

IRED PANEL @ LISBON CONGRESS

Thursday July 31, 2025

16:15-17:45

CHAIR WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION:

Welcome to the panel

“Inter-Regional Encyclopedic Dictionary (IRED):

Drives, Unconscious, and Enactment: Transforming Chaos into Creativity”

https://www.ipa.world/IPA/Dev/About_Psychoanalysis/IRED/English/Home.aspx

Unique features of IRED which catalyze creativity rest on a radical vision of a full representation of a pluralistic conceptual landscape in complex evolution. In representing regional and theoretical diversity, including areas of ambiguity, uncertainty, contradictions, and controversies, IRED is consistent with William James’s vision of the evolving pluralistic universe, and with contemporary epistemologies that emphasize *interactivity, incompleteness, unpredictability, and heterogenous routes of evolution*. Here, knowledge is a never-complete evolving process: we interact with the object of our inquiry and are changed by it—all within specific historical-cultural and clinical conditions. With enough complexity, new unpredictable developments emerge, holding in tension one *and* many psychoanalyses, one *and* many perspectives, where the center *and* the margins, the general *and* specific mutually constitute each other.

Tables 1a, 1b - Concepts

Diagram – Process

The unique features of IRED that catalyze creativity could be summed up as working with ‘Evolving Plurality’, ‘Complexity’ and ‘Otherness’.

It is through the ‘*culture of IRED*’, through the inter-active and inter-perspectival, regional and inter-regional *translation of meaning*, that *translational bridges* can be built that ultimately transform the ‘*alien other*’ into the ‘*familiar other*’. *Translational bridges provide a liminal space* where various perspectives, cultures and languages can meet in a translational-interpretive territory that belongs to all of them and to none of them exclusively. In this liminal space we learn about the other from inside and about ourselves through the eyes of the other. Encountering and translating *otherness* thus becomes the chief motor force of creativity both in IRED work and in concept evolution, their migration and mutation.

In Migration-Mutation of concepts, encounters with ‘otherness’ create emergent hypercomplex patterns:

First – when psychoanalytic concepts are migrating from historical psychoanalytic centers towards the periphery – encountering ‘other’ cultures, histories of thought and languages, “...new phenomena occur, and more so when crossing the oceans. There, the fortunate expansion of psychoanalysis intertwines with a variety of factors...” (*‘Intersubjectivity’*; Latin America section).

The amount of regionally specific conceptualizations coming out of both North and Latin America echoes the hypercomplexity of the novel peripheral ‘branching’ occurring when heterogeneous trajectories head for ‘previously empty spaces’ (Da Cunha and da Fontura Costa 2021).

Second, hypercomplexity of liminal territories - areas of confluence of several psychoanalytic traditions, cultures and/or languages, where the number of interactions exceeds a certain threshold, new developments, terminologies and a re-drawing of boundaries may occur. Examples from ‘*Unconscious*’, ‘*Intersubjectivity*’ and ‘*Object Relations Theories*’ illustrate how Francophone analysts of the Montreal region at the cross-roads of influences between French tradition, British Object Relations and Ego Psychology included Ego Psychologist Hans Loewald in the predominantly French ‘Third Topography’, traditionally viewed as incompatible with Ego

Psychology. ('Third Topography' was the new English translation term for 'Le Troisième Topique', in tri-regional dialogue with Christian Seulin from Paris, one of the proverbial 'centers').

(THE) UNCONSCIOUS

Eva D. Papiasvili

The notion of the unconscious with its implication of a de-centered theory of subjectivity has been universally accepted as the foundational discovery of psychoanalysis and a core assumption of psychoanalytic theory since its very beginning.

Psychoanalysts are not alone in their subjugation to the "stranger within", but they are unique in making the epistemological, clinical, and ethical implications of this disruptive, yet potentially transformative, presence the daily object of study.

The following excerpt identifies relative *periphery* of Freud's theorizing, at the roots of one of the areas of intense *central contemporary interest* across regions – the non-repressed, non-symbolized (pre-symbolized, pre-psychic) unconscious, relevant to the regressive breakdown of symbolization in the context of 'group psychology':

"Historically, in 1890's, Freud had introduced a type of defense that had more radical regressive pathogenic implications than the repression seen in neurotic patients. This intuition was made more explicit in Freud's (1911) study of the Schreber case with the introduction of the mechanism of "*repudiation*" or "*rejection*" by the ego (*Verwerfung*), a drastic process called later "*foreclosure*" by Lacan. This non-neurotic mechanism of defense was taken up again in the Wolf-Man (1918) and posited as a process of *erasure or deletion* of the mind's ability to represent - a *representational abolishment* causing a hole or emptiness in the mind. This line of thinking was supplemented when Freud in 1920s introduced the mechanism of negation

[*Verneinung*] and the splitting of the ego [*Ich Spaltung*], a concept he would take up again in “Splitting of the Ego in the Process of Defense” (1940 [1938]). However, it has been mainly post-Freudian writers who have teased out the principle of the ‘negative’ as a basic assumption throughout Freud’s writings... Bion, Lacan, Green and others recognized that the unconscious is not only a hidden presence/striving for representation but is equally constituted by powerful forms of absence, ascriptions both protective and destructive.”

Plethora of various contemporary conceptualizations of pre-symbolized or traumatically de-symbolized unconscious, prior to repression and prior to internal structuralization and representation, *at the root of* bio-psychological thrust of the drives and affects related to Matte Blanco’s indivisible mode of the Unconscious Logic, Bion’s pre-psychic, unmetabolized beta-elements, registered at a somatic or neurobiological level, or Dejours’ ‘*amental*’ (*thoughtless*) *unconscious*, Fernando’s traumatically frozen *unconscious of the Zero Process*, of all of which lack the associative and elaborative generativity of the repressed unconscious.

Repressed unconscious, on the other hand, a fluctuating achievement of an internally conflicted subject, can become a sophisticated generator of symbolic codes and messages, a potential resource of growth, recovery and creative outcomes.

Group Unconscious

This interdisciplinary section addresses and documents “the inexhaustible destructive and creative potential of the group’s irrational and regressive, yet enlivening and regenerating processes and contents”, based on a bifurcation between repressed and non-repressed unconscious.

“Historically, unconscious processes and contents underlying group behaviors, culture and society, have been addressed by Freud throughout the development of psychoanalytic theory in more than 20 writings, most notable of which are *Totem and Taboo* (1912-13), depicting a manifestation on a group and social level of the Oedipus Complex; *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* (1921), with the focus on *group regression* and primitive projective and identificatory processes, i.e. *projection onto the leader* of the group members’ (super)ego ideal, freeing them from moral constraints in the expression of their instinctual urges, and *mutual identificatory processes* among the members and the leader, *libidinal ties* between them fostering

a sense of belonging and heightened sense of strength; and *Civilization and its Discontents* (1930), with the group membership unleashing formerly *unconscious aggressive-sadistic-destructive impulses against the 'other' groups...*” Throughout history, according to this view, “various compromises have been responsible for the highest order sublimatory outcomes as well as the malignant destructive outcomes, i.e. slavery, violent genocides, wars, abuses and victimizations, throughout history”.

Although already before Freud, Le Bon wrote of individual and cultural regression, speaking of a “cultivated individual” becoming a “barbarian” acting on their instincts in a group, it was Freud who was the first to address the group unconscious from a distinctly dynamic perspective. He not only observed that the **regression** of the individual in the group is universal and elaborated on the dynamic processes pertaining to group identification, but also boldly asserted that both the individual and the group retain the past in their unconscious memory traces.

If, as Freud pointed out in his “Interpretation of dreams” (1900) and in “Civilization and its discontents” (1930), people do in dreams what they wish to do, what prehistoric people did, so, when they become part of a crowd, they do it. And where the first civilized man hurled obscenities rather than throwing a stone at another, the “civilized” man, becoming a “barbarian” when part of such a crowd, does throw the stone. (Breakdown of symbolization.)

The basic thesis, that the unconscious potential for primitive aggression available in different degrees in every individual may be activated rapidly in regressive group processes inspired a flourish of post-Freudian and contemporary studies. Bion, Anzieu, Kaes and others theorized group activated *primal fantasies* reflective of psychotic level personality and *primitive projective-introjective-identificatory processes* specific to groups. Kernberg, Volkan, Herron, Blum, Papiasvili and others investigated how throughout history, group activated aggression, in turn, may be amplified by the combination of the collective internalization of historical trauma and an acute social crisis that disrupts ordinary social structures. Under such conditions, the paranoid polarity of a dominant ideology can emerge and fall on fertile ground.

Historical trauma binds together the members of a social group, race, religion, or nation, and predisposes them to a rapid regression into a paranoid ideology, paranoid mass movement,

fanaticism, ostracizing, and violent attacks upon another political, national, or racial subgroup. “Other groups” become marginalized, objects of early splitting, narcissistic and paranoid regression, and defenses against them. The lack of a mourning process was identified as one of the etiological factors.

This has been true throughout the recorded history and is true today. In the detailed dynamic psycho-historical account of the multiple traumas of the Middle Ages, we (Papiasvili and Mayers 2013, 2014, 2016) found multiple forms of regressive identificatory processes, paranoia, and aggressive enactments against others and self.

Another type of regression, when symbolization does not break down, was what we termed ‘*transcendental configuration*’ to designate the creative splitting/division whereby ego privileges the primary process to survive/to transcend the unfathomable traumatic reality. In “*Transcendental Configuration*”, the *access to, and transformation of the infantile-irrational-magical provides a needed resource for overcoming traumas* of epic proportions throughout the Middle Ages, leaving legacies of uncommon achievements and discoveries in virtually every area of human activities – politics, law, sciences, art, technology.

A more recent example of creative elaboration, reorganization, transformation and creative mastery of group trauma on the record was in the aftermath of chaos and destruction of the WWII, when a new psychoanalytic modality arose, first conducted with the WW II veterans: The group analytic therapies, where deeply unconscious *basic assumptions* and *multiple regressive transferences* of both projection and displacement types onto the therapist as well as onto the group and the group members are *quickly activated, are readily visible* and therefore dynamically understandable and interpretable (Slavson, Foulkes, Bion, Wolf, Lebovici and Diatkin).

An example of evolving plurality, temporal-spacial complexity, the UNCONSCIOUS entry becomes its own liminal territory, where the undertheorized, relatively peripheral idea of Freud’s conceptual thought grows into one of the central areas of interest of contemporary psychoanalysis. Various perspectives on group unconscious and the group-specific dynamic of regression leading to an activation of primitive ego operations, unleashing destructive aggression as well as creative mobilization are radically relevant to our times.

References on file

DRIVE(S)

Joseph Fernando

While every concept in psychoanalysis can be theoretically or terminologically controversial, – a good example being transference – the concept of drives is uniquely so. In Freud’s original conceptualizations, the sexual drive was the original reservoir of creativity. His later addition of an aggressive drive added ideas about chaos and destruction. Freud’s ongoing revisions and reworking of his drive theory no doubt encouraged creative reworkings by others. Different theoretical trends in psychoanalysis varied in their responses to Freud’s conceptualizations, some rejecting the idea of drives altogether, some making it a cornerstone of their theory, and others, in between, reinterpreting the concept of drives.

The IRED methodology involves being inclusive of major contributors and trends, of minor ones, and of those that may be seen as peripheral. We trace influences of authors on each other, and the evolution of concepts. We summarize trends from each region, highlighting convergences, divergences, and ongoing controversies. However, we do not attempt to synthesize these trends into a final conclusionary statement. Our method is descriptive of concepts and conceptual influence and evolution as they actually were and are, not prescriptive of how they should be, what is the best, or how they should be used. In this, the method is analogous to the psychoanalytic method at its best, which listens with evenly hovering attention to whatever comes up and lets the material speak for itself, rather than trying to speak for it. This leads to a certain chaos of various ideas, some related to each other, some outside of the main discourse. We have seen repeatedly how through this method, creativity emerges from the chaos of varying viewpoints.

In the period around the Second World War, many of the leaders of psychoanalysis migrated from Europe to North and Latin America. Aspects of this migration have been discussed in the

literature, for instance the fact that many of these North American émigré analysts avoided discussion of the traumatic and social aspects of their experience and may have avoided analyzing these things in their patients to the extent they under other circumstances would have. The situation was complex: In the North, Hartmann, Kris, and Loewenstein revised ego psychology along the lines of “economic theory,” looking at the energetic aspects of drives such as neutralization of aggression to form defenses, while at the same time enlarging concepts about object relations. Edith Jacobson conceptualized in the same vein but developed object relations theory further. In the 1960s and 70’s, Peter Blos contributed influential studies of adolescence. Contemporaneously, Margaret Mahler et al. added her observational studies of the separation-individuation process, also using ideas of drive neutralization and regression, and Erik Erikson focused on identity and the life cycle as well as the interactions of these developments in the individual with the societal forces. Meanwhile, in Latin America, a notable émigré from Spain, Angel Garma, the first President of the Argentinian Psychoanalytic Association, postulates that the internalization of external aggressive circumstances, infantile and present, instigates individuals into self-destruction and death. This is what Garma calls the death drive represented by the superego. For Garma, making the innate self-destructiveness conscious makes it possible to handle it in a better manner, binding it to a tendency towards life and orienting it towards sublimatory aims. This initiated further interest of Latin American analysts in the death drive.

These are only some of a large group of European migrants. Naziism fascism, and the traumatic events of WWII had a huge influence on the course of psychoanalytic theoretical development, as these migrants entered a different culture, including psychoanalytic culture, which they influenced and which influenced them. The chaos of the war led, in unpredictable ways, to a burst of creativity. (I have not even mentioned such major émigré contributors to other concepts such as Otto Fenichel, Franz Alexander, Heinz Kohut, Hans Loewald, and Heinrich Racker.)

At the regional phase of the North American draft on drives, I wrote a section on the ego psychologists, and many other contributors wrote on other theorists. It is interesting to see how the early ego psychologists were first attacked in North America for what was seen as their reduction of human relations to drives and their vicissitudes such as neutralization, while in Europe, for instance by Lacan and others, they were attacked for almost the opposite – for

stressing adaptation and superficial (ego) aspects of the personality. Social movements and the movements of people across the globe do not by themselves create conceptual changes or innovations, nor can they adjudicate which theory is a better fit for the phenomena, but as an entry such as that on drives is put together through the work of the IRED methodology, the movements within each area can be followed in detail as they reflect and respond to social influences. We can see in the drive entry the reflection of a much more diverse and at times chaotic social situation over the last 50 years, in the emergence of a much more diverse set of drive theories, and theories that either rejected the idea of drives altogether, or saw them not as fundamental but as derivatives of other things, such as affects or interpersonal issues.

In the next step of the IRED methodology, we put together the drafts from three regions: North America, Latin America, and Europe. I was one of four analysts who worked on this multi-regional phase of the drive entry. In this phase as well, the method is not to condense or leave out anything from the 3 regional drafts, nor to adjudicate which set of theories is better, but to make sure all relevant ideas are described. At this stage we could see the way in which drive theories in Europe and Latin America had started from the early and late work of Freud, and in the case of Latin America especially, of Melanie Klein, and gone in many directions, some quite distinct from those of the classical ego psychologists who settled in North America. In reading the section of the entry related to Latin American contributors, one is struck by the diversity of ways in which authors developed creative approaches and conceptualizations of the drives, many of them, following in Garma's footsteps, finding the deepest insights into drives in dialogue with Freud's idea of the death drive. Summarizing Latin American contemporary theorizing, Serapio Marcano state that the concept of the death drive forces revision of the role played by aggression in human bonds from the beginning and throughout life.

There were other interesting bifurcations and differences that became apparent at this inter-regional phase of our work. For instance the North American draft had entries related to French North American perspectives, mainly from French Canadian analysts from Quebec such as Dominique Scarfone, who had developed their own ideas related to the drives, some based on European French analysts such as Laplanche, but then having their own view on these authors, and developing them in ways sometimes quite different from their European counterparts. In Europe meanwhile, controversies surrounding the drive concept and drive theory have been an

important “driving” force of post-Freudian conceptual developments, as drive has been part of many central debates and controversies. It was precisely on the grounds of such controversies that British Object Relations Theories were born. Another émigré analyst – Anna Freud – prominently participated in the generative controversial discussions at the British Psychoanalytic Society.

In our IRED entry we could trace how over a century of work on these ideas and clinical realities, had led not only to a chaos of theories, but to a flowering of creative theoretical innovations and mutual influences. As analysts we work best when we ride at the edge of darkness, where both chaos and creativity reign. Our IRED entry on the drives attempts to capture this edge.

ENACTMENT

Antonio Pérez-Sánchez

I. Introduction

Not only do authors’ theoretical backgrounds shape how terms are defined in psychoanalytic dictionaries, but so do their histories and geographical contexts. With few contributors and widely differing viewpoints, definitions often reflect partial or biased perspectives. Even international dictionaries typically rely on a single expert for each entry.

The Inter-Regional Encyclopaedic Dictionary (IRED) addresses this through a collaborative methodology. While bias cannot be entirely eliminated, IRED reduces it in two key ways:

First, each entry is independently drafted by teams from Europe, North America, and Latin America. These versions are then reviewed by over fifty regional contributors before being merged by an interregional team.

Second, IRED requires the inclusion of all relevant theoretical perspectives. Rather than merely contrasting views, it fosters a shared articulation—one that reveals real points of agreement while preserving differences. In Bionian terms, this functions as containment: diverse viewpoints gain coherence without being flattened.

IREED's richness lies in its emphasis on contrast. Instead of offering final answers, it invites critical engagement and interpretation.

To illustrate this approach, I will explore the entry on *Enactment*, not as a contributor but as a critical reader.

II. Convergence and divergence areas.

There are several areas of consensus across psychoanalytic traditions regarding the concept of *enactment*. One such point is the distinction between ***enactment* and *acting out***. While acting out is often used in a pejorative or moralising sense, enactment has come to signify a relational dynamic that implicates both the analyst and the patient. It is generally understood as a mutually influenced dynamic, emerging from unconscious processes.

Another point of agreement is the central role of **countertransference**. The analyst's enactment is often viewed as a form of countertransference in action. Significant examples include Racker's concept of complementary countertransference, the North American relational approach, and Steiner's distinctions between countertransference and *enactment* in European tradition

Enactments—though initially disruptive—can become transformative when recognised and interpreted. Cassorla's notion of the "M moment," trauma-focused work in North American, and the European attention to the containing function of interpretation all support the view of enactment as potentially therapeutic. There is also broad agreement that the analyst must engage in reflective work following an enactment to render it clinically meaningful.

Nonetheless, important **divergences** exist depending on theoretical orientation. Differences appear even at the level of terminology. In the French tradition, expressions such as *mise en scène* and *enaction*.—often linked to Freud's notion of *Agieren*—are preferred. North American analysts, particularly relational approach, emphasise the connection between enactment and dissociation, trauma, and early developmental processes. In Latin America, field theory predominates, focus on symbolisation and shared psychic spaces.

The **analyst's degree of involvement** is also interpreted differently. Latin American thought highlights how the analyst might lose their analytic stance. In European perspectives, such moments are seen as temporary failures in the analyst's containing function. In contrast, North American relational theorists often consider enactment necessary, arising from the analyst's subjectivity and mutual influence.

Symbolisation plays a crucial role in Latin American theory, where the transition from chronic to acute enactment is often seen as a moment of symbolic breakthrough. For North Americans, enactments are associated with unmentalised traumatic experiences and provide an opportunity to process these in a new way.

Clinically, each tradition emphasises different aspects. North Americans focus on early developmental trauma and transgenerational transmission. Latin Americans offer clinical typologies distinguishing between acute and chronic enactments, employing metaphors such as “dreaming for two” or “not dreaming for two.” Europeans, meanwhile, underscore the contrast between interpretations that contain and those that merely repeat—or collude with—the patient’s enactment.

III. Towards an internal dialogue

From this rich tapestry of perspectives about enactment, a **shared** recognition emerges: enactment is an **inevitable** aspect of psychoanalytic practice. The real **divergences** lie in how it is interpreted and the analyst’s stand toward it.

Broadly speaking, two main positions can be distinguished. One, the *active posture*, seeks to anticipate and prevent enactments. When this occurs, the analyst strives to understand what elements of the patient’s internal world have been expressed through his enactment. The *second position* is more accepting—some might say celebratory—viewing enactment as *necessary* mode of communication in analysis.

These views are rooted in differing conceptions of the analytic setting. If we see it as a space where the analyst contains and metabolises the patient’s unconscious projections, then analyst’s enactment may be felt like a rupture—a failure in that containing function. As Money-Kyrle noted, no analyst can maintain perfect containment at all times. Breakdowns are inevitable; the task then becomes identifying and interpreting the patient’s projections that overwhelmed the analytic frame.

Still, despite the IRED’s pluralistic methodology, no entry can fully escape the theoretical leanings of its contributors, and some imbalance is inevitable. For instance, the IRED’s conclusion on *Enactment* states that “the analytic dyad becomes destabilised”—a phrase rooted in *field theory*, which frames enactment as a co-created dynamic. In contrast, internal object relations theory might

interpret enactment, as I have said, as stemming from the analyst's failure on the part of the analyst in his containing function, rather than from mutual construction.

While both perspectives agree on the need for interpretation, they differ in emphasis. *Field theory* sees enactment as inherently relational and co-constructed. Object relations theory allows for it to be triggered unilaterally, even though it unfolds within the relationship; so the responsibility belongs to the patient, for communicating in this way, or to the analyst, for failing to manage and contain the projection adequately; or both, when there is a collusion.

What does this mean for me as a reader? I feel closer to the European mainstream, which sees the analytic relationship as an interaction, rather than a full co-creation. Still, the idea of co-creation makes me reflect on interaction as something we —patient and analyst— *do* together: sometimes aligned in the analytic task, other times not, especially when the patient's psychotic or omnipotent infantile part is against analysis.

Another difference appears in the French perspective, where the analyst's enactment itself is viewed as potentially therapeutic (*enaction, mis en scene, L'expérience agie partagée* -'shared acted experience-) or even '*sensory empathy*') is seen as therapeutic. Although I do not fully share this, it makes me reflect on the role of '*action*' in analytic communication. For instance, when I decide to interpret, I may not initially be clear on what I want to say; I follow an intuition. But, in speaking, I hear myself, and this *action* often clarifies my thoughts more precisely than the initial formulated did.

Final Remarks

The true challenge of the IRED lies in maintaining a delicate balance between openness and coherence. The richness of the entries comes from the creative tension between converging and diverging viewpoints. But this also brings the risk of **confusion**, if too many perspectives are presented without structure; of **false synthesis**, if real differences are papered over; or of **neutral detachment**, where no meaningful dialogue takes place between theories.

To avoid these pitfalls, each entry must walk a fine line. It must allow for multiplicity without fragmentation, for synthesis without dilution. Ultimately, the value of the IRED lies not in offering final answers but in opening a space where thought can unfold. The reader is not just a passive recipient, but a participant in the process of meaning-making. And it is precisely this invitation to

creative engagement that transforms theoretical chaos into a new kind of order: dynamic, living, and responsive to the complexity of psychoanalytic thought.

CONTAINMENT & TRANSFORMATION

Vera Regina Fonseca

The Beginning of My Story With IRED

In 2009, during the second term of my analysis, I lost my analyst of many years. Some months later, likely to digest my bereavement, I began to write a paper about my experience with him. The point I wanted to explore was what had happened along the analytic process that had so deeply changed me.

My analyst followed a quite different theoretical orientation from my own, so writing the text was a kind of reverse working party, completed with the reading of my analyst's articles for the first time. I could find out many things about Bion's presence in Brazil and in Latin America in general, as well as about the delicate weaving of his theories into my analyst's singular technical apprehension of them.

Thus, when a few years later I was invited to participate in the IRED entry Containment: Container/Contained, I was quite motivated. It would be the next step in delving into Bion's ideas despite not having dedicated myself much to it before.

During the process, the to-and-fro of writing such a comprehensive concept, I realized the vast territory of thought a concept launches when it is created/found and the need for a taste of adventure that those who enter it must have, in parallel to a certain rigour of following others' lines of thinking.

The Importance of IRED

As clinicians, we rely on concepts to address our challenges; but when overused, these concepts risk oversimplification, potentially becoming devoid of meaning.

Yet, when ideas are carefully contained, explored and juxtaposed within a shared space, a new epistemological power emerges.

The IRED provides such an optimal environment, fostering the growth of our psychoanalytic tree of knowledge without constraints.

Our Holy Tree

Let's take again the metaphor of a tree, in which the branches stand discrimination despite being born from the same trunk. But now imagine that "...That holy tree is upside down, branches in the ground... Those roots and sky... now pass the nectar 'round"¹. And then also the other way round, in such a way the tree forms an expanding almost spheric canopy.

This is how I picture our ever-growing body of knowledge.

The Living and The Dead - Their Stories

Indeed, it's astonishing when we take the dimension of psychoanalytic data about human mind. Considering that there are roughly 18300 psychoanalysts linked to the IPA (and many other analytic institutions all over the world), and around 5600 people in analytic training, it is a huge mass. And what about those already gone? 120,000? OR 240,000? How many clinical stories do we have in our gigantic "library"?

"...the mind produces meaning in great measure to contain primary emotional experiences (IRED, p. 1015)"

¹ *Akaal - Song by Ajeet and Trevor Hall · 2016*

Each clinical experience is an emotional experience for both the patient and the analyst- what the meaning will be will depend on such an experience staying for a while in the analytic space, that is, being contained to be transformed. Of course this is not an easy task. Emotions may be avoided or banalized, for example. Or may be so overwhelming that the space implodes itself.

Some part of the experience, however, stays and is communicated, first to the patient and the analyst herself and later, if possible, to the analytic community. This is our amazing database.

Processing The Stories into Knowledge

And how do we “process” such database? How can it be transformed into group knowledge?

Consider the following quote: “The capacity to transform emotional truth through thinking is thus vital to survival. Catastrophic change refers to the result of transformations of such intensity that their impact on the actual situation and the personality become overtly manifest.” (IREN, p. 1020).

Could we posit that the IREN may propitiate, as a collateral effect, such change, by bringing together and exploring the possibility of coexistence of different ways of thinking about concepts in the same space? I wish to stress the spatial dimension, because containment and transformation depend on space; and in what concerns IREN, it is meant to be an institutional space.

Let’s take further the entry ‘Transformation’: “The realization of the oedipal preconception shows two tendencies: ‘social-ism’ tendency as opposed to the narcissistic tendency. Such tendencies spread in a spectral model, a non-structural field of work and are one of the facets of the psychoanalytical object (Bion, 1962a). ...for an individual to socialize’ (i.e., to relate to others) depends on renouncing the belief in a single explanation for facts” (IREN, p. 1037) and thus, in omnipotence.

Aren’t such negotiations embedded in the IREN task of juxtaposing and composing both tendencies in the same space, leading to the possibility of finding several different answers for the same question? This is clear in the following quote: “To think is a process, which implies recognition that a link exists between two other people apart from him. If this tridimensional concept is not accepted, there will never be social-ism and the individual will not be able to enjoy

the benefits of a third person, initially the father, later the family, finally the society” (IREED, p. 1037).

Let’s take the classical statement that “the therapeutic action of analysis...is closely linked to the analyst’s function as container for the patient’s unmetabolized and projected emotional experience” (Levine 2007, p. 963). It can be applied to the analytic community, which would work as the container where the metabolites of the digestion of thousands clinical cases would be deposited. This container should not be a passive receptacle of analytic experiences and reports, instead creating an active interaction among the elements, to allow concepts to emerge, and finally, to be confronted, discriminating their differences and similarities, complementarities and areas of incompatibilities, their reason of being within their epistemological histories. This is the task of IRED.

Time To Contain and Time to Transform

And to accomplish this task, we need time. As the projected content must remain in the recipient’s mind for as long as necessary to be transformed, we also need time for each concept to confront the distinct versions of itself, in the mind of the authors, and in the readers, meaning that IRED’s complex task is also an unending one.

Going back to the title of this Congress (“Psychoanalysis as an anchor in chaotic times”), we must also keep in mind the possibility that: “...some people hold the belief that a group only establishes itself by first excluding of what is different, then devaluing the difference (i.e., ‘otherness’) and, finally, moving to destroy it”(IREED, p.1038).

Time To Destroy And Time To Resist

As IRED’s proposition concerns the task of including and respecting differences without denying them, we are currently challenging a dangerous worldwide situation in which even the protocol agreement of accepting differences have been attacked. We witness, with horror, the narrowing of tolerance and thinking space, the shameless exclusion of ideas in the pursuit of power. Even if we

can see fierce resistances to these destructive tendencies, it seems a huge wave of dismantling human values is sweeping our world.

Exactly because of this, IRED stands for a model of expanding within the differences, growing and enriching the horizon of thought.

The diversity of the contents contained within one's mind prompts the formation of links between confrontation and adjustment among such different elements, and it generates a state of aliveness quite distinct from the one in which similarities would be the rule.

REFERENCES

Chuster, A., Malin, B., Muller, F., Papiasvili, E., Vermote, R. (2023) Transformation(s). In: IRED (IPA - Inter-Regional Encyclopedic Dictionary Of Psychoanalysis). Pp:1003-1064.

Levine, H. B. (2007). "A Note on Notes: Note Taking and Containment." *Psychoanal. Q.* 76 (3): 981–90.

