

## Abend Introduction

Sandy and I met when we were both psychiatric residents at Albert Einstein Medical College in 1960. It was evident to everyone at the time, that Abend was a comer.

In subsequent years, Sandy more than fulfilled his early promise, as a doctor, teacher, editor, author, administrator, raconteur, oenophile, golfer, music maven, and all around good guy.

Sandy has lectured at all over. He chaired COPE. He has headed groups that have helped our analytic teaching programs develop new curricula, democratize our ways of selecting teachers, and respectfully study and sometimes integrate new scientific developments.

He was one of those invited to Moscow to lecture to Russian professionals on the essential principles of psychoanalysis, and to help them set up training programs. His success there led to subsequent trips to Croatia, Japan, and Korea, where he lectured and advised the nascent groups, to help them with their training programs.

For six years he edited of The Psychoanalytic Quarterly for

six years. His helpful and tactful comments to authors encouraged some with newer voices and energies to contribute to the scientific literature. That greatly broadened the content and influence of that Journal. Later, he stepped down graciously, and left a prosperous, functioning operation for the strong, innovating editor, Owen Renick to take over.

He continues to organize publications. Most recently, Sandy conceived, organized and shepherded what became an astonishing Quarterly publication of presentations and discussions of current ideas about therapeutic action. This work is related to tonight's subject, and I enthusiastically recommend it to you all.

Sandy's many published writings have made his, one of the scientifically eminent voices in psychoanalysis.

He has not hesitated to contribute time to administration. Sandy has served as Councilor at Large and as Secretary of the American Psychoanalytic Association, and as President of the New York Psychoanalytic Institute, and in other important committee positions locally, nationally and internationally.

As a doctor, Dr. Abend has evolved into being an analyst's analyst, much in demand as a consultant to colleagues and their families.

All of the above only describes a part of his collection of interests and involvements. He is an excellent poker buddy,

hockey, football and basketball game companion, authority on various sports arcania, and a willing (if sometimes annoying) giver of golfing swing tips. At the University of Louisville Sandy had to give up his hope that being six feet tall and a graduate of Bronx basketball courts might qualify him to be a college star. He did this and he has been, to his relatively less athletic friends, a gratifyingly humbled, but still enthusiastic, jock.

Withal, I could go on with a listing of many more excellent attributes, secure in the feeling that he will never need to buy larger hats, because his head will never swell. That's my final editorial comment.

However, Sandy gave me license to say some of my own thoughts that came as a response to tonight's presentation, and I gratefully am about to take him up on that.

Tonight's presentation describes the history of Freud's ideas about transference, and emphasizes Freud's unchanging conviction that transference analysis is the only vehicle of change in analytic treatment. Abend, poses the unanswered question why, when Freud made many changes in his other psychoanalytic ideas, this was so.

The subject initially seems to be simple and straightforward. Abend's treatment of it includes explicit suggestions about questions he puts off for discussion for another day. One such question is of how best to conceptualize the interrelationships

between reality and fantasy aspects in the analytic relationship. Another is the question how can we better understand the formation and effects of never conscious unconscious fantasies.

The paper also stimulated my thoughts. Sometimes, things not explicitly stated call attention by their absence. I believe that Abend suggests other issues for further study and discussion. I credit him for instigating me to think about some matters which remain to be investigated and seriously considered. These thoughts now follow.

One thing that came up for me was a sense of dissatisfaction about our tendency to contrast insight and support, and I wonder if those terms retain much usefulness.

A second matter that came up for me was connected to our ideas about the part played by the analyst's unconscious fantasies. I want briefly to refer to three of Abend's papers, *Serious Illness in the Analyst: Countertransference Considerations: JAPA 30:365:1982; Countertransference, Empathy and the Analytic Ideal: The Impact of Life Stresses on Analytic Capability; Quarterly LV:363:1986*, or *Countertransference and Psychoanalytic Technique, Quarterly LVIII;374:1989*). Abend carefully reviewed the literature and and by means of telling clinical examples, he convincingly showed his willingness to examine himself in the service of his work, and his desire to accept his own limitations consequent to his own inevitable unconscious

conflicts. Elsewhere, Abend gave us a parallel and classic discussion of patients' fantasies about cure and their effects on analytic the course of the work. I think more could be said about the effects of analysts' fantasies about cure on the work.

I want to discuss the analyst's unobjectionable transference in connection with the therapeutic alliance-transference issue. That is a distinction I do think is useful to make. If experiencing the incompatibility of two contemporaneous perceptions, one more and the other less realistic is an event that makes change possible, then we have reason to distinguish transference and therapeutic alliance. That would mean that transferences concealed in unobjectionable transferences are included in therapeutic alliances.

My next thought was, the analyst has information about the patient's fantasies of cure. He has some information about his own. The patient might stimulate the analyst to arrive at new ideas about the working of his own mind. The analyst has two minds' unconscious workings plus his own abilities to observe those workings. The patient has clues about the analyst's fantasy life but probably not enough to achieve as objective a view of the analyst's psychology as might be desirable, ideally.

My next thought was, here's where self revelation comes in, and there are two kinds. The analyst may or may not explicitly reveal things he thinks he knows, that is one sort of self revelation, and he unwittingly reveals aspects of what he

doesn't know about how he thinks and that is also self revelation. But the patient is left with little capacity to understand what the analyst transmits unconsciously, or what the analyst keeps to himself on a conscious level. The analysand is said to benefit by experiencing contradictions between his fantasy-influenced experience of the analyst and his more objective evaluation, but much about the analyst cannot become available for that more objective evaluation.

Perhaps when we discuss the differences between the analyst's situation and the analysand's, among ourselves or with our patients, we should also think about ways to bring in the aspects of differences between the situation of analyst and patient that I have outlined.

With regard to answering the question, why did Freud adhere to the idea that transference analysis is the only way to promote change, one might think that a better understanding of Freud's fantasy life might be useful. But Freud was very careful, even secretive about what he revealed about his inner life.

We know from the Fliess letters that Freud dropped the seduction theory when his self analysis led him to realize that his Oedipal rivalry with his father had fueled the construction of that theory, but Freud never intended those letters to be published. Freud did not approve of self revelation. Since our theories are influenced as all our ideas are, by unconscious fantasy, what unconscious fantasies codetermine Freud's and

our ideas about confidentiality and self revelation? Would it be useful to know more about the deep factors that influenced Freud's theory formation and are we in a situation of uncertainty analogous to the patient's situation with respect to us?

Abend mentions ego strength and ego change through analysis. Insofar as we use the term ego to represent the interface between the bodily physiology and the outside in which we are embedded, wouldn't it be wise to try become a bit more specific about what constitutes ego strength and ego change? Then we might be able to take variances in talents and deficits into account. I think we might benefit by paying more attention, to what is happening in academic psychology, philosophy, linguistics and neuroscience that might bear on the issue of inherent capacities?

Mel Brooks as the two thousand year old man had a business of manufacturing stars of David. Six men, each holding a point, rushed to meet in the center of a room. The heat of the collision fused the points. Sometimes the points impaled the workmen. He was brought a new item to consider and turned it down. It was a cross, "I could have laid off two men but I thought, too simple. I didn't realize then that it was eloquent." Abend's contribution may sound simple. It's deep and eloquent, and it certainly rewarded me in reading it. I thank him for that, and for his confidence that I would do him justice.