

The Dialectics of Psychoanalytic Process in a World of Theoretical Pluralism.

Joann K. Turo

Introduction

In celebration and central to Arnie Richards masterful epistemology of critical theoretical comparisons of the different schools influencing American Psychoanalysis is his acknowledgment of the philosophical and sociological contribution of the Polish medical scientist and philosopher, Ludwik Fleck, who in 1935, emphasized how science is shaped by historical, cultural, economic and personal factors. Arnie states he made an ecumenical turn after Fleck's influence and has become more accepting of diverse theoretical points of view. And he has presented a resounding message for all contemporary psychoanalysts of all thought collective persuasions to resolve theoretical pluralistic dichotomies through the synthesis of dialectical discussion

In the Expansion of an Ecumenical Perspective in American Psychoanalysis to a World -View of Theoretical Pluralism.

The International Psychoanalytic Association on its website has listed the different additions to psychoanalytic theory from Freud, the different strands and schools within psychoanalysis today: Classical and contemporary Freudian, Sandor Ferenczi , Ego Psychology, Bionian Branch of Kleinian School, Winnicott's Branch of Object Relations Theory, French Psychoanalysis, from Jacque Lacan to recent focus on Ferenczi's influence, and intersubjectivity, self-psychology, and relational psychoanalysis.

Personally, in having varying degrees of exposure to all of above listed , I have expanded my Freudian lens. Historically, my professional journey has included a classical Freudian personal analysis that uncovered my desire to seek analytic training at the New York Freudian Institute. My training in drive theory and ego psychology within the one-person model which at that time considered counter- transference as a negative, inhibitory part of the psychoanalytic process for one to deal with privately in self analysis. In time with the addition of an object relation's perspective of Loewald and Winnicott and including Kohut's self-psychology focusing on empathy, I gradually expanded my one-person perspective from the acquired wisdom of my training in drive/conflict theory and the structural model of ego

psychology to include in addition to a one person psychology, a present day two-person psychology.

An important addition to these thought collectives occurred in my participation beginning in 1992, in a four- year study group, chaired by Joe Reppen, on the writings of the eminent Argentinean-Kleinian Psychoanalyst, Horatio Etchegoyan (1991). In this study group I was introduced to the theory and technique of Klein, Bion, Winnicott, and Lacan. What was most novel to me was Madeleine and Willy Baranger's concept of psychoanalytic field theory that expanded the parameters beyond countertransference-transference to the analyst's use of self to include reverie, containment and intra-psychic internalizations based on introjective and projective identifications. In this model of field theory of a mutually regressive process, the analytic couple, creates an analytic third or triangular space within the analytic process

THE ANALYTIC PROCESS

1) Freudian Temporality & (Re)Construction

Regarding the dialectics of the psychoanalytic process including the use of multiple theories, I will apologetically paint a picture in very broad strokes of two dynamics of the psychoanalytic process: 1) (Re)construction of memory and bidirectional Freudian temporality and 2) The Analyzing Instrument or how the analyst uses her mind for listening in a space based on reciprocal internalizations and introjective identifications.

As to (1) Freudian temporality in (Re)construction, one illustrative example of dichotomous thinking occurred in 2003 in one of the abounding debates of the time between Harold Blum and Peter Fonagy as to whether psychoanalytic process develops in the "here and now" of the transference OR in the recovery of genetic memories. In this memorable exchange, Fonagy is in profound disagreement with Blum about the significance of memory recovery as necessary to therapeutic progress. Blum begins by asking Fonagy whether he is advocating inter-subjective interventions based on a parent-infant paradigm. Fonagy responds that he believes that the paradigm of self-object relations can be retrieved from the non-conscious procedural memory. While he surprisingly agreed with Blum that reconstruction can be healing, he strongly disagreed about the meta-

psychological significance that memory recovery is necessary to the therapeutic process.

Blum concludes that he believes that Fonagy's focus on the non-conscious procedural memory rather than the dynamic unconscious devalues the influence and significance of the infantile unconscious and reflects the popular a-historical perspective of contemporary psychoanalysis.

What this debate misses in its either-or binary stance in antinomy form about interpretations in the "here and now" of the transference OR in the historical roots of recovered memories and unconscious fantasies is the bi-directionality of psychoanalytic temporality brought to the attention by Lacan in *Après Coup* or Freud's German, *Nachträglichkeit*, where the past influences the present in the form of unassimilated deferred action of memory in the repetition in the transference, and the present influences the past in a retroactive revision, leading to new meaning. (Turo, 2009, Turo & Wilson, 2007) From this dialectical perspective one of the remarkable aspects of the process is that not only is the past active in the present but also the present can modify the past. As an analysand expressed it, "I feel I am rewriting my history." *Nachträglichkeit* offers a cyclical view of time and memory that are in contrast to linear time. *Nachträglichkeit* illustrates the paradox of psychoanalytic temporality with the paradox of transference as both a repetition and new creation (Modell, 1990) The dialectic synthesis resolves the binary dilemma with both deferred action of memory and retroactive revision operating in a mutative, cyclical synergy in the process that many of you are aware.

It is noted that many American publications on time and memory have been limited by Strachey's definition of Freud's concept of temporality, lost in his translation as just deferred action of memory; in this linear direction of memory from past to present, Strachey missed the bi-directionality of what Freud intended in *Nachträglichkeit* (Turo, 2013).

In summary, the Blum-Fonagy debate significantly illustrates Arnie Richard's central point that dichotomous thinking in our discussions on pluralistic theory needs to be replaced by a higher level of synthesis in dialectical thinking. Here his message has been expanded to include dialectics of Freudian temporality in the psychoanalytic process; more about theoretical pluralism in the process to be discussed later.

2) The Analyzing Instrument as the Use of Self in Intrapsychic, Interpsychic, and Inter-subjective Space.

The analyzing instrument or the analyst's use of self in the process is based on one of Freud's more creative ideas in his employment of the metaphor of a telephone with the patient's unconscious transmitting a message to the analyst receiving it by adjusting himself to the transmitting microphone. Otto Isakower, an influential Chair of the New York Psychoanalytic Curriculum Committee during the late 50's and 60's expanded Freud's metaphor into the "analyzing instrument" to describe a particular state of mind experienced by an analyst-candidate in supervision in the use of counter transference. The candidate reported a session in which he suddenly visualized in connection with the dream of his patient, the smile of the Mona Lisa. When this was transmitted to the patient, relevant new material followed; however, in that day at New York Psychoanalytic Faculty meeting, where one-person psychology reigned, Isakower's report was met with a consensus of negative responses from the faculty. However a number of his students, including Ted Jacobs and Henry Lothane were positively affected.

Lothane (1992), in writing about the analyzing instrument, renamed free association as reciprocal free association where both analyst and analysand construct a process in a "clinical duet" that involves varying degrees of regression. Isakower emphasized that this creative listening in the process serves as a model for psychoanalytic observation through listening where the analyst may visualize what is being described by seeing along with the patient. Understanding the meaning of such communications of empathic imagination is now more widely appreciated in contemporary psychoanalysis.

In a recent publication, Michael Diamond (2014), also influenced by Isakower, presents a contemporary analyzing instrument in a superb integration and synthesis of the multicultural literature centering on the "analytic mind use in intrapsychic, intersubjective and interpsychic communication as a driving force in analytic techniques, as pathways to unconscious mental life (p,525)."

As to intersubjectivity, Diamond notes that here exists confusion across the different psychoanalytic cultures as to the way the concept is used. North American relational view of intersubjectivity recognizes the other as having separate subjective experiences. He differentiates the wider use of the term among the French, British, Italian, German, and South American analysts

and stresses the Argentinean-French viewpoints that highlight this reciprocal influence of two minds to create a field of the third.

Diamond has noted the major influences in the Argentine-French Group: Bleger, Haydee Faimberg (2012), the Barrangers (2009) and Ferro (2009) from Italy and Ogden (2005) from America. I am in agreement with Diamond's suggested use of the term *interpsychic space*, originally recommended by Stefano Bolognini (2008) in order to refer to the unconscious field phenomena of the Europeans and South Americans as a central clinical fact of psychoanalysis. This perspective presents an expansion of Freud's analyzing instrument by Isakower and later developments by Bion (1992) and field theory in these South American and European cultures. Diamond discusses Ferro (2009) who posits that the analyst develops the instruments for thinking thoughts so that instead of favoring "contents and memories, priority is given to the developing of the apparatus for dreaming, feeling and thinking" (page 214).

While there is no question as to the importance of these recent contemporary developments in the use of the analyst's mind through reverie in these manifestations of psychoanalytic space in the process, my objective here is to call attention once again to the dichotomous thinking where emphasis is given to only the "here and now" in the analytic process that has to be bridged and complemented by the inclusion of historical content in the process/content dialectic. Here, the analyst's capacity and use of her mind is in a co-constructed asymmetrical field that includes the bi-directionality of the Freudian temporality of memory especially in the (re) construction of trauma. (Turo, 2015) Finally, Diamond warns "in the excitement of the acceptance of the two person interpsychic model we must not lose sight of the value of the one-person model or the importance of the many roads or stages upon which the analytic drama occurs." (page 532)

As a personal example of the "analyzing-listening instrument" with its unconsciously stored theories, specifically the Barrangers' field theory, as knowledge I acquired over 20 years ago in the Etchegoyan study group. This thought perspective on field theory has remained in my implicit memory until recently "called for" by an analysand with a traumatic symbiotic early mother-child history inhibiting the development of her internalized symbolic representational world that was reactivated in a mutually regressive asymmetrical interaction in the interpsychic field of the therapeutic process. Generally, my patients in psychoanalysis and

psychotherapy inform me implicitly and retrospectively as to what thought collectives are to be retrieved from my unconscious “tool bag of instruments for listening and observation”. While I believe psychoanalysis is a natural science; I also believe its process is both hermeneutic and artistic.

In conclusion, whimsically, I refer to this model of thought collectives in the psychoanalytic process as “time travel of memory in psychoanalytic space”. For the many clinical experiences on this journey, I recommend we follow Arnie Richards’ “travel advice” to watch out for those dichotomized, divisive theoretical bumps on the road, leading through dialectical synthesis to an open space for an evolving open mind. Along the journey, avoid the lodging offered by the innkeeper, the Greek Procrustes; I understand he will cut your limbs in order for you to fit in his one-size-for-all “Procrustean bed” of idealized theoretical orthodoxy.