I'd like to begin by extending a Happy New Year to all. We begin the year on a painful note - the loss of a prominent and much beloved member of our community - Ruth Stein. Emanuel Berman and Rina Lazar - both close friends and colleagues of Ruth's have written a short essay in honor of her. This can be found on page 5. This year also begins with some important changes in the composition of the IARPP Board of Directors. Neil Altman, Jody Davies, and Peggy Crastnopol have rotated off the board, thus opening up three new positions for board members. Neil, Jody and Peggy have all been board members from the inception of IARPP in 2001 and their departure is a substantial loss to the organization. Neil and Jody were co-editors of Psychoanalytic Dialogues for many years, and played important roles in articulating the guiding vision and mission of our organization. Peggy played an invaluable role for us through her representation of IARPP on the west coast of the United States. She also played a central role in setting up and running our extremely popular on-line colloquia. And finally she was beginning to play an active role in forging links to Latin America (something she will continue to do as a member of our International Education Committee). Finally, I would like to express my profound gratitude to Neil, who as secretary of IARPP for a number of years, was always ready to take on critically important organizational tasks, both large and small. Rina Lazar, who was elected to the board last year, has now been elected by the board to take over as secretary, beginning January 2010. I look forward to working closely with Rina.

The IARPP bylaws specify that 50% of the board members are elected by the Board of Directors and that 50% are elected by
the general membership. Since last year the board elected 2 of the 3 vacant board positions, this year the general membership will be electing 2 of the 3 vacant positions. The third vacant position has been filled by Spyros Orfanos, who has been elected by the board to fill the position of President-elect. Spyros will be taking over from me as president in 2011, when my two year term as president comes to an end. We all feel very fortunate to have Spyros assume the position of president-elect. Spyros is Clinic Director, New York University Postdoctoral Program in Psychotherapy and Psychoanalysis. He is a Founding Member of the Board of Directors of the Stephen Mitchell Center for Relational Studies and the Board of Directors of the International Association for Relational Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy (IARPP). He chaired the IARPP inaugural conference “Relational Analysts at Work” in New York City in 2002 and co-chaired the IARPP conference “Metamorphosis” in Athens, Greece in 2007. He is Past President of the Division of Psychoanalysis (39) of the American Psychological Association and Past President of the Academy of Psychoanalysis of the American Board of Professional Psychology. I’m delighted to have an opportunity to work closely with Spyros, and to be able to hand over the presidency to someone so uniquely qualified for the position.

In terms of submissions to the eNews, Jill Bresler (our editor) and I are extremely gratified by the wealth of high quality responses we received to our invitation to contribute short essays and book reviews. In this issue we are publishing two book reviews (one by Sophia Richman on Ecrire La Vie by Helen Epstein and one by Rachael Peltz on Antonio Ferro’s work). We also feel fortunate to be able to publish two excellent short essays on psychoanalysis in Argentina - one by Vanina Waizmann and Andrés Roussos and one by Felipe Muller. These two essays were written in response to the initiative I proposed when I first took over as president of IARPP of “capitalizing on the international nature of IARPP by finding new ways of exploring the relationship between culture, psychoanalysis and its impact on the diverse forms of psychoanalysis that have evolved in different cultures, as well as the impact of diverse cultures on the receptiveness, assimilation and ongoing transformation of relational psychoanalysis.”

In line with this initiative, I would also like to remind people that Rachael Peltz and I are co-chairing a panel on this topic at our San Francisco conference. The panel members are Neil Altman (USA), Chana Ullman (Israel), Gianni Nebbiosi (Italy), Juan Francisco (Chile), and Andrew Samuels (England).

For our next issue of the eNews we would like to invite members to continue to 1) submit articles on the topic of psychoanalysis and culture, and 2) continue to submit short reviews of books by non-American psychoanalysts. continued on Page 11
Psychoanalysis in Argentina I
Felipe Muller, Ph.D.

Argentina, a country of immigrants, is associated with many good and bad things. Psychoanalysis is definitely one of the good ones, but in a curious way. Visitors wonder about what seems to be an excess of its presence in Argentine culture. Roudinesco and Plon establish a relationship between immigration and such a presence (Roudinesco and Plon, 2008, p. 62). For them, psychoanalysis would provide this community, which takes Europe as its mirror, with a practice that would produce knowledge about itself, its roots, and its meaning. This would explain in part its success, unique in the whole world, throughout the urbanized middle class.” But it would not explain in the particularities of the dominant theoretical frameworks.

I’ve been conducting a study about the dominant theoretical frameworks among psychotherapists in Argentina. When active clinicians are asked to indicate what theories guide their clinical practice, 53.1% report using a psychoanalytic framework. The second most important group, with 39.8% of the sample, were the integrationists (psychotherapists who integrate different approaches in their practice), whose vast majority used a psychoanalytic theory as their “base theory”. When we focused on the psychoanalytic group, we have to conclude that the dominant and hegemonic psychoanalytic framework in Argentina is, by far, Freudian-Lacanian: 41.9% reported to be oriented in their clinical practice by a combination of Freud and Lacan’s theories, while 32.6% reported being Freudians, and 15.4% defined themselves as Lacanians. Only 5% reported being Kleinians, Winnicottians, etc.

These numbers do not reflect the situation of more classical institutions, like the Asociación Psicoanalítica Argentina (APA), or Asociación Psicoanalítica de Buenos Aires (APdeBA). But at the same time, the former, the first IPA institution and one of the more pluralist institutes in Argentina at the moment, is dedicating this year’s last issue of its Revista de Psicoanálisis to the presence of “Lacan at the International Psychoanalytic Association”.

Having described the big picture, I would like to address the issue of the conditions for the reception of relational psychoanalysis in Argentina. The first thing to consider is Prejudice. This has at least two sources related to three historical moments. One historical fact is that Freud’s ideas arrived to Argentina through French psychiatrists at the beginning of the last century. Psychoanalysis, in
The Italian psychoanalyst Antonino Ferro offers our community a radical relational model of the mind, as well as a revised position on the goals and methods for the practice of psychoanalysis. Rather than offering a standard review of one of his books, I would like to summarize my understanding of his perspective as seen from a conglomerate of books, articles and presentations. In his writings over several decades Ferro has moved from offering a critique of his early clinical work with children and adults to increasingly developed models of the mind and practice of psychoanalysis that subject the basic principles of psychoanalysis to a systemic re-examination. His model is a synthesis of the ideas of Bion, field theory (taken from the Barrangers in Argentina) and his own narrative approach.

This synthesis offers us a revised perspective of the goals of analysis, an alternative system for assessing areas of difficulty in the “psychic apparatus” (the state of the mind’s capacity to process experience), and a set of principles for how to best approach the analytic process. I think of him as an unusually generous teacher and writer who makes every effort to reach his readers in much the same way as he attempts to reach toward his patients, through the use of metaphor and the fruits of his own imaginative narrative derivatives.

In presentations to the San Francisco psychoanalytic community (2003, 2008) Ferro made his message clear and simple. The goal of analysis involves making the emotional experiences that arise between analyst and patient thinkable. This deceptively simple process is indeed, transformative for both members of the relationship according to Ferro.

His ideas are founded on the belief that “relational truth is the only possible locus of transformation” (2002, p.43), For Ferro, the ultimate goal of
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Like many friends and colleagues in Israel, in the US and around the world, we were shocked and heart-broken by Ruth Stein’s sudden death in NYC on January 17, 2010.

Ruth was born in Linz, Austria on June 3, 1947. Her father, Asher Steinberger, a brilliant rabbi and Talmudic scholar, earlier spent three years in Auschwitz, and lost his first wife and three children during the holocaust. His new family immigrated to Israel when Ruth was four, and she grew up in Israel and later spent four years in Iran, where her father worked as an Israeli representative during the Shah’s period.

At age 19 Ruth married her first husband, Dov Stein, and both of them chose an ultra-orthodox life style. Their three children, Dolly, Bitti and Yoav, were born in the subsequent years. During the late 1960s Ruth completed her undergraduate studies at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, majoring first in French Literature, and later on in Psychology. She pursued her M.A. studies in Clinical Psychology in the early 1970s at the same university, and subsequently completed her internship, and worked in psychiatric hospitals and mental health clinics in Jerusalem, while starting a private practice. Following her first analysis, with Erich Gumbel (one of the pioneers of psychoanalysis in Israel), she divorced in 1980 and adopted a secular life style.

During the 1980s Ruth pursued doctoral studies under Joseph Sandler, the first professor at the Freud Chair of the Hebrew University. Her doctoral dissertation, a critical evaluation of affect theories in psychoanalysis, was submitted in 1988, accepted Suma Com Laude, and formed the basis of her book, “Psychoanalytic Theories of Affect” (Praeger 1991; Karnac, 1999).

During the 1980s Ruth also went through a second analysis (with Rena Hrushovski-Moses) and undertook psychoanalytic training at the Israel Psychoanalytic Institute, graduating in 1992. In 1997 she was elected to be a training analyst, and started teaching at the Institute. Earlier on she joined the faculty of the Tel Aviv University Postgraduate Program in Psychotherapy.

In 2001 Ruth married Gavriel (Ben-Ephraim) Reisner, a lecturer in English Literature, and they moved to NYC, where she became an Associate Professor at the NYU Postdoctoral Program in Psychotherapy and Psychoanalysis and a faculty member of IPTAR, practiced psychoanalysis and psychotherapy, and taught and supervised in several additional programs.

Ruth was a member of the IARPP Advisory Council from its first day, and recently consented to be a candidate to the IARPP Board. She presented her
work in most IARPP conferences, as well as in many IPA congresses, and in numerous psychoanalytic centers all around the world. She was a member of the US Editorial Board of the International Journal of Psychoanalysis, and served as an Associate Editor of Psychoanalytic Dialogues. Her papers were published often in both journals, as well as in Studies in Gender and Sexuality and elsewhere.

Following 9/11 she became deeply invested in the study of fundamentalism, utilizing Mohamed Atta’s letter to explore the motivations of his group. This interest culminated in her recent book, “For Love of the Father: A Psychoanalytic Study of Religious Terrorism” (Stanford University Press, 2010).

A major focus of her writing in recent years has been the study of sexuality, combining relational emphases with French psychoanalytic thought, particularly the work of Laplanche. This was the topic of her paper “The Otherness of Sexuality: Excess”, published in JAPA in 2008, which was awarded the JAPA Prize at the meeting of the American Psychoanalytic Association in January 2010.

Tragically, her untimely death followed this honor very shortly. At the end of one of the sessions of that same meeting she suddenly lost her consciousness, and a massive stroke was diagnosed at the hospital to which she was rushed, leading to her death two days later.

Years ago, when asked by one of us how she experienced potential space, Ruth replied: as the whole universe.

Indeed, her interests and wishes were universal, space was infinite for her. The universe, with its thousands of suns and planets, was a challenge to her thinking, a mystery to be solved, a challenge she was confident she could meet given enough effort and time. Always in a hurry, she believed she could have it all. Alas, although she got to have a lot, having everything proved impossible.

Ruth was a sharp beam of light penetrating outer space, recognizing no limits. But she was willing to slow down for us, on our familiar planet, so we could slowly learn new languages, foreign to us. Her discourse was always both abstract and sensual, experience-near but also remote in its daring innovation, expressed in a memorable, brilliant, unique poetic style.

Would she have lived longer if she were less ambitious, less demanding of herself, less eager to present her thought everywhere, more capable of staying in a more protected potential space, in a quiet, warm room of her own? But then, maybe we would have lost some of her irreplaceable qualities.

Ruth had a way of entering people’s hearts without knowing for sure she did, without being fully cognizant of the intensity of her presence. She was lively, vibrant, warm, charming, good-hearted, funny, passionate in both her loves and resentments.

Anyone exposed – whether as a friend, as a patient, as a supervisee, as a student – to Ruth’s unique personal presence, to her deep thoughtfulness, to her capacity to describe both ambitious ideas and mundane life details with great accuracy and originality, will always remember her and miss her.

Emanuel Berman and Rina Lazar
Tel Aviv
I hope that everyone reading the eNews is looking forward to the opportunities of this new year, and that each of you can reflect with some satisfaction on the year that has just passed. Last year, with the inspiration and help of Jeremy Safran and the technical prowess of Elisa Zazzera, the eNews grew quite a bit. In our last issue, we wrote that this year we wanted to expand the eNews coverage into three areas: reports about psychoanalysis around the world, book reviews, and letters to the editor. Well, two out of three is pretty good. I am still waiting for a letter, but we have accomplished our other objectives.

In this issue, we are pleased to feature two articles about psychoanalysis in Argentina, one by Felipe Muller, the other by Vanina Waizmann and Andres Roussos. I have been to Buenos Aires, and must report that aside from the wonderful food, wine, dance and music, it also has a neighborhood called Villa Freud! Any city with an area named after the father of psychoanalysis must have a thriving psychoanalytic community. In fact, this is true for the whole country of Argentina, as you will read in these two fascinating articles.

We are also very pleased to have a book review of Écrire la Vie, by Helen Epstein. The review of this compelling book, about children of Holocaust survivors and originally published in French, was written by Sophia Richman. And finally, Rachel Peltz has given us a review of some of the central ideas of the Italian psychoanalyst, Antonio Ferro. I was very pleased to have this introduction to an analyst whose work is new to me, but who teaches and lectures around the globe. It was my hope that the book reviews would heighten IARPP members' awareness of notable analysts whose work may not be represented at their training institutes, and I have already benefited from Rachel's article. Ferro's work sounds very worthwhile, and I look forward to reading it.

On another note, it is almost time for our annual meeting, this year in the beautiful city of San Francisco. The program looks fantastic, and I must admit that I am also looking forward to as many great meals as I can possibly fit into what promises to be a very exciting conference. I hope to see many of you there!
Psychoanalysis has a long history in Argentina. As early as the 1920’s, psychiatrists in Argentina were looking for new ideas and became interested in studying Freud’s work. Freud’s ideas spread quickly and steadily in our country, and before long, Argentina became one of the most important psychoanalytic centers of the world. Argentinians, especially those in the big cities, live psychoanalysis as part of their culture.

Part of this impact was a result of the way in which the first Argentinean psychoanalysts transmitted Freudian thought. The psychoanalytic culture in Argentina has always been a media oriented culture, and since the beginnings, psychoanalysis has been in the media for the general public. Rascovsky, as well as other early proponents of psychoanalysis in this country, always intended to extend the psychoanalytic message to the people and their every day needs (he became a public person talking about psychoanalysis and from that perspective on television and radio, and in print media as well). The model rapidly gained a social place due to its penetration in the media and in the Argentinean intellectual environment. Consequently in the twentieth century psychoanalysis became an impact and social modeling factor in Argentina. It became something known, accepted and used by everyone. It is a public good, and therefore, it was easily assimilated in Argentina. Here many psychoanalysts are famous and public persons, an unusual circumstance which reflects the degree of acceptance of psychoanalysis.

To talk about the emergence of psychoanalysis in Argentina is to talk about the emergence of the Argentinean Psychoanalytic Association in 1942, founded by Angel Garma, Celes Cárcamo, Amaledo Rascovsky, Enrique Pichon-Riviè re, Marie Glas de Langer and Guillermo Ferrari Hardoy. Psychoanalysis is even today the principal trend in our country in relation to psychotherapy practice and academic training at both the bachelor’s and post-graduate levels. The State University offers clinical education that is clearly linked to the Freudian-Lacanian psychoanalytic trend. American psychoanalysis was never predominant, Kohut being the strongest referent in that tradition.

Argentina has its own psychoanalytic school, characteristic of South America (we cannot forget also our neighbor country Uruguay, which has also been strongly influenced by psychoanalytic ideas), called the School of El Río de la Plata (named for the river that separates the cities of Buenos Aires (Argentina) and Montevideo (Uruguay). This school has been clearly influenced by the English (originally) and French (in the 60’s) schools.

Theoretical developments in Argentina are important, both in quality and quantity, but the close links to
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In 1977 I came across Helen Epstein’s seminal article “The Heirs of the Holocaust” in the Sunday New York Times Magazine Section. It was the cover story and it shook my world. I had survived The Second World War as a hidden child, but as so many of us who were heirs to the Holocaust, I had not yet faced its long term impact on my life. Helen Epstein’s work, which was based on interviews with sons and daughters of survivors opened up a subject that had been ignored for much too long. Although I myself am not of the second generation, I was so young during the war years that I could identify with the issues of children born to traumatized parents after the war.

Helen herself was one of those children so she knew first hand about the powerful reverberations of the Holocaust on the generations. Before the age of thirty this remarkable young woman called attention to the impact of the Shoah on the second generation and ushered in the concept that ultimately came to be known as “intergenerational transmission of trauma”. But Helen always had vision and a depth of understanding beyond her years. While still a college student she had published her first story in the Jerusalem Post. In the summer of 1968 while visiting Prague, the city of her birth, the 20 year old was suddenly caught in the middle of a hostile takeover of Czechoslovakia by Soviet forces. As destiny would have it, she found herself reliving the experience her parents must have had 28 years earlier when the Nazis had invaded Prague. Helen had the wisdom and the courage to sit down at a typewriter and record what she saw and heard and felt as it was happening. The Jerusalem Post was happy to publish her account of the Soviet invasion and so began her career in journalism.

Ecrire La Vie is a new book featuring four of Helen’s essays translated into French by Cecile Nelson and published by La Cause des Livres in Paris. It spans about 40 years in the writer’s life and includes a copy of the original newspaper article she wrote in 1968 about the Russian invasion and three other essays. In addition, the book features a wonderful introduction by the analyst and memoirist Philippe Grimbert. The essays are a blend of autobiography, history and psychoanalytic explorations.

In these articles Helen traces the development of her interest in literary non-fiction from her journalistic debut to a highly developed passion for memoir. Life stories have always captivated her. They are a window into people’s lives and give her insight into how they handle and make sense of the things that happen to them. Because life stories are woven into the broader cultural and social context, they allow for a more intimate and less abstract knowledge of history.
In addition we would like to invite members to submit short essays on the topic of Psychoanalysis and research. I'd like to place this invitation in a context by saying a few words about the topic. While the influence of the trend towards evidence based practice has had more of an impact on psychoanalysis in some countries than others, I think it is undeniable that it is a widespread trend. In response to the growing pressure to conduct research on psychoanalysis there have been various responses within the psychoanalytic community. One response has been to ignore this development and to continue as usual.

A second has been to attempt to develop more of a research oriented culture within psychoanalysis. For example, The International Psychoanalytic Association now provides funding for conducting empirical research and publishes empirically oriented articles on a semi-regular basis in The International Journal of Psychoanalysis. The American Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association now has a regular research feature in most issues.

In an upcoming issue of The American Psychologist, Jonathan Shedler will be publishing an excellent review of the substantial body of rigorous empirical evidence that has already been published demonstrating that psychoanalytically oriented treatments are as effective as cognitive behavioral treatments for a range of disorders, and that patients receiving psychoanalytically oriented treatments are likely to continue improving after treatment termination. With the permission of the American Psychological Association, this article has already been widely disseminated and is generating a considerable amount of excitement within certain psychoanalytic circles. To view the American Psychological Association’s press release on Shedler’s forthcoming article click this link: http://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/2010/01/psychodynamic-therapy.aspx

A third response has been to critique the evidence based treatment movement. In a article published in the American Psychologist in 2000, Cushman and Gilford, for example, argue that it is critical that we recognize that some of the implicit assumptions underlying the evidenced based treatment paradigm include an emphasis on the value of: speed, concreteness, efficiency, systematization and adaptation. In turn, a number of dimensions are devalued including: ambiguity, complexity, uncertainty, and individual variation in treatment. The therapist is conceptualized as a type of psychotechnician who delivers a standardized technique in a maximally efficient fashion, and this lends itself implicitly to a view of the clients as a passive recipient of this technique who varies in terms of the extent that he or she is compliant with the treatment protocol.

Irwin Hoffman has recently published an important critique of the tendency to privilege the “scientific method” over the traditional case study method. His article: Doublethinking our way to “scientific legitimacy” appears in the October 2009 issue of The Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association. Without going in to the details of his critique of research methodologies such as randomized clinical trials, I would like to emphasize one part of his argument that I think is particularly intriguing. Irwin argues that problem with overemphasizing the importance of demonstrating the “scientific validity” of the psychoanalytic enterprise is that valid critiques of the relevant underlying philosophical and epistemological assumption will become marginalized. He argues that in recent years an entire genre of literature has emerged that engages in a type of Orwellian doublethink in which psychoanalytic researchers conduct controlled psychotherapy research trials, while at the same time relegating critiques of the underlying philosophical and epistemological assumption to the status of caveats.
From Irwin’s perspective, the danger with this approach is that it pays a kind of lip service to serious critiques, while at the same time continuing to privilege a dominant research paradigm that ultimately has pernicious effects on our cultural values. According to him: “If we submit to instrumental, black-and-white thinking, which after all seems to surround us now, in our culture and our time, in an especially pervasive and dangerous way, we lose so much of what human experience can be; we participate, in effect in the desiccation, the destruction of experience rather than in cultivating and celebrating its full potential.”

I am sure that there are many readers among our membership who find themselves resonating with this part of Irwin’s argument. I personally find myself torn between two worlds. On one hand I have been an active psychotherapy researcher since the beginning of my professional career. At the same time, I am well aware of many of the limitations of psychotherapy research, and am sympathetic to the type of arguments that Irwin and Philip Cushman are making.

To repeat then, as a second possible essay topic, we would like to encourage our membership to submit short essays addressing the kinds of issues raised by Jonathan this country, was first read in French. A second historical fact, and related directly with what I want to call the first source of Prejudice, goes back to the times of the Melanie Klein – Anna Freud controversy. In the years when the Asociación Psicoanalítica Argentina was the founder institution in Argentina, Anna Freud’s proposals were circulating in the U.S. through the influence of Harffmann, Lowenstein and Kris, while Melanie Klein’s ideas were doing the same in Buenos Aires. So, the fact that psychoanalysis first arrived in French, as well as the fact that Klein’s theories were widely received as opposed to ego psychology theories, forged a gap between psychoanalysis in Argentina and psychoanalysis in America. Another fact here is that psychoanalysis developed in the U.S. within the medical/psychiatric setting, while in Argentina it grew outside it.

But if the first source of Prejudice was not strong enough, the second one is. The second source has to do with Lacan himself. Lacan’s theories arrived in Buenos Aires at the end of the sixties; generally, it is described as offering an attack on official institutions and a more intellectually refined and rebellious theory, among other things. Lacan developed his theory against an enemy, and his enemy was ego psychology. For Lacan, the ego is a symptom, and the whole idea of making it stronger via the analytic process is, for him, to completely miss Freud’s original contribution. So, in Argentina, almost any American author is probably an ego psychologist, and, therefore, someone to dismiss. Prejudice is maybe the first obstacle that relational authors would have to deal with.

Another difficulty for the reception of relational psychoanalysis comes from some of the productions themselves. For example, all the creativity, sharpness and strength of relational authors like Stephen Mitchell are weakened when polarizations between a classical or traditional and a relational psychoanalysis are formulated. In general, it pictures a Freudian theory that is drastically different from how people read Freud in Argentina. And maybe we have to accept that the picture of the classical perspective is closer to the ego psychology appropriation of Freud than to Freud himself. Polarization, in that sense, might not be a good strategy as is complementation between models.

There are also some further conceptual problems, but of a different kind. Specifically, the use of the word self is another big problem. While it has caught on strongly in the psychoanalytic Anglo-Saxon world, it has not in the psychoanalytic world of Latin America. While it is part of the relational
lexicon, in Argentina it is associated mostly with Kohut’s theory. So it would help to clarify how the word self is used, and most importantly how it relates to other concepts such as ego and subject. Nowadays, everyone is talking about the subject in Argentina, as you would expect when the dominant theory is Lacanian. Clarifying this issue would help to elucidate problems in any possible dialogues.

There are some places that might be more open to the reception of relational ideas: IPA institutes, for example. Owen Renik visited Argentina a couple of years ago, and people in these institutes were looking forward to his visit and what he had to say. The concept of enactment has generated a study group at APA. And the author of this note has been invited at that same institute to talk about intersubjectivity. Private universities are another place to consider (state universities are very Lacan-oriented and the prejudice against anything American is very strong). So, visiting and lecturing at these places, and publishing in psychoanalysis is the creation of thought – the ability to process one’s own emotional experience. This goal emerges out of what Ferro took from Bion’s theory of the mind - how thoughts are formed out of primordial emotional states that ideally, are contained through others’ containing capacities, which eventually enables the internalization of these capacities and expansion of what can be experienced, learned and thought.

Ferro then takes Bion’s model of the mind and applies it to the field of analysis. He has cultivated listening tools for navigating the analytic field by utilizing the rich tapestry of both patients’ and analysts’ narrative derivatives, reveries, somatic and unarticulated nonverbal experiences, and by habitually consulting his analytic “GPS” through the use of the “après coup”, i.e. the emotional quality present in the patient’s response to the analyst’s interventions. Ferro is always taking the temperature of the field via these tools. Ferro’s focus is on developing a shared text, tuning into the patient’s narrations and characters, assessing the mental functioning of the couple; and maintaining a constant supply of listening vertices - i.e. the angles from which to organize what one hears.

In the analysts consulting room, Ferro offers a retrospective on his own analytic development. What emerges out of this critique is a list of what not to do: Do not persecute, intrude or dominate the patient with your thoughts about what is happening. Do not decode patients’ unconscious phantasies; do not rigidly interpret in the transference; do not offer “precooked” interpretations; do not claim authority over what can be known - do not saturate the field with your own ideas. Instead we have Bion’s principles of moving always from experience (O) to knowledge/ theory (K); negative capability – a concept originally found in Keats about the capacity to not know; and the principles of transformation and micro-transformations.

This critique of his earlier work is also meant as a cautionary illustration of how much what we see and hear is filtered through the lenses and earphones of the theories we most prize. Ultimately Ferro is striving to free the analyst from this stricture --- though no such freedom can ever exist. But he warns us over and over to try to become aware of when our theories are functioning to plug our ears rather than opening them to what our patients are trying to tell and show us.

Of course it was in fact a synthesis of a new set of theories, most notably Bion’s, that enabled Ferro to see things in a new way and deliver his critique of previous sessions earlier in
his career.

Ferro's rendering of Bion is nonetheless quite unique, one that supplied him with new soil for planting his own garden of fresh ideas. What are the limitations of thinking in this way? I have found that at times my efforts to be receptive to the patient's narrations and dialects - to remain in "unison" with the patient by "unsaturating" the text, can limit my ability to psychically "see" and "hear" outside of the field of what is going on. A difficult tension exists between empathic listening - a kind of "oneness," and the components of "deep interpretation" which necessitate separation from the field enough to render meaningful the emotional experiences present but perhaps unwelcome by either or both members of the analytic dyad. Ferro refers to this potential obstacle in his discussion of impasses. I'm not sure he has developed his thinking far enough with regard to this tension. I imagine he would respond by describing the need for microtransformations in which change takes place in small ways throughout a session, ultimately enabling the expansion of what can be felt and known together.

Ferro's theory is highly optimistic and forward looking, most akin in attitude to Winnicott's in my estimation. For me, the belief in the transformative potential of one mind in the process of engagement with another, whose primary responsibility is the rendering of the emotional experiences generated between them knowable this is a radical relational theory I want to learn from.
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In terms of theoretical developments, the introduction of relational psychoanalysis in Argentina
would imply integrating pre-existing concepts of local psychoanalysis with relational concepts. Some authors who worked in the 60's and 70's, for instance Willy and Madeleine Baranger (with the concept of field theory), David Liberman and José Bleger, made great contributions to theory and practice, and anticipated relational concepts. Liberman, with communicational theory, thought of a psychoanalysis that could be denominated dialogic. Bleger made a link between social psychology (developed with Pichon Rivière), and an updated version of the English School, where the interaction factor played a key role. We could say that these authors, among others, established the basis for a relational way of thinking in Argentina. Still, Relational Psychoanalysis has not spread in Argentina yet. As it took between 25 to 30 years for French psychoanalysis to become accepted, the relational trend needs time to be part of the psychoanalytic culture in Argentina. There are a few people who know about relational psychoanalysis in our country, and we can count with one hand the number of texts that are translated to Spanish (two of them by Mitchell, if we are not mistaken). This generates a barrier for relational psychoanalysis to be read by psychoanalysts and psychotherapists.

Another thing to mention is that therapists trained in relational psychoanalysis are very few, and, meanwhile, there is no critical mass to allow it to spread widely. Therefore, not only the lack of texts in Spanish, but the lack of spokespersons to spread the model, and generate local material, hinder its acceptance.

Psychoanalysis in Argentina is characterized for being orthodox in theoretical terms, but open and flexible in its action stances. I consider that when relational psychoanalysis arrives in Argentina and when it is spread in different ways, it is very likely that it will come to stay due to its compatible characteristics with the Argentinean culture. The Argentinean culture is open to social bonds and tends to take into account human relationships. Argentinians value the subject-subject interaction more than the subject-object one. This being said, if relational psychoanalysis could be spread, Argentina would easily and strongly assimilate the model and see the interventions of psychoanalysis as relational acts. Seeing the relationship as a source of cure and having a strong understanding of the subject-in-relation, is something absolutely assimilable for the psychoanalytic culture in Argentina.

There is a great deal here that will be of interest to psychoanalysts. In these articles Helen touches on issues of memory, identity, gender, and the creative process. The last article on the construction of narrative in analysis and in memoir may be of special relevance for those whose interest lies in the interface between literature and psychoanalysis. This piece was born out of a presentation that Helen and I did at the First Public Lecture of the Steven Mitchell Center for Relational Studies in 2008. A version of this paper is about to be published in Psychoanalytic Perspectives.

By that point in time, Helen and I had become good friends. We initially met when she contacted me by e-mail after reading my memoir. We connected immediately; I found her to be a kindred soul who shared my passion for autobiographical narrative, my Holocaust history, and my appreciation of psychoanalysis. We also share a conviction about the importance of telling the truth and a powerful drive to expose that which has been hidden. This predilection probably has its roots in the fact that our early years were veiled in secrecy and we were subjected to a parental injunction against breaking the silence which they themselves had embraced. As Grimbert points out in
the Preface to Helen’s book, survivors who lived through the unspeakable walled themselves up in silence and passed this legacy on to their children. He writes “Helen freed the voice of the second generation.” But I know that she did so at great emotional cost. The writing of *Children of the Holocaust*, her first book stirred up an unexpected emotional upheaval within her, and ultimately led her into therapy. In later years, it was once again the writing of a memoir that brought her back into analysis where she could safely explore her past in the presence of another whom she trusted.

Much of Helen’s writing is infused with a psychoanalytic sensibility. She is interested in the role of psychoanalysis in the creative process. She writes candidly and honestly about her personal experience with psychoanalysis describing in detail some of the most powerful moments for her. It is fascinating to read about the process from the perspective of a patient who is also a gifted writer.

Perhaps the American reader who does not read the French language will be disappointed that this marvelous selection of essays is published in French. For those readers, let me reassure you that an American compilation is in the works.
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Shedler’s forthcoming American Psychologist article demonstrating the effectiveness of psychoanalytically oriented treatment, and the type of critique mounted by Cushman & Guilford, and Irwin Hoffman.

To remind people of the guidelines, essays and book reviews should be no longer than 1000 words in length and should be submitted to Jill Bresler at drjbresler@aol.com.

Once again, I wish you all a joyful and peaceful 2010 and look forward to seeing many of you at our conference in San Francisco.

Jeremy Safran
President
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