

**IPA INTER-REGIONAL ENCYCLOPEDIA DICTIONARY (IRED):
THE INTER-REGIONAL PHASE
Panel Presentation in Buenos Aires, July 28, 2017**

1. PHILOSOPHY AND UNIQUE FEATURES OF IRED

Stefano Bolognini, IPA President (2013-2017) and Chair of IRED

It is my pleasure to open this panel on the IPA Inter-Regional Encyclopedic Dictionary of Psychoanalysis (IRED), together with the three Regional Co-Chairs Arne Jemstedt (Europe), Elias Mallet da Rocha Barros (Latin-America) and Eva Papiasvili (North-America): each of them will present and explain important elements and processes about the way this seminal work is organized and progressively built up, with the fundamental collaboration of the distinguished colleagues who work on the Inter-Regional Encyclopedic Dictionary's regional teams and who produce first the regional drafts and then the inter-regional entries.

As many of you know, the project of the Inter-Regional Encyclopedic Dictionary (IRED) and its inspiring philosophy are rooted from the very beginning in what we call "the IPA Mentality": that is the increasing awareness, inside our scientific community, about the worldwide geographical and cultural basis of the advancement of Psychoanalysis today, no more limited to few early, prestigious and exclusive sources like it used to be in the past.

Psychoanalytic concepts, theories and terms developed enormously in more than one century, both enriching our general knowledge and diversifying the national and regional versions of each of them; and this is the main reason for adding a new psychoanalytic Dictionary to those excellent ones which already exist, but which select and present the concepts (admirably so) in a way which is characteristic of a particular national or regional psychoanalytic culture.

The IPA is the only worldwide psychoanalytic organization poised to explore and to present the evolution of concepts and terms throughout all Regions. The moment has come to extend this perspective to the whole theoretical psychoanalytic landscape, with no restriction.

The IRED will try to include all substantial scientific contributions about each concept, but will also avoid redundancies and repetitions in its style and final contents; as you will see, a special room will be given also to the so called "Regional Concepts", mentioning also the resonances and further versions and permutations they achieved in other Regions.

This ambitious, highly advanced work will be progressively published, in the official IPA languages, in a special area of the IPA Website, and it will be available to all those who are interested in the theoretical evolution of Psychoanalysis; we expect it will become in the future a fundamental working instrument for psychoanalysts, psychotherapists, psychologists, and University teachers and students all over the world.

We also consider this enterprise as a work in progress, so that further changes, integrations and adjustments will be possible in the next years for each entry, after suggestions by the readers and subsequent evaluation by the Editorial Board of IRED.

Finally, we are grateful to the previous and to the current IPA Administrations and Board, which approved and also now support this initiative, so meaningful regarding the IPA will to connect the whole psychoanalytic community by acknowledging its theoretical richness, variety and continuing scientific evolution.

2. MULTIPHASIC METHODOLOGY, FOCUS ON INTER-REGIONAL PHASE

Eva D. Papiasvili, North American Co-Chair

In line with the philosophy of completeness, richness and full intra- and inter-regional representation, the Task Force implemented original multi-phasic methodology, consisting of:

1. Identification of the concepts most relevant to contemporary psychoanalytic thought and clinical work
2. Intra-regional phase
3. Transitional phase
4. Inter-regional phase

First, to **identify the concepts** most relevant to today's psychoanalysts at work, we implemented so called '5+1' methodology, asking the original pool of about 25 consultants of diverse orientations within each region, "Which concepts informed their thinking and work most", and "Which concept resonated most with their respective region, or originated there". The concepts were then ordered according to the frequency with which they occurred in each region and globally.

The **intra-regional phase** for each concept included formation of conceptual teams (out of those who mentioned the concept in their responses), who would be writing regional conceptual drafts, starting with those concepts that occurred most frequently in all continents. After conceptual teams write the drafts, there is an **intra-regional review** with the participation of all consultants of each region.

The **transitional phase** includes the formation of inter-regional teams, consisting of one member of each regional concept team serving as inter-regional consultant. One of the regional co-chairs (usually of the region where the concept was mentioned among the most relevant ones and wrote one of the original drafts, or the original draft) functions as an inter-regional coordinating co-chair, whose function could be defined as a 'contributing editor' on the inter-regional entry.

The **inter-regional phase** includes collating the regional drafts into inter-regional entries. The final tri-regional entries are constructed either from the three original regional drafts, or gradually – through stages of constructing first bi-regional drafts and incorporating one response draft into it, or collating one original regional draft and two response drafts. Because of the crucial **encyclopedic dimension** of the dictionary, the concepts are presented in their historical evolution as well as current multi-perspectival theoretical exposition and their clinical usage. The unprecedented **inter-regional methodology** involves ‘inter-cultural translations’ and ‘bridging’ among different ways of conceptualizing and writing, preserving the regional variability and finding deeper common threads.

This methodology is necessarily predicated on, and further fosters the attitude of openness and inclusion, treating **differences as enriching assets** rather than impediments or burdensome complications. In practice, it often leads to deeper **insight into internal connections** within and between different perspectives and within and between different elements of conceptualizations in their evolution.

First five most general concepts occurring most frequently on a global scale, with which the intra-, and then inter- regional work started first, 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. In practice, because ENACTMENT was also mentioned among the frequent Latin American concepts, this concept was also engaged among the first ones inter-regionally. Subsequently, regional chairs coordinated identification of the next most frequently mentioned global concepts as OBJECT RELATIONS THEORIES, CONFLICT and NACHTRÄGLICHKEIT, and regionally variously specific concepts SELF, AMAE, EGO PSYCHOLOGY, INTERSUBJECTIVITY, DRIVES, FIELD AND MULTIPLE FIELDS THEORIES, and THEORY OF COMMUNICATION. Those are the first 19 concepts being gradually published in all IPA languages on the IRED pages of the IPA web site.

Of those, inter-regionally finalized UNCONSCIOUS, COUNTERTRANSFERENCE, ENACTMENT, CONTAINMENT and SETTING are already published and translated into all IPA languages, and CONFLICT, TRANSFERENCE and AMAE are thus far published in English. All remaining concepts have been intra-regionally finalized and are in various stages of the inter-regional work.

The concepts next in line for the intra-regional work have been identified as: FREE ASSOCIATION; BUILDING PSYCHIC STRUCTURE: INTERNALIZATION, REPRESENTATION, SYMBOLIZATION; INFANTILE SEXUALITY; and REGRESSION.

**3. VIEW FROM LATIN AMERICA:
REFLECTION ON SELECTION OF CONCEPTS
Elias Mallet Da Rocha Barros, Latin American Co-Chair**

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. I would also like to thank Virginia Ungar, the new IPA President, for reappointing us.

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 three regions work. Even though I am acquainted with the differences in psychoanalytic culture within such regions, and especially with the differences in approach between Latin America and the rest of the psychoanalytic world, I was still very positively surprised with what I experienced throughout my work alongside my co-workers and with my experience with the Latin American Consultants.

I also wish express my deepest gratitude, to the 45 Latin American Consultants and ad hoc experts who have cooperated with this monumental work of producing for publication these **“five concepts plus one”**. I think I owe a special thanks to both Abel Fainstein and to Claudia Borensztein for their readiness in helping me.

While working as coordinator for the Encyclopedia I ran into some interesting issues and observed some instigating patterns that emerged in the responses we were getting from our consultants and collaborators. This is a potentially very rich material, which might give us a lot of food for thought. So, in order to present our findings and reflect on the feedback we garnered, I should start by presenting the manner in which we set to work.

We were interested *both* in identifying the core concepts that guided contemporary clinical practice in our region *and* in tracking down, when relevant, regional particularities which shaped specific psychoanalytic cultures. In order to do this in a constructive way that could give us access to observe patterns in the replies of our consultants, we formulated two direct questions for them to reply in a more or less straightforward way:

- 1. “Which five concepts inform your psychoanalytic thinking and clinical work the most”?**
- 2. “Which concept originated in your psychoanalytic culture, or has a special resonance within that culture, that you feel deserves to be the first regional concept to become an entry?”**

Based on the answers we received, we identified **five general concepts and one regionally specific concept within each region**. We reached this final result in the following way: firstly, we proceeded to identify the 5 general concepts occurring most frequently on a

global scale (in accordance with our question 1); secondly, we identified what we called a “plus one” concept, that was the most often cited in each of the three regions (in accordance with our question 2).

The results were as follows. The most frequently mentioned general concepts, occurring across all the three regions together were:

- **“TRANSFERENCE”**
- **“COUNTERTRANSFERENCE”**
- **“UNCONSCIOUS”**
- **“PROJECTIVE IDENTIFICATION”**
- **“CONTAINMENT”**

The regional concepts thus identified were:

- **“TRANSFORMATION”** (Latin America)
- **“SETTING”** (Europe)
- **“ENACTMENT”** (North America)

This selection of concepts strikes me as very curious and potentially significant, allowing us to reflect, perhaps, on some of the characteristics of contemporary psychoanalysis as it is practiced in each region.

I would like to summarize to you today some of the thoughts that occurred to me and submit them to your appreciation. These are very general impressions that, given the restraints of time and space, will only be sketched out, and, hopefully, might foster a deeper discussion of the significance of our findings.

I feel that what might pique the interest of many psychoanalysts, as it piqued the interest of the experienced editors, is that the selection of concepts is not entirely self-obvious when we look at it more closely, and, in some cases, might even be somewhat counterintuitive in important aspects. One could firmly be unsurprised by the selection of concepts such as “transference”, “countertransference” and “the unconscious”, given that these are core ideas of the psychoanalytic field as such.

But I do not feel that the same could be said of “projective identification” and “containment”. We must keep in mind that these concepts were selected *across all three regions* to be amongst *the top five concepts that inform our theoretical and clinical thinking the most*. This warrants some comments in my view.

We all know that the concept of “projective identification” has a long controversial history, but seems to have gained widespread international acceptance as of late. This is in and of itself something meaningful with regards to the broad history of psychoanalysis.

The concept of “containment” also has roots in British Psychoanalysis, in the works of Bion. But the inter-subjective turn seems to have become deeply rooted in contemporary psychoanalytic culture, but especially in North and Latin America. With respect to Europe, as far as I know, the concept of “containment” has had significant impact in the works of some analysts, whom I will not list here.

With respect to these two concepts, originally developed within the British psychoanalytic tradition, above all through Klein and Bion, we could perhaps begin our considerations of the significance of our results by suggesting that Melanie Klein has, in the last few years, gradually gained autonomy and universality as a psychoanalytic theoretician, and is less and less thought of as the spearhead of a specific (and, to some, idiosyncratic) “Psychoanalytic School”. I believe that Klein has finally broken the limiting barriers that the adjective “Kleinian” imposed upon her thinking and upon the thinking of those trained in what was once perceived as a specific and separate tradition. We must remember that Melanie Klein herself always rejected being characterized as the pioneer of a specific school of thought, given that she always saw herself as merely continuing the work of Freud. Her thoughts also gave rise to controversies, which would shake psychoanalytic thinking to its very core and give rise to some of the most interesting and profound shifts in analytic theory. That the concept of “projective identification” has become so widely accepted is a recent development of this long history and points to further shifts within analytic culture. It indicates, perhaps, that Kleinian Theory is less and less regarded as a tradition within *British* psychoanalysis and has become a central part of *Psychoanalytic* theory as such.

And what could be said of Bion’s concept of “containment”?

This concept filled in a gap that has become critical to contemporary psychoanalysis. I am thinking of the shift in a patient’s relationship to his own mind in the context of inter-subjectivity, in such a way as to hinder the impulse towards action and foment the possibility of reflection.

I would now like to focus on the specificities of the Latin American region. Given the results we obtained and given my comments above, could we then venture to suggest that Latin American clinical practice is, on the one hand, firmly structured around foundational Freudian concepts (“the unconscious”, “transference”, “countertransference”), but also more and more colored by Kleinian and Bionian theory, in their broader and more general aspects?

My last comments will be directed to the concept selected in Latin America, i.e. the concept of “transformations”. While for Bion this was a very specific concept, it gradually gained a wider meaning and became a theory of psychic change. This was not Bion’s original sense or intentions, but it was itself transformed, especially in Latin American psychoanalytic culture where “transformations” is approached under a more general perspective and:

*“[is] defined as the series of change experienced by a **group of elements** that vary from a previous to a subsequent stage, where the recognition of the identity of these elements that have changed, would depend on the existing **invariants.**”*

Lopez-Corvo, R. 2003: *The Dictionary of The Work of W.R.Bion*. London: Karnak, p. 290.

I believe that the choice of this concept by the Latin American community, which took active part in our research (around 100 psychoanalysts and psychoanalytic authors), is indicative of a strong Bionian trend, which has become crucial to clinical practice throughout Latin America rather than a widespread influence of a “Bionian school” or “group”. In other words, in Latin America, certain ideas of Bion have been incorporated into and become crucial to clinical practice, without necessarily having changed readers of Bion into staunch “Bionians”.

This runs counter to common sense views, which usually attribute to this region a more purely Freudian approach to psychoanalysis, only occasionally colored by some Bionian influences, especially in Argentina and Brazil, where a specifically local understanding of Bion has flourished. We also usually tend to expect a strong influence of the French school of Psychoanalysis in Latin America, but the result we obtained, curiously, run counter to such expectations.

These are all preliminary remarks designed to foster further discussion.

Thank you all very much.

4. VIEW FROM EUROPE: INTER-REGIONAL WORK – *THE PROCESS* Arne Jemstedt, European Co-Chair

It is an honour and a challenge to have the task of being the European Co-chair for this great and inspiring project.

The focus of this panel is to describe and discuss the work of producing the final tri-regional entries that have so far been finished. As you have heard they are: Containment: Container/Contained, Enactment, the Setting, Countertransference, the Unconscious, Conflict, Transference and Amae.

So this is the focus, but I wish to point out, that simultaneously with the work with the tri-regional entries there is an on-going intra-regional and bi-regional work with different concepts, for instance in Europe with the concepts of Drives, and in Europe and North America with a bi-regional draft on *Nachträglichkeit*.

Eva has given a fine description of the different aspects of the Methodology for work with

tri-regional entries. I have been the co-ordinator for two finalized tri-regional entries: the Setting and Transference and I will give some examples of my experience and my impressions from this work.

The Setting was originally a specific EU concept (not suggested by North and Latin American consultants), and NA and LA consultants wrote response drafts to it and then these three were brought together. As to Transference, first a bi-regional EU and NA draft was created to which a LA response draft was written.

My task as the interregional coordinator is to work in close contact with the three consultants (one from each region) for the final entry of the concept in question. This task can be described as the task of an editor. When I (and the three consultants) have the three drafts on, e.g., the Setting, I give suggestions on how to bring them together. To do this in a coherent and harmonious way is a delicate, interesting and not easy work. When the EU consultant on the Setting read the NA response draft her first impression was that it had “a very different approach” from the EU draft, which would make the task of constructing a joint draft difficult. An interregional consultant for another concept wrote: “The two drafts are both so well written and sufficiently discreet that I am uncertain what the outcome [of bringing them together] will be.” Despite initial doubts like these, the entries that have been finalized have a good coherence and consistency to them. I think you will agree when you read them on the IPA website.

The three regions differ in their way of writing. There are of course personal styles that colour the original regional draft, which is good, the consultants are living individuals with a style of their own, and then there are cultural differences. The European way of writing is more condensed, while the North American way is more expansive. The Latin American drafts that I have been involved with, and I think especially of the draft on Transference, are complex and sometimes with a kind of tragic touch (is that an expression of an Latin American soul, or am I wrong?). By the way, it has been very interesting for me learn more about Latin American ways of thinking psychoanalytically which I knew too little about and which I find have a special complexity and depth to it.

When the work with the tri-regional entry starts, I ask the three consultants to contact each other and decide how they wish to divide the work between them and as I said I give suggestions on how this entry might be structured. My general idea about the structure is like this:

At the same time as the three regions represent different psychoanalytic cultures, they all have – of course – a common source in Freud and they partly overlap and have influenced each other. So when it comes to the origin and early development of the concept in question, the three drafts can be merged in a hopefully consistent way, e.g., in the entry of Transference. This is true also for the later development of the concept. Contributions from important authors like, e.g., Klein, Bion, Winnicott, Lacan are described in all the three regional drafts sometimes in long sections, sometimes in shorter, often with a specific regional touch. Also these can be brought together in the general section of the entry, sometimes with a specifically added headline, e g

“Kleinian influences in North America” after the general description of Klein’s theories on Transference. To mention the influence from LA on the other regions, in the entry of the Setting Bleger’s contribution is referred to in both the NA and EU drafts.

An interesting example of the mutual psychoanalytic influence between the three regions is that Ferenczi and Ferro are referred to in the LA draft on the Setting but not in the EU draft.

Coming back to the entry on Transference, which is 42 pages long, first there is a bringing together, merging, of the three regional drafts with headlines like “The origin of the concept of transference in Freud”, “Freud’s further development of the concept”, followed by “The British contribution” with authors like Klein, Winnicott and Bion, “The French contribution”, with sections on Lacan and Laplanche including “Lacan in the USA” and “A reading of Laplanche in French Canada”. After these merged, general sections there follows “Specific North American Perspectives and Developments” with intermediate headlines like “Jacobson and Loewald: Transitional Thinkers of Classical Psychoanalysis” and “Relational/interpersonal perspectives”. After this NA section follows “Developments of the Concept in Latin America” with e g a long section on Racker’s contribution and also extensive and very interesting and complex descriptions of theories of LA authors unknown to me, Fidiás Cesio and Mauricio Abadi.

The structure and composition of the as yet finalized entries differ and this is the case also with the Setting and Transference. While the structure in the Transference entry is like sketched above with the origin in Freud and then headlines with mainly the theories of important authors (Klein, Winnicott, Lacan, etc.), the composition of the Setting entry is along themes: e g external setting, internal setting, setting and regression, but also in this entry there are sections with “Specific North American Contributions” and “Specific Latin American Contributions”.

The consultants for the final interregional entries worked very hard, creatively and constructively – it was really a very good teamwork. When I went through the email correspondence between them and me, it is obvious that the communication has been very intense, tight and respectful, covering a wide spectrum of ideas, suggestions and problems. “Do you agree that this a good and meaningful merging of the section on Freud?”, “The section referring to ‘Beyond the Pleasure Principle’ could be more developed”, “I think a discussion concerning the similarities and differences between ‘setting’ and ‘frame’ should be included”, “parts of the NA section could be more condensed” , etc.

The conversation of course also included all the formal aspects of the entry: the headings, references, year of publication, page number, the elimination of first person references (like we, us etc.) and other things like that.

I hope I have given you at least a glimpse of this stimulating and challenging work with the production of these two examples of tri-regional final entries.

**5. VIEW FROM NORTH AMERICA:
INTER-REGIONAL WORK – *SOME EMERGING TRENDS*
Eva D. Papiasvili, North American Co-Chair**

Looking first at the specifics of the North American **intra-regional** participation, three points stand out:

- **Inclusion on the merit**, with APsaA and Independent IPA institutes and societies in the US, Canadian Psychoanalytic Society, Japanese Psychoanalytic Association and additional expert writers of diverse theoretical orientation participating. This produced first time inclusion of such enriching conceptualizations as ‘Third Model theorizing’ as part of the Object Relations Theories, North American French theorizing on Conflict and Intersubjectivity; and first time international encyclopedic dictionary inclusion of the Japanese psychoanalytic concept Amae.

- **Welcoming the diversity of perspectives**: Consultants spontaneously enlisted additional contributors to write on underrepresented perspectives: the conceptual diversity and the less known perspectives became an asset to the draft. Given the context of a history of sometime-exclusionary practices, especially in the USA psychoanalysis, here was an opportunity for an ‘anti-exclusionary’ historical corrective with a widest range of theoretical viewpoints, unseen before.

- **A very active review process**: In North America, not only a very scholarly review process evolved, but sometimes the reviewers became additional writers filling in gaps, e.g., in Object Relations Theories: fuller representation of Klein by Judy Mitrani and Leigh Tobias and in Conflict, additional inclusion of Relational perspectives by Adrienne Harris and her team of invited additional specialized authors, some of whom became part of our expanded team of contributors on another North American draft on Intersubjectivity. A thorough regional review process also led to enriching post-review collaborative expansion of the Japanese psychoanalytic concept Amae, where it was truly the passage ‘through the eyes of the other’ that brought new enriching insights to the native concept.

All this prepared us rather well for the **inter-regional phase**:

I had an honor to participate as a coordinating co-chair of the finalized inter-regional entries Containment, Enactment, The Unconscious, Countertransference, Conflict, and Amae. Additionally, honoring last wishes of Richard Gottlieb, I continued his work as the North American inter-regional consultant on Transference (inter-regionally co-chaired by Arne Jemstedt). Below are some emerging trends, which I observed:

- Throughout, continuing the work of **learning through differences**, and seeing them as **meaningfully inter-related** became a core insight and experience. This included inter-related themes such as the manner in which the ‘mainstream’ vs. ‘non-

mainstream' perspectives are treated within and between the continents; related to these were patterns of exclusion vs. inclusion, which seem to be further related to dialectic between conciseness vs. full representation; firm vs. permeable boundaries, as related to attitudes towards emerging conceptualizations globally, and how these possibly correlate not only with geographies but also the type of concepts: clinical vs. theoretical and traditional vs. less traditional, with one end of such continuum exemplified by Countertransference ('a common ground' with more permeable conceptual boundaries), the other, by metapsychological conceptualization of The Unconscious (firmer boundaries).

- **Changing contours of the conceptual landscape**, e.g., some concepts considered regionally specific, or in some cases living a bit like isolates within their own language sphere, are more globally interconnected than previously thought. Some specific examples include the Enactment-related not previously translated French Belgian concept 'L'Éxperience Agie Partagée' (Shared acted experience); and Mate Blanco's Latin American Conceptualization of Unconscious Logic, now under the encompassing entry of (The) Unconscious.
- There is a new appreciation of how one region's thinking **relates** to other regions' thinking. Some conceptual teams, e.g., Countertransference, took a 'global view', literally tracing the routes of how the concept traveled between the times, the continents and between the theoretical orientations, picking up enriching elements through each multi-faceted 'translation' and visiting new geographic and theoretical spaces.

OVERALL, *what is emerging*, through the challenging but uncommonly gainful multidimensional inter-regional work, emphasizing fullest possible (intra- and inter-regional) representation and encyclopedic (evolutionary) dimension, *is an internally inter-connected multi-perspectival psychoanalytic thought*, constituting a possible new vision of the field and a new answer to the quintessential question – One psychoanalysis or many?