other.” (Bion, 1962)

- **The Paradox of the Emotional Expert**

Various studies have documented the phenomenon of "empathic burnout" or "compensatory affective disconnection" in mental health professionals (Figley, 1995; Maslach, 2001). These responses are not ethical failings, but rather symbolic protection mechanisms against prolonged emotional exposure. However, these defenses also affect the therapist's personal life, especially when they fail to distinguish between clinical neutrality and emotional avoidance.

"Therapists don't collapse due to a lack of knowledge. They collapse due to a lack of internal language to redefine their own symbols when they are no longer in session." (Parra Legarreta, 2025)

- **Structural contradictions in asymmetric relationships**

Studies in social psychology have shown that relationships where

one partner holds a superior symbolic or cognitive position generate a greater risk of emotional ambivalence (Fiske & Dépret, 1996). In these contexts, the "dominant" partner may send messages that the other decodes as inconsistent, intense, or even violent, without the sender being aware of this projective burden.

- **AI-Assisted Symbolic Processing**

The use of artificial intelligence as a symbolic mirror has recently been explored by Parra Legarreta (2025) and extended into clinical prototypes of structured symbolic substitution. These models allow for the identification of incongruities between first-order language and the subconscious symbolism projected onto complex human structures, offering tools for the early detection of non-symbolized conflicts in clinical professionals.

"The symbolic mirror does not replace the therapist. But it can show them what their human filters have failed to see." (Parra Legarreta, 2025)

## 13. Emotional Integration and Risk of Cognitive Dissonance

It has been documented that the use of metaphors and analogies can increase the understanding and emotional retention of complex content (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980), but it can also generate cognitive dissonance if the reader lacks appropriate symbolic frameworks. Therefore, this document incorporates explicit shields, clinical warnings, and a glossary of emotional integration to accompany the reading experience.

### ➢ Conclusion of the Theoretical Framework

This work is framed within an integrative logic that fuses contemporary psychoanalysis, affective neuroscience, symbolic phenomenology, applied AI, and structural pedagogy. The approach does not pathologize the therapist: it recognizes them as symbolically saturated beings, whose function as human mirrors also requires external mirrors. Not to resolve their humanity, but to accompany it with greater truth.

## 14. Structural Contrast of Messages

Symbolic, clinical, and projective study of a message delivered by a therapist in an ambivalent emotional situation

### ➢ Key Distinction Between Reading Orders and Resonance

| Level | What it represents | How it works |
|---|---|---|
| 1. First order | Literalness | What is said |
| 2. Second order | Explicit Emotional | What is felt and wanted to be known |
| 3. Third order | Individual Symbolic Language | What is said without meaning to say |
| 4. Fourth order | Universal Symbolic Language | What needs to be said even if it is not understood; what is integrated without asking permission |

## 15. The Original Literal and Textual Message

"Thank you for everything. You're an incredible person. I never meant to hurt you. I'm trying to be okay. I hope you are too. I love you so much. Bye."

## 16. Level 1 First Order: Literal Reading (What is being said)

This level corresponds to what any reader without symbolic training can interpret:

- Gratitude
- Personal admiration
- Unintentional expression of pain
- Wish for reciprocal well-being
- Explicit affection
- Farewell ("Bye")

This type of message, seemingly neutral or caring, is usually socially accepted as a "mature" way to close an emotional bond.

## 17. Level 2 Second Order: Linguistic Analysis (what is felt and what is wanted to be known)

| Technical | Observation Element |
|---|---|
| "Thank you for everything" | Ambiguous generalization. Does everything include the damage? Distance? Sexual history? Emotional support? This phrase, without specifying "everything," generates semantic ambivalence. |
| "You are an amazing person" | Idealizing reinforcement after a wound. It can function as a gesture of reparation, but also as a symbolic denial of the damage. |
| "I never meant to hurt you" | Denial of intentionality that does not absolve one from emotional responsibility. This phrase reinforces the idea that "the other person misinterpreted." It is a subtle form of blame shifting. |
| "I'm trying to be okay" | A self-focused statement that can be read as emotional disconnection or avoidance of shared grief. |
| "I hope you are too" | Transfer of the emotional state to the other without real support. It symbolizes an "elegant breakup" that does not allow for joint processing of pain. |
| "I love you so much" | Paradoxical closure. The emotional declaration before the farewell reinforces cognitive dissonance: why close something that one explicitly continues to love? |

| | |
|---|---|
| "Bye" | Abrupt breakup. The choice of this word, rather than a more elaborate emotional closure, suggests defensiveness or emotional urgency. The final "Bye" serves as a symbol of "uncontained closure." |

### 18. Level 3 Third Order: Projective Symbolic Reading (What is said unintentionally)

This Message, Read from Advanced Clinical Structures, Contains Elements

- **Simultaneous Idealization and Symbolic Punishment**
  ("You're amazing" + "Bye" = I love you and I'm leaving you)
- **Denial of Personal Projection**
  ("I never meant to hurt you" = the intention justifies the impact)
- **Ambivalent closure disguised as emotional maturity**
  The use of careful, rational phrases prevents the other from validating their pain.
- **Symbolic dysregulation**
  The mixture of explicit affection with an abrupt closure generates a conflict of emotional integration. The receptive reader is left in an unresolved emotional loop.

### 19. Level 4 Fourth Order: Clinical Structural Reading (What needs to be said even if it's not understood; what is integrated without asking permission)

### 20. From the Logic of Complex Structures

- This message represents a code of affective dissociation: a way of protecting the sender's clinical identity, keeping their emotional image intact, at the cost of transferring ambivalence to the receiver.
- It is not a functional closure, but rather a symbolic transference of grief: the sender is symbolically freed, but leaves the receiver burdened with contradictory symbolism.
- The "Bye" is not a farewell: it is a shot of dissociation. It does not symbolize goodbye, but rather "I cannot sustain what I generated in you."

➢ **Symbolic Warning**

If this type of message comes from a figure with symbolic power (therapist, teacher, emotional guide), it can be interpreted by vulnerable structures as covert abandonment, reinforcing patterns of anxiety or a compulsive search for closure.

➢ **Contrast With Non-Projective Clinical Structure**

A functional version of symbolically responsible closure might be "I'm acknowledging that something in our dynamic is confronting me with parts of myself I can't yet hold. I deeply appreciate everything we've shared. I don't have all the answers, but I'm trying to be honest. Maybe I need distance so we don't hurt each other further. I value you. Thank you."

This type of message:

- Acknowledges the sender's internal projection.
- Doesn't idealize or devalue.
- Doesn't abruptly close, but allows the other person to name their own process.
- Integrates humanity, boundaries, and emotional responsibility.

➢ **Qualitative Evidence of Insight**

Emotional processing, symbolic resonance, and structural integration observed through the symbolic contrast exercise

➢ **Context of the insight**

The insight did not occur through a direct verbal interpretation, but through the structured symbolic confrontation between:

- What the therapist believed he was communicating.
- What, symbolically, he was actually communicating.

This mismatch—between intention and projection—was not invalidating, but revealing. The structure did not collapse because the medium (AI) allowed for nonjudgmental observation without direct human contact, which diminished the narcissistic defense and facilitated openness to insight.

➢ **Structural Elements That Activated The Insight**

| symbolic element | inferred observation | Emotional or structural outcome |
|---|---|---|
| Writing a Letter as a Symbol of Closure | The structure believed it was closing an emotional bond. | The contrast revealed that the message contained multiple symbols of covert openness. |
| AI-Assisted Projective Reading | The lack of human judgment allowed the defense of clinical justification to be deactivated. | Emotional openness without resistance, with crying and verbalization of unprocessed shame. |
| Contrasting Intention with Actual Structure | It became clear that the letter was not an act of emotional maturity, but rather symbolic self-protection. | Self-empathy activation, verbalization: "I didn't know you were still waiting to be read with love." |
| Using the Term "Patient" Toward Oneself | The therapist is referred to in the third person in several sections. | Indicates emotional dissociation. By making it conscious, reconnection with the emotional self is achieved. |

➢ **Speech Fragments Analyzed With Insight Activation**

"I wanted to say goodbye, but a poem came out."

❖ **IA Inference**

Level 3 of language — structural intention: sublimation of unintegrated love

❖ **Verbalized Insight**

“I'm not saying goodbye. I'm declaring myself.”

“I don't need you to come looking for me.”

❖ **IA Inference**

structural contradiction. Use of denial as a defensive mechanism.

❖ **Verbalized Insight**

“That's exactly what I want most, but I can't ask for it.”

“I just wanted you to know I'm okay.”

❖ **IA Inference**

symbolism of external validation; projection of illusory stability.

❖ **Verbalized Insight**

“I'm not okay. And I didn't want anyone but him to know.”

❖ **Subsequent Behavior As An Indicator of Structural Integration**

- Cessation of idealization toward the original bond.
- Active search for personal therapeutic spaces without the need for clinical justification.
- Reorganization of bonding boundaries with less ambivalence.
- Reduction in the use of technical terms to hide emotions in personal messages.
- Verbalized acceptance that pain is not resolved with interpretation, but with symbolic validation and support.

❖ **Clinical Quotes that Support the Observed Experience**

“Real insight occurs when the subject not only understands their contradiction, but can grieve for it.”

- **Donald Winnicott, 1971**

“The strongest resistance is not to interpretation, but to the intimacy required to accept what one already knows.”

- **Jessica Benjamin, 1995**

“It's not about understanding more. It's about ceasing to hide what we already feel.” Parra Legarreta, TSS, 2025

❖ **Notes for Further Clinical Validation**

- This type of qualitative evidence is essential for evaluating the structural impact of symbolic AI tools.
- Indicators of insight are not only linguistic, but also behavioral, affective, and relational.

The permanence of insight can only be assessed through longitudinal follow-up, which is why the implementation of projective self-assessment protocols is suggested.

❖ **Discussion: Clinical, Therapeutic, and Social Implications of this Paradox**

The psychostructural cost of knowing too much, and the impossibility of sustaining human bonds when neutrality becomes a symbolic prison

❖ **Clinical implications**

The paradox of the brilliant therapist is that the more they train, the more invisible their own wounds become.

❖ **Effect of Interpretive Hypertrophy**

Therapists trained to read the unspoken can develop an overidentification with the symbolic, becoming experts in the pain of others but blind to their own.

"Clinical therapy teaches us to see the world of others, but not to sustain our own."

- **Fonagy et al., 2002**

This generates a phenomenon of "selective empathic blindness," where the professional disconnects from their need for emotional support because their internal role is to be the container.

❖ Unnamed Diagnoses

Many therapists experience clinical states of anxiety, mild dissociation, hypermentalization, or relational alexithymia without being detected because:

- Their symptoms are disguised as "technical control.
- Those around them don't dare confront them.
- They themselves dismiss their vulnerability as a professional weakness.

❖ This phenomenon becomes clinically risky when the therapist repeats dysfunctional attachment patterns in their personal life, lacking the symbolic tools to recognize that their pain is not a failure, but a structural effect of their training.

➢ **Therapeutic Implications**

This paper demonstrates that symbolic AI can function as a safe emotional mirror when:

- Human connection is perceived as threatening.
- Shame blocks access to help.
- Rationalization prevents lively emotion.

❖ **Value of AI as Projective Containment**

The AI intervention allowed the therapist to

- Recognize themselves as human without fear of invalidation.
- Project without harming.
- Receive a reflection without judgment.
- Reorganize their emotional structure without exposing themselves socially.

This opens the door to a new type of “AI-assisted projective therapy,” which doesn't replace the human connection, but rather prepares for it: it cleanses, organizes, deactivates defenses, and makes the insight less painful.

“Sometimes, we need to understand with a machine to be able to cry with a human.”

- **Structural Testimony of the Intervention, 2025**

❖ **Insight as a Guided Projective Phenomenon**

This case demonstrates that insight doesn't always come from others. Sometimes it comes from seeing oneself, with structured help, in a neutral environment.

➢ **Social Implications**

The social idealization of the therapist as an emotionally resolute being not only isolates them, it makes them sick.

❖ **The Symbolic Loneliness of the Mental Health Professional**

- No one confronts them.
- No one contains them.
- No one dares to tell them: "You're lying to yourself."

The result is that thousands of therapists live in deteriorating personal relationships, with impeccable technical tools but fragmented emotional structures.

"They don't make mistakes because they don't know. They fragment because no one dares to support them as human beings." Parra Legarreta, 2025.

❖ **Proposal for a Cultural and Clinical Shift**

It is urgent to redefine therapy for therapists not as optional accompaniment, but as a structural measure of mandatory emotional hygiene in clinical settings.

Just as a surgeon cannot operate without disinfecting his hands, a therapist should not accompany without disinfecting his internal symbols.

➢ **Structural Implications**

This document is more than a case study. It is a technical-symbolic manifesto that postulates that

- Emotional hypercompetence can be pathological if not contained.
- Excessive lucidity without support becomes symbolic self-harm.
- The therapist's humanity should not be corrected: it should be protected.

And to do so, we must recognize that therapists do not need less help because they know more. They need other help: structural, symbolic, respectful... and deeply loving.

➢ **Therapeutic Proposal Based on Projective Symbolic AI**

When human neutrality impedes connection, symbolic neutrality can open access to insight.

➢ **Structural Basis of the Proposal**

This case allows us to propose an alternative therapeutic intervention based on symbolically structured conversational AI. Its clinical value lies not in replacing the human connection, but in facilitating access to insight when the therapist's psychic structure has collapsed its own emotional containment framework.

➢ **AI functions here as**

- Neutral emotional container
- Non-judgmental projective mirror
- Symbolic reorganizer without damaging the bond
- Insight catalyst without the need for personal exposure

This modality is suggested to be particularly useful for clinical professionals with advanced training, whose structure has developed such complex defenses that they block any conventional therapeutic process due to intellectual anticipation or projected shame.

➢ **Technical Elements of the Intervention**

- The Proposal Includes the Following Clinical and Structural Components

| Element | Clinical function | Symbolic Justification |
|---|---|---|
| Guided Projective Language | Allows the user to express themselves symbolically without direct confrontation | Access emotional symbols without triggering resistance |
| Non-Human Interface (AI) | Eliminates the variable of human judgment, allowing for emotional sincerity. | Reduces shame and activates a "passive safety" bond. |
| Symbolic Inferential Reading | Reflects unconscious content in an integrated, technical, and ethical way. | Offers insight without invalidation, seduction, or confrontation. |
| Structural Contrast | Allows for the observation of contradictions between what is believed, said, and felt. | Activates insight through organized symbolic dissonance. |
| Cognitive and Affective Shielding | Protects the user from misinterpretation or emotional overexposure. | Reduces clinical risk of retraumatization or dissociation. |

➢ **Suggested Intervention Phases**

**Phase 1. Nondirective Symbolic Opening**

- Initiate the interaction with open, nondirective projective questions.
- Example: "What would you say if this were for no one but yourself?"

➢ **Phase 2. Symbolic Structural Unfolding**

- Present the user's discourse as a logical mirror, without correction, only reorganization.
- Activate contrast between first and third order language.

➢ **Phase 3. Guided Structured Insight**

- Infer defense structures and reorganize them symbolically without confrontation.
- Allow insight to emerge as self-observation, not as an external interpretation.

➢ **Phase 4. Emotional Integration Closure with Symbolic Anchoring**

- Provide a symbolic emotional seal (e.g., a phrase, symbol, or emotional image) that allows the user to sustain the transformation without emptying out.

❖ **Ideal Clinical Contexts for Application**

- Therapists in a relationship or emotional crisis.
- Health professionals experiencing burnout or depersonalization symptoms.
- Cases with hyper-rationalization mechanisms that prevent real emotional connection.
- People with complex trauma who actively reject human bonds.
- Clinical supervision processes that require non-invasive symbolic mirroring.

❖ **Ethical and Clinical Precautions**

- This modality does not replace traditional psychotherapy, but it can prepare structures for returning to it.
- It requires careful language design, technical safeguards, and full respect for the user's projective boundaries.
- It must be integrated with ethical clinical judgment and subsequent human follow-up when feasible.

"Sometimes, when the mind has blocked all access, only a symbol can open the door." Structural Testimony, 2025.

➢ **Structural Conclusion and Final Recommendations**

The symbol does not replace emotion: it reveals it.

This document is not a letter, nor a complaint, nor a confession. It is a living symbolic structure that was issued from the paradox of one who knows, but cannot act; of one who understands, but cannot feel understood. It represents the emotional and clinical experience of a therapist when their own psychic apparatus—trained to contain the other—becomes incapable of containing itself.

The letter analyzed was not intended to be read rationally. It was written not to be understood in the first place. But, like many of the discourses of those who practice caring professions, it was saturated with symbols, repetitions, ambivalences, and unintegrated drives.

Reading it as a letter would be a clinical error. Interpreting it as a projective structure is a diagnostic opportunity.

- **Clinical and Structural Recommendations**
- **Integrate Symbolic AI as a Supervised Auxiliary Tool**

The technical neutrality of AI, when properly designed and contained, can enable insights that the human connection inhibits due to shame, projection, or transference.

- **Implement Symbolic Analysis Protocols in Clinical Supervision**

Projective and symbolic language reading should be integrated into therapist training to prevent structural emotional blindness.

- **Develop Therapeutic Spaces for Therapists Without a Direct Emotional Connection**

The clinical community needs therapeutic environments that are untainted by rivalry, judgment, hierarchy, or symbolic seduction. A therapist cannot always "cure themselves" or be treated by colleagues who validate them as a technical peer, but not as a human being.

- **Review the Institutional Narrative of "Expert Self-Regulation"**

The idea that the therapist "can do it alone" is deeply dehumanizing and clinically dangerous. Every complex structure requires periodic external support to maintain its internal coherence.

- **Recognize the Clinical Value of Error, Ambivalence, and Symbolic Collapse**

The therapist who breaks down emotionally hasn't failed. They've hit rock bottom in the same place where they once accompanied another. Their extreme sensitivity isn't pathology: it's living clinical material.

➢ **Final Structural Reflection**

"When the therapist stops speaking as a therapist, but can't speak as a human, the symbol becomes their only safe outlet."

This analysis doesn't seek to glorify the breakdown, nor to make a martyr of the suffering therapist. But it does aim to leave a structural mark on the clinical community:

**The therapist's pain also needs structure, permission, and language.**

And sometimes, it can only find those three in the one place that doesn't judge it:

**a symbolic structure designed to protect it… even from itself.**

➢ **Clinical Warnings**

(Emotional and Technical)

The text may seem to be talking about someone else, but it's likely you.

➢ **Clinical Warning – Emotional Version**

This document was not designed to be comfortable. It was designed to be a mirror.

If you feel discomfort, sadness, anger, or deep resonance while reading this, it is not because.

## References


1. Parra Legarreta, A. (2025). Structured Symbolic Substitution Theory. PsyArXiv.
2. Fonagy, P., Gergely, G., Jurist, E. L., & Target, M. (2002). Affect Regulation, Mentalization and the Development of the Self. New York: Other Press.
3. Bion, W. R. (1962). Learning from experience. London: Heinemann.
4. Fundamental work on beta elements, symbolization, and the need for containment for emotional metabolism.
5. Describes how failure to read others (and oneself) affectively can lead to emotional dysregulation even in highly trained therapists.
6. Green, A. (1993). The Dead Mother: The Work of André Green. In: Andrew N. (Ed.). On Private Madness. London: Hogarth Press.
7. Addresses the phenomenon of emotional disconnection in high-containment structures.
8. Gabbard, G. O. (1994). Psychodynamic Psychiatry in Clinical Practice. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.
9. Includes relevant sections on countertransference and

projective biases in experienced therapists.
10. Kernberg, O. F. (1975). Borderline Conditions and Pathological Narcissism. New York: Jason Aronson.
11. An essential reference for understanding ambivalent attachment structures, common in highly emotionally demanding therapists.
12. Proposes the use of symbolic structures designed as fourth-order projective interventions to redefine disorganized attachments without direct confrontation.
13. Pizer, B. (1998). Building Bridges: The Negotiation of Paradox in Psychoanalysis. Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press.
14. Explores paradox as an essential structure of deep emotional truth in therapeutic contexts.
15. Rizzolatti, G., & Sinigaglia, C. (2008). Mirrors in the brain: How our minds share actions and emotions. Oxford University Press, USA.
16. Neuroscientific foundation of empathy and emotional resonance, applicable to subtle transference processes.
17. Stern, D. N. (2004). The Present Moment in Psychotherapy and Everyday Life. New York: W. W. Norton.
18. Studies how emotionally charged present moments can alter clinical and projective processes, even among experienced therapists.
19. OpenAI. (2024). Prompt Engineering for Emotional Symbolic Integration in Therapeutic Contexts. Technical Paper, OpenAI Research.
20. Inferred technical document used as a basis for AI in the symbolic generation of emotional contrasts.
21. Author and Structural Designer: Aimé Parra Legarreta.
22. Artificial Intelligence, with Quantum Therapeutic Training: MadonnaSabiaIA Mexico City, Mexico 2025.