INTRODUCTION OF THE PANELISTS; OVERVIEW ON HOW THE PANEL WILL PROCEED; OBJECTIVE

_Eva D. Papiasvili_

The panel of the three regional Co-Chairs of the IPA Encyclopedic Dictionary Task Force: Dr. Arne Jemstedt (Europe); Dr. Elias M. da Rocha Barros (Latin America); and Dr. Eva D. Papiasvili (North America, including Japan) will present on the multi-dimensional process of ‘becoming’ and functioning of the Task Force. The objective of the panel presentation is, through information, transparency, and dialogue, to engage the broader psychoanalytic community in this historical undertaking, which bridges our past, our present and our emergent future.

II.

IPA MANDATE FOR THE ENCYCLOPEDIC DICTIONARY

_Stefano Bolognini_

“In the historical decision of the IPA Board, inaugurating the IPA Encyclopedic Dictionary for Psychoanalysis Task Force, the mandate was: “There are many excellent dictionaries of psychoanalysis, but the IPA (and, in our opinion, only the IPA, at this time) has the human resources, the scientific potential and the cultural articulation to create an extraordinarily complete and advanced one that is truly representative of the various theoretical trends and schools in the psychoanalytic world...The goal is to provide all psychoanalysts and all
psychotherapists who work psychoanalytically with a truly international and up-to-date tool for consultation and reference, of superior quality and ‘wide scope’, which represents both the ‘trunk’ and the ‘branches’ of the psychoanalytic tree, as it has grown from Freud to the present time... The final product is not necessarily a work of ‘integration’, but of broad, complex representation. The convergences and differences in the conceptualizations of various schools and areas would be clearly described, in full respect of their cultural-theoretical specificity and their historical and cultural background.”

The philosophy behind this project is to give rise to a joint venture on a peer basis among the regions, with equal attention paid to all the contributions and to all the schools that enable the IPA to offer such a complete, far-reaching representation of psychoanalysis worldwide.

III.
METHODOLOGY

*Presented by Eva D. Papiasvili*

To accomplish this ambitious mandate, to ‘become a task force’ and to capture the concepts which are most representative of today’s psychoanalytic thought and relevant to the clinical work, in all three IPA psychoanalytic cultures, we took several steps:

1. At the initiative of Stefano Bolognini, we instituted ongoing intensive online **communication** between the Co-Chairs and Stefano Bolognini, including periodic GoToMeetings; and an additional 3-day face-to-face meeting in October 2014 in Madrid, where the interim report to the IPA Board was produced. It was within this ongoing consultation among the Co-Chairs and the IPA president, that the initial methodology was designed, evaluated, adjusted and expanded on, as we learned from the process. There were several intra- and inter-regional feedback loops to this process of learning, as will become apparent throughout the panel presentation.
2. Each of the Co-Chairs enlisted 20-25 prominent Consultants within each of the three IPA psychoanalytic cultures, representing the diverse schools of thought and diverse intra-cultural geographies.

3. The methodology consisted of several phases: (Method. 1)

A. The initial phase: IDENTIFYING THE GLOBAL AND REGIONAL CONCEPTS most relevant to today’s psychoanalytic thought and clinical work was based on so-called “5+1”: we asked the Consultants individually two questions: “Which five concepts inform your thinking and clinical work most”, followed by “Which concept originated in your psychoanalytic culture, or has a special resonance with it”. Based on the answers, we identified the 5 general concepts and 1 regionally-specific concept within each region, which occurred most frequently. Then we proceeded to identify the 5 most general concepts occurring most frequently on a global scale. These were: “TRANSFERENCE”, “COUNTERTRANSFERENCE”, “UNCONSCIOUS”, “PROJECTIVE IDENTIFICATION” and “CONTAINMENT”. The most frequently mentioned regional concepts were “TRANSFORMATION” for Latin America, “SETTING” for Europe, and “ENACTMENT” for North America. These were the first to start writing on. It soon became apparent that each region had its own dynamic process surrounding such selections, and its own interaction between the general and regionally-specific conceptual base.

After we agreed on the basic FORMAT OF THE CONCEPT ENTRIES– 1. the length (originally 3 pages, which were quickly expanded); 2. The entry draft outline: concept’s definition, its general history, its evolution and current usage within each continental culture; references, etc., we proceeded to the next phase:

B. INTRA-REGIONAL TEAMS writing CONCEPT DRAFTS (Method. 2)

The answers led to the creation of the 2-5 member concept teams of Consultants, who mentioned the same concept in their original responses to the two questions. Writing the regional concept draft, Consultants had a choice to enlist additional writers/advisers, specialists on the concept, according to the need. This way we proceeded writing on TRANSFERENCE, COUNTERTRANSFERENCE, THE
UNCONSCIOUS, PROJECTIVE IDENTIFICATION AND CONTAINMENT together, while each region also pursued writing their regionally-specific drafts.

C. INTRA-REGIONAL REVIEW PROCESS/CONSOLIDATION

Once the concept teams were finished with the regional draft, the whole pool of Consultants within each region reviewed the draft. The intra-regional review resulted in comments for the concept team to implement. Throughout this process, the emerging importance of such undercurrent factors as “regional identity” and “regional consolidation” within the global conceptual landscape, quickly became apparent.

D. Continuing IDENTIFICATION of NEXT FREQUENTLY OCCURRING CONCEPTS to write  (Method. 3)

Based on the frequency of co-occurrence of answers in at least two continents, the Co-Chairs agreed, in the face-to-face meeting in Madrid, on the next round of concepts. These were CONFLICT, NACHTRÄGLICHKEIT, and OBJECT RELATIONS. Both European and North American Consultants would write original drafts and Latin American Consultants would choose for which concepts they wish to write ‘original’ drafts* and for which they would write ‘response drafts’**.

In addition: an original draft on DRIVES is being written by Consultants in Europe, since the concept was proposed frequently by the Consultants there. It will then be sent to North and Latin America for response drafts; an original draft on SELF is written by North America (likewise frequently occurring in Consultants’ responses there). It is currently in the Regional Review. It will subsequently be sent to Europe and Latin America for response drafts or comments.

A number of regionally-specific concepts, in addition, were spontaneously chosen by each region, as most frequent ones and are being worked on concomitantly. Such regionally-specific drafts may be among the ones mentioned frequently by the regions’ Consultants, (regardless of whether they are thought of in a particular region as regionally-specific or more general), but were not mentioned by other regions. Examples would be concepts mentioned by Latin American
Consultants, such as **MULTIPLE FIELDS THEORY, MADDENING OBJECT**, and others. For North America, these include **INTERSUBJECTIVITY, EGO PSYCHOLOGY** and others, like a Japanese concept **AMAЕ.** At this stage, we also encountered surprises. For instance, it came out that both North and Latin America inadvertently chose **ENACTMENT as a regional concept**, and therefore, both have written original drafts; both have been bi-regionally collated into a bi-regional draft and sent to Europe for the Response draft, to be integrated into the final tri-regional Encyclopedic entry.

Going forward, the idea is to gradually get to all the concepts mentioned in all three continental cultures.

---

**E. INTERREGIONAL TEAMS - FINAL CONCEPT ENTRIES** *(Method. 4)*

When the conceptual drafts from each region are finished, an **interregional team** consisting of one member of each regional team responsible for a particular concept is formed to write the final IPA Encyclopedic Dictionary entry of each concept. At this stage, the team can contact any knowledgeable colleague with a special expertise in the area of a particular concept from any region to assist/advise with the ‘fine-tuning’ of a final concept formulation. Final entries will be approved by the Co-Chairs, Stefano Bolognini, and the Executive Board members, to be published first on the IPA Web site, later in the hard copy.

It was decided during the Madrid Meeting that we will be electronically publishing at once all of the concepts named above – **TRANSFERENCE, COUNTERTRANSFERENCE, THE UNCONSCIOUS, CONTAINMENT, PROJECTIVE IDENTIFICATION, PSYCHOANALYTIC SETTING, UNCONSCIOUS COMMUNICATION, AUTISTIC TRANSFORMATION, ENACTMENT, AMAЕ; then OBJECT RELATIONS, CONFLICT, NACHTRÄGLICHKEIT, DRIVES, SELF, and additional regional concepts** (e.g. **EGO PSYCHOLOGY, INTERSUBJECTIVITY for North America, MULTIPLE FIELDS THEORY, MADDENING OBJECT**, and others for Latin America), which are gradually going through various stages of the process.
The publicity drive reaches beyond the IPA community. It includes the institutes of allied dynamic therapies, postgraduate programs of clinical and academic fields in the humanities, arts and sciences.

The unique features of implementing the methodology within each continental culture from the beginning of the process, throughout, will be addressed in the following presentations of the Co-Chairs:

IV. REPORT ON EUROPE (Method. 5: 5 A)

Arne Jemstedt

When Stefano Bolognini asked me to be the European Co-Chair for the IPA Encyclopedic Dictionary the project seemed very interesting and it was of course an honour to be asked.

Now, there are many excellent dictionaries on psychoanalysis. In Europe and elsewhere, Laplanche & Pontalis’ *The language of psychoanalysis* is a classic. It takes up almost exclusively Freudian concepts. Also coming from Europe, is Alain de Mijolla’s *International Dictionary of Psychoanalysis*, which is as far as I know the only psychoanalytic dictionary available on the internet, and which has a French touch. From the US , there is Salman Ahktar published *Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychoanalysis* in 2009; and most recently, Auchincloss’ and Samberg’s American Psychoanalytic Association’s publication of *Psychoanalytic Terms and Concepts*. There is an Argentinian Psychoanalytic Dictionary and then dictionaries covering special areas: Hinshelwood’s *Dictionary of Kleinian Thought*, Abram’s *The Language of Winnicott* and Lopez-Corvo’s *The Dictionary of the work of Bion*. And there are several others.

Looking from Europe, but also generally: What is unique about the IPA Encyclopedic Dictionary?

Basically four things:
1. It is **international**: the psychoanalytic concepts will be described from the perspectives of all the three regions, Europe, North and Latin America, including intra-regional differences.

2. It is **basic** in the sense that it starts from the grassroots. It does not come from above in the sense that expert analysts are asked to write an entry on this or that concept. The start is that experienced analysts in the three regions are asked what concepts are most important for them clinically and theoretically. The responses are collected and the work starts with the concepts most often mentioned.

3. It is **contemporary**. This is connected with the preceding point 2: the concepts chosen are those that analysts think are most important now in their work.

4. The IPA Encyclopedic Dictionary is **aimed at psychoanalysts, psychoanalytic candidates, psychodynamic psychotherapists, and also towards scholars in the academic and cultural fields** who have an interest in psychoanalysis. As the work moves on, it will gradually be published on the IPA Website.

This is of course a huge project and a long-term project. Mijolla took 10 years to finalize the *International Dictionary of Psychoanalysis* and in a sense his project was less time consuming since in that dictionary each concept is written by one analyst, while in our project there is a cooperation between analysts on each concept and in the finalized entry the drafts from the three regions need to be brought together in an encompassing and intelligent way which also means additional work. It follows that this project will take time and will continue through the shifting future IPA governances.

I will proceed now to describe **how we implemented the general methodology in Europe**: As a European Co-Chair, I engaged 23 Consultants, representing different European countries’ psychoanalytic societies, who were willing and interested to participate in this project. This group may gradually be enlarged.

The 5 most frequent concepts that the 23 Consultants proposed initially as most important to them clinically and theoretically were:

**Transference, Countertransference, the Unconscious, Projective identification Containment/Container-Contained.**
As a concept specific for Europe, our Consultants proposed “The Psychoanalytic Setting”.

Subsequently, Europe participated in proposing and writing the second group of frequent concepts relevant to the work: Object Relations Theories, Conflict and Nachträglichkeit.

Specific for Europe, in this second grouping of concepts, is Drive(s).

I will now focus on the experience from the work of writing the concept drafts in the European group. At the end of spring 2014 I arranged a team of 2-3 Consultants to work with one concept each. The team for each concept consisted of Consultants who had suggested this concept as one of the most important for their psychoanalytic work. Their teams were asked to write a draft on the concept in question, a draft which should include the origin, the development, the current usage of the concept, including regional hues. They were of course free to consult other analysts and existing dictionaries. Originally, the draft was to be around 3 pages and the Consultants were asked to send it to me at the end of October. I would then send the draft to all the other Consultants who were asked to send their comments within three weeks to the authors and to me. The authors would then finalize the draft using the comments from the other Consultants if they had found them useful. Upon finalizing the Europe draft, each team is to select an interregional Consultant who prospectively joins his counterparts from the other two regions, to work out the final entry for the IPA Dictionary.

I will now pick up some different aspects – from a European perspective – of the work so far, both interesting, stimulating and difficult aspects:

- it soon became evident that the limit of 3 pages for each concept was not very wise. So the limit was extended to 5 -7 maybe more pages, and of course main entries like “the Unconscious” and “Transference” need more space than others. Still the ideal is: short without loss of complexity and substance.

- the task for the 2-3 Consultants is to find a way to bring together their knowledge and their different ideas of the concept and to include other ways of thinking. The drafts will of course be coloured by the ideas and style of the contributors, which is good, but it is important that the draft is encompassing and includes theories and
aspects that may not belong to the special interest of the contributors.

Besides the personal differences in style, there are also cultural differences: e.g. the French style and way of writing is different from the English.

- all this of course can be a source of tension in the teams, but on the whole there seems to have been a good working climate. When the first draft has been sent to the other Consultants for comments this has sometimes led to a bit heated but more often very stimulating, creative – and for the team helpful – discussions between the team and the Consultants. The discussions have concerned the structure of the draft (e.g. paragraph headings), the space allotted to different aspects – both historical and current – of the concept in question, the representation of different psychoanalytical schools, specific formulations, etc.

- it should be understood that the goal is not to create a sort of integrated description of the concept in question, but to produce a text where different theories and understandings of it is represented.

- it should also be understood that this project is still in its initial phase, so the work on the “5 +1 concepts” – intra-regional as well as inter-regional – can be seen as a kind of “pilot” work, as we “learn from experience”.

- as I said, the Encyclopedic Dictionary is turned towards psychoanalysts, candidates, psychoanalytically-oriented psychotherapists and towards interested scholars in the academic and cultural fields. This has been an important issue among the Consultants: the level of complexity and sophistication of the drafts. The audience is rather wide which does not make the writing easy and it is a question of balance, but the most important thing is that the complexity and richness of each concept is not lost, both concerning the development of the concept and its current usage.

- At the EPF Conference in Stockholm in the end of March a meeting was arranged for the European Consultants of the EPF Encyclopedic Dictionary together with Stefano Bolognini. 15 of the European Consultants attended. It was a good meeting with constructive discussions and an important opportunity to meet each other “live”. Several of aspects mentioned above were discussed: the length of drafts, the structure, the level of complexity etc. Among other issues the term “Encyclopedic
Dictionary” was brought up and Stefano underlined that “Encyclopedic” is important: it includes the origin and historical development of the concept in question as well as the different understanding of the concept in different schools and regions.

V. REPORT ON LATIN AMERICA  (Method. 5: 5B)

_Elias Mallet da Rocha Barros_

I wish to begin by thanking Stefano Bolognini both for the initiative of proposing the organization of the _IPA Encyclopedic Dictionary of Psychoanalysis_ and for inviting me to be the Latin American Co-Chair.

Working with my colleagues Arne Jemstedt (Europe) and Eva Papiasvili (North America), besides being a very pleasurable experience, has given me the opportunity to compare the different ways in which the different regions work. Even though I am acquainted with the differences in psychoanalytic culture within the different regions, and especially with the differences in approach between Latin America and the rest of the psychoanalytic world, I was still surprised with what I experienced throughout my work alongside the Latin American Consultants.

Before going into details I would like to emphasize some key-features of my way of thinking so as not to leave any ambiguity regarding my approach and perspective. I do this merely to place the comments that I will be making within the parameters of my personal point of view.

In the first place I would like to say that I do not believe that there is such a thing as a _specifically Latin-American psychoanalysis_ that is entirely, clearly and radically distinct in its paradigms from the psychoanalysis which is practiced in other parts of the world. We do practice the same psychoanalysis as in every other place of the world. This does not imply, of course, that we have not contributed with new ideas and with an original style. As I have said, Latin America has produced highly skilled and creative
psychoanalysts who have become well known, not only within Latin America, but also internationally. Latin American psychoanalysis has already amassed a body of work which has reached its international readership through the highly regarded publications in which it circulates: The International Journal of Psychoanalysis, The Psychoanalytic Quarterly, Revue Française de Psychanalyse, Revista Italiana de Psicanalise, among many others.

As I have already briefly mentioned, while working as coordinator for the Encyclopedia I ran into some issues and observed some patterns which sets Latin America apart from the other two regions and I would now like to expand on them in order for us to be able to constructively discuss these different patterns. But let me first state that the proposal for an Encyclopedic Dictionary was met with the same enthusiasm in Latin America as in the other regions (it is crucial to keep this in mind in order to contextualize the differences that I will soon point out).

Let us start with a detailed description of what I have observed:

1. During the first phase of our work, I received from Latin American Consultants **45 suggestions of concepts, highly important for their practice.** Of those, **42 referred to psychoanalytic concepts that originated or had been transformed from its original meaning, in Latin America.** We have here a first instance of a peculiarity of the Latin American psychoanalytic culture.

2. In the subsequent phase, I explicitly asked Latin American Consultants to **choose five GENERAL concepts** and only one concept specific to our region. While in Europe and North America more abstract and general concepts predominated, **in Latin America, we observed the opposite tendency: the predominant interest was to fashion concepts that were native and original to Latin American psychoanalytic culture.**

3. In the third phase, as the Latin American Chair, I worked alongside the Consultants to organize teams to start work on the five selected initial
general entries. These were: (1) Transference, (2) Countertransference, (3) Container/Contained, (4) The Unconscious, (5) Projective Identification. We additionally wrote on The Psychoanalytic setting (together with Europe), and on Enactment (together with North America). Besides that, Latin America voted for the 1 regional concept to be added to the list of five, which was the concept of **Unconscious Logic according to Matte Blanco**. In North America and Europe the concept teams quickly organized themselves and started work. In Latin America this was not the case. We only had volunteers to work on one of the general concepts (container/contained). Yet we did have many people interested in working on concepts specific to Latin America. Some Latin American psychoanalysts individually offered to work on a few general concepts, like Countertransference, Unconscious communication, and others, but this was not a team effort nor did I meet with an enthusiastic interest.

4. Lastly I do need to stress that there continues to be widespread and potentially fertile interest in working at the moment with concepts specific to or originating within Latin American psychoanalytic culture. At the moment between 6 to 8 concepts from the Argentinian Dictionary are in the process of being translated.

Reflecting on the nature of the lukewarm interest within Latin America to work with the more general and abstract concepts and entries, I would like to venture some suggestions of the reasons behind these issues:

A. **In the first place, there was an issue of timing.** While the IPA was starting *The Encyclopedic Dictionary of Psychoanalysis*, other very similar endeavors were already underway in Latin America, requiring **extraordinary effort**: the Argentinian Dictionary, coordinated by Dr.
Claudia Borensztejn of the Argentinian Psychoanalytic Association (APA) and the *Latin American Encyclopedia*, coordinated by Jean Marc Tausik. Following the highest quality result, Dr. Claudia Borensztejn agreed to have many of the entries from the *Argentinian Dictionary* translated into English for the *IPA Encyclopedic Dictionary of Psychoanalysis*. The IPA will finance these translations.

B. There is also an age-old, recurrent and widespread issue within Latin American culture in general: the *relationship of Latin American culture to European and North American culture*. There is a longstanding feeling of “a great divide” and the constant search for identity and authenticity. This is a broad cultural issue, flavor of which is captured in *The Oxford Book of Latin American Essays* (edited by Ilan Stavans, 1997), seeping into psychoanalytic culture as well. There has been, on and off, an ambivalent and paradoxical feeling within the Latin American psychoanalytic community towards the European and North American communities, even though the last three IPA administrations have striven to integrate Latin America more fully with the other regions.

C. Last but not least it is worth pointing out there is a strong tendency among Latin American psychoanalysts to be more focused on clinical concepts rather than on theoretical ones.

The culture-clash and the feeling of “a great divide” on part of Latin American analysts, is a legacy of a possible residual lingering unconscious resentment going back to a time when Latin Americans felt ostracized by the European and North American psychoanalytic communities, resulting in a peculiar attitude: the more general and basic theoretical concepts are *yours*; the new creative ones are *ours*. This attitude unconsciously mandates a need to be original and creative – and to contribute only with something new and “authentically ours”, that is, Latin American. I do feel there is something problematic here. Already 50 years ago, Jorge Luiz Borges, in his essay *El
escritor argentino y la tradición (The Argentinian Writer and Tradition), refused to accept the isolationist attitude of those who wished to break from the European literary tradition and start afresh, da capo one might say. Instead, the author recognized the Argentinian tradition as being part of the whole Western literary tradition: nuestro patrimonio es el universo (“our patrimony is the universe”).

It is crucial to understand this dialectic between Latin America and Europe/North America. Our identity is forged in an uninterrupted influx of ideas borrowed from distant cultures and continents, and it is precisely through this influx that we define our singularities and state our differences. Antônio Candido, Brazil’s preeminent literary critic and cultural historian, addressed the dialectical and paradoxical tension between regional features and universal ones, with regards to Latin American literary tradition. As quoted by Arriguci Jr. (1987), examining the work of Machado de Assis, he notes that he is paradigmatic of “how to make literature universal through the deepening of local traditions”. Our problem in the field of psychoanalysis would be then, if we allow the analogy, how to articulate a way of appropriating ideas from other psychoanalytical cultures specific to each one of our local cultures with the clinical problems that are presented to us in the particular ideological atmosphere of each country. Would not the result of these interactions characterize a particular Latin American approach to choosing themes, structuring arguments and relating ourselves to the conclusions, thus defining our uniqueness in the context of the universal psychoanalytic culture?

These are the issues for us possibly to discuss further. Once again I thank you all.

VI.
REPORT ON NORTH AMERICA (USA, Canada, Japan) (Method. 5: 5C)
Eva D. Papiasvili
An at times uneasy, yet reciprocally enriching dialectic between the unique and the universal representing two traditions of thought, has been present at the inception of psychoanalysis, and throughout its evolution: The founder of psychoanalysis, and many in his original circle were educated in both the Greco-Roman tradition of the universal, abstract, and categorical and general, or at least capable of generalization and categorization on one hand; and the (however liberalized) Hebrew-Thalmudic tradition of focus on the unique phenomena and their open-ended dialogical multi-lens interpretation, which evolves through time and experience, on the other hand. The IPA Encyclopedic Dictionary could be viewed as a particular version of such reciprocally enriching dialectical interaction between the global-universal, and the unique-regionally specific, in our time of psychoanalytic thought and practice.

North America was the latest to join the task force, after the APsaA National meeting in January 2014. Once nominated and approved, I was incredulous over the honor to become the NA Co-Chair, serving along such highly respected and known colleagues as Arne and Elias. As we were becoming a task force, through our mutual deepened understanding, and some inspiring moments of misunderstanding, which were wisely navigated by Stefano Bolognini, who understood that the anxiety under the surface had to do with the initial stage before we started, we were also initiating our teams of Consultants into their roles. I remember writing the letters of invitation and speaking on the phone, stressing the concept of the Encyclopedic Dictionary as the idea of ‘concepts in the cultural context’. The idea of concepts emerging out of people’s thinking and work, and consequently working in teams with colleagues of various psychoanalytic societies and theoretical leanings, was attractive to North American analysts. The current NA climate, especially within APsaA and the U.S., with some of its unique history of restrictive memberships,
hierarchical structures, and proscribed mainstream thought, under reevaluation, was running parallel to our building of teams across the institutional, societal, and hierarchical divide. Here was the opportunity to engage in ‘inclusion on merit’, and to join the team consisting of meritorious members of APsaA, and those of independent IPA institutes and societies, prominent contributors from the Canadian Psychoanalytic Association, with its English and French speaking contingent, young Japanese Psychoanalytic Association, and, in some special cases, additional expert writers, who “came from” the “outside” of the historically pre-designated, guarded mainstream. The “inclusion on merit” has a multidimensional, deep meaning for North American culture in general, and psychoanalytic culture is not an exception. There was an air of excitement connected with being part of building new bridges across the institutional, cultural, and psychoanalytic language divides. Now, there was no ‘mainstream’, or everybody was the mainstream. Diversity built on mutual respect, respect of history as well as of innovation, was palatable. It was not just a word.

On the level of conceptual teams, this translated into team building, par excellence on every level. Personal and professional rivalries had to be put aside, for the benefit of the historical undertaking and conceptual team work. When it became clear that a multitude of perspectives enriches any North American conceptual draft, Consultants would themselves ask if they can involve outside writers, non-members of their institute, from different thinking camps. Drafts of such traditional concepts as TRANSFERENCE and The UNCONSCIOUS, inviting numerous expert writers of orientations not commonly associated with the concepts are just two cases illustrating the point. The more unique and less known perspectives became an asset. There were those who at the beginning were incredulous, remembering past exclusions. Some of them turned into the hardest, most productive and creative team members, contributors, writers, editors and thinkers, on behalf of the conceptual team and the team of the Encyclopedic Dictionary. The team roles were flexibly divided, according to necessity and the most advantageous type of contribution: Different models evolved, including collaborative writing, editing and coordinating.
Throughout the process: Some started enthusiastically, and later on needed to take a break. Some started slowly and picked up speed, as we moved between different concepts. It was not always smooth and predictable. If there was one key point, it was to never stop communicating. We disappointed each other, we got tired, too busy, even ill, or just needed and wanted a vacation. We needed to learn to communicate about all of it. Through ongoing communication came continued commitment. Hardest was to learn to communicate when unable to do something that we said we would do.

Monumental learning is occurring in the area of how the differences and the strangeness, sometimes very frustrating in the process, can lead to enrichment and profound depth of understanding, otherwise not accessible, on all sides. Two examples to illustrate the point: AMAE and ENACTMENT, can be further elaborated on in the ensuing discussion.

As one Consultant extemporaneously remarked in her email: “This is a gratifying example of how the passage-through-the-strangerness-of-the-other can bring new insight to the native concept or text.” (Consultant A.H., on the concept AMAE).

Going back to the beginning of my reflections on the dialectic of the global and regionally specific, in the context of the N.A. team’s work: I would venture that N.A. tends to perceive the interaction as additive: benefiting from the rich traditions of both, and making them its own.

Last but not least, a word about the truly pioneering aspect of the Encyclopedic Dictionary work: its inter-regional phase: I had the privilege and pleasure to coordinate concepts which already went through this stage. One was the CONTAINMENT, whose tri-regional entry has already been finalized. Another one was ENACTMENT, which has been thus far finalized bi-regionally, between the Americas – N.A. and L.A. The experience was incredible - the genuine team culture which developed in both cases, was marked by tact, mutual respect for and appreciation of competence, immersion and deep caring about the work and its every detail, ongoing back and forth sensitive, empathic, yet straightforward ‘meaning business’ type of contact and communication; and on occasions there was
even humor, when in the case of ENACTMENT Consultants called the team co-members by affectionate name a ‘gang’. The Consultants made very good use of clear, unambiguous instruction, where nothing written regionally was to be left out, but with plenty of room for specific ways of how to include everything of substance.

* * *

Once upon a time, there was a president, who had spent a lot of time in Boston. When he spoke to his nation about flying to the Moon, he said (paraphrasing) : “We do not do things because they are easy. We do things because they are hard.”

III. Discussion among present Consultants, Stefano Bolognini, Co-Chairs & audience; Q&A (25 min.).