

# 10th ANNIVERSARY IPA INTER-REGIONAL ENCYCLOPEDIA DICTIONARY (IRED)

**European Psychoanalytic Federation (EPF) Conference**

**Florence, Italy**

**March, 22, 2024**

**Palazzo degli Affari**

## Programme

**Heribert Blass**, President EPF, President-Elect IPA

**Stefano Bolognini** (Founder of IRED, past president IPA, past chair IRED): *The Origins of IRED*

**Eva Papiasvili** (Current Chair IRED): *The Current State of IRED*

**Marie-France Dispaux**. *Openness to the diversity of psychoanalytical concepts: my experience.*  
(Member of the EU IRED team)

**Dimitris-James Jackson**. *IRED'S Unifying Plurality of Psychoanalysis.* (Member of the EU IRED team)

Chair: **Antonio Pérez-Sánchez**. EU Co-Chair

\*\*\*

**Antonio Pérez-Sánchez**

### Presentation

We welcome you. Thank you for coming to celebrate the 10th anniversary of IRED's work.

Ten years of scientific activity can be considered a considerable time to pause and examine what has been done and what remains to be done.

Being a dictionary, one might think that 10 years is enough time to have completed, or almost completed, the task. However, we have only finished 18 entries. Even though it comprises almost 1000 pages. It must therefore be a special dictionary. Indeed, it is. As its name suggests, it is also *encyclopaedic* and, moreover, and this is, I think, the most important thing, *interregional*.

It is a pleasure to have the presence of the current president of the EPF, and the President-Elect of the IPA, Heribert Blass.

We will also be joined by the initiator of the project, Stefano Bolognini, who will talk about the origins of the IRE\$D; its current chair, Eva Papiasvilli, who will inform us about the current status of the project; and two European contributors, France Marie Dispaux and Dimitris-James Jackson, who will tell us about their experience.

We will follow this order of presentations, and afterwards there will be a discussion with the audience and with people connected via the Internet.

\*\*\*

## **HERIBERT BLASS**

EPF President IPA President elect

Dear colleagues, especially dear colleagues of the IRED Committee, Today, during our 37th EPF Conference in Florence, we are meeting to celebrate the tenth anniversary of the IPA Inter-Regional Encyclopaedic Dictionary, and I would especially like to congratulate the colleagues of the IRED Committee and also convey my thanks for the excellent and important work on this inter-regional project over the last ten years. IRED is so important because it helps to build bridges of understanding between psychoanalysts from different countries and continents, not only by translating basic psychoanalytic concepts into many languages of the world, but above all by communicating the historical development of these concepts with the specific manifestations in the individual regions of the IPA. It is a living bridge because IRED is a work in progress and is constantly evolving, and because the aim is not a reductionist integration of concepts. Rather, the focus is on conveying diversity and equal appreciation of different conceptualisations. Following Ludwig Wittgenstein, it could be said that the limits of my conceptual language also mean the limits of my sensory world of thought. It expands our mental and emotional world even more if we can also find access to our own limited terms and concepts in other languages and cultures. Engaging with the other culture enables us to utilise other perspectives and, in the best case, to discover previously unknown, new dimensions in supposedly clear meanings. As international psychoanalysts, we benefit at least twice from IRED: with its help, we can better empathise with the feelings and thoughts of colleagues from other languages and cultures and thus strengthen our international connections. This strengthening of our understanding of others has a positive effect on ourselves, because we all gain an expansion of our own theoretical and conceptual horizons through this exchange. In this way, IRED helps us to recognise the limits of our own concepts and to become humble. At the same time, it strengthens scientific curiosity

and the desire to explore the unknown, so that it also enriches us on an intrapsychic level. By increasing understanding collegial connections in all regions of the world, it promotes mutual respect and recognition of difference. I refer to the 'world', and not just the 'IPA world', because IRED is not limited to practising psychoanalysts, but can be used by all researchers and interested parties of different orientations. In addition to fostering collegial cohesion within the IPA, it serves as a free, constantly evolving body of knowledge that is democratically available to all interested parties in the world on an equal footing - for the benefit of psychoanalysis and for the enrichment of us all. I would like to congratulate you once again on ten years of IRED and express my sincere thanks.

\*\*\*

## **STEFANO BOLOGNINI**

Founder of IRED, past chair IRED, past president IPA

### ***THE ORIGINS OF IRED***

The project for an IPA Encyclopaedic Dictionary was originally inspired by at least three factors of a very different nature:

1. on the one hand, the scientific ideal of providing a reliable descriptive *summa* of the knowledge built up by generations of analysts;
2. on the other hand, the strong institutional desire to enhance the worldwide function of the IPA, the highest community expression in our field, by summoning it to this endeavour as the only scientific-professional entity endowed with the appropriate means for the purpose;
3. finally, the realistic awareness of the multiplicity, variety and complexity of the conceptual developments of psychoanalysis, in a historical and geographical sense.

All of this required the setting up of inter-regional teams, with variable composition, with more than one level of processing and editing for each concept, and the engagement of regional Co-Chairs and Contributors who had a genuine pluralist vision regarding the evolution of concepts, but who respected the specificity and originality of the productions of the various countries and schools, presenting them without any pretension of integrating them into a homogenised version.

A further basic criterion adopted from the outset was the broad and diversified distribution of the tasks involved in the production of the entries, which implied the convening of an equally broad number of Contributors: an undertaking of this magnitude could not be carried out by a few, and we soon realised that it would be unrealistic and unrealistic to conceive of it from a restrictive point of view. Today there are more than 120 Contributors.

The 2013-2017 IPA Executive found the immediate and unwavering support of the Board, and this support has never been lacking even from subsequent Executives and Board Members, to whom we have been grateful for their help all these years.

This realisation would not have been possible without the work of the colleagues who organised it (the Regional Co-Chairs), of those who expertly constructed the entries (the Contributors), and of those who with true generosity edited the translations into many languages (the Translators).

Finally, the Regional Federations (APsA/NAPSAC, EPF and FEPAL) regularly provide space at their congresses for IRED initiatives, for which we are very grateful.

As initiator and first Chair, I would like to express my personal, profound thanks to my first companions in the adventure: Eva Papiasvili (New York), Arne Jemstedt (Stockholm) and Elias Mallé da Rocha Barros (San Paulo), who were the initiators as Co-Chairs, together with 2013-2017 IPA Officers Alexandra Billingham (Stockholm) and Juan Carlos Weissmann (Buenos Aires) who was succeeded after two years as Treasurer by Andrew Brook (Ottawa).

They were soon joined by our first historical Consultant Abel Fainstein (Buenos Aires). Then gradually Victoria Korin, Inès Bayona stepped in as Latin American Co-Chairs during 2018-2020. In 2021-2023, the IRED Committee was joined by Felipe Muller (Buenos Aires), Joseph Fernando (Toronto) and Antonio Pérez-Sánchez (Barcelona) as IRED's current regional Co-Chairs, and Jerome Blackman (Virginia) as the current North American Consultant. This being our first Ten Year Anniversary, I would like to mention them all with sincere gratitude and esteem.

After 10 years, however, beyond the excellent results we have achieved, of which our current outstanding Chair Eva Papiasvili gives us the full picture, we have also achieved a good awareness of the problems and difficulties we regularly face, and which to some extent we can consider organic precisely due to the context of the inter-regional nature and magnitude of this initiative.

Some of the problems are eminently practical: first the pandemic, and then the growing general economic difficulties, have made in-person meetings increasingly difficult, which would instead be invaluable for further projects and verifications.

Other problems are of a more subtle and complex nature.

It has not been easy for IRED to acquire the meaning and function of a fundamental tool - as it can be - in the field of Education: not many Training Institutes of the various IPA societies have yet adopted it as the text for their courses to Candidates, and the number of IPA colleagues who are familiar with it is growing, but it is still underestimated compared to the potential of this scientific resource.

In a certain sense, however, it must be considered that the IRED nevertheless implies a subterranean narcissistic challenge for every analyst and every analytic group or school: its representational function of the vastness of the analytic conceptual world and its developments frustrates first of all the illusion of every single analyst to know exhaustively its theoretical landscape (of which each of us in fact knows a fairly limited part).

Secondly, belonging to a school, which is completely natural and legitimate, must however be confronted with the existence and the possible richness of scientific contents of the other schools, thus losing the illusion of centrality or even uniqueness even at the group level: a not insignificant narcissistic wound, similar to that of families who, by sending their children to school, must accept that they come into contact with other families and supra-familiar institutions; it is not by chance that access to IRED in training institutes is still relatively little officially promoted in certain societies.

I am very hopeful about the future of this scientific resource, just as I am more generally hopeful about the future of our inter-regional scientific, professional and educational community, the IPA desired by Sigmund Freud 124 years ago.

The IRED is an expression of a supra-national spirit that we could call 'IPA Mentality', and it is based on the desire for knowledge, cooperation and mutual recognition of belonging in spite of diversity, in our common psychoanalytic world transmitted from generation to generation, from country to country.

\*\*\*

**EVA D. PAPIASVILI**

Chair IRED

## ***CURRENT STATE OF IRED: ONE PSYCHOANALYSIS AND MANY***

It is my privilege and pleasure to participate in this gathering of European contributors to commemorate 10 years of IRED. Over the last 10 years I have worked with many of you and cannot say enough about the importance of your remarkable contribution.

*“My course is set for an unchartered sea ...”*, wrote Dante Alighieri in Divine Comedy (Paradiso, Canto II). It may be of note, that Dante originally intended to write an encyclopedia. It is also worth noting that Dante’s Comedy has been called ‘The psychoanalysis of the Middle Ages’ (Chessick 2001, Papiasvili, 2020).

Some 700 years later, another native son of Italy – Stefano Bolognini, in his capacity as the President of the IPA, summoned the scientific and organizational resources of the IPA to inaugurate Encyclopedic Dictionary, today’s IRED. Stefano had the audacity and the wisdom to insist on the fullest possible tri-regional representation of general as well as regionally specific concepts, most relevant to today’s psychoanalytic work and thought, as they developed from Freud until the present time.

Today, after 10 years of unprecedented collaboration of more than 150 psychoanalysts worldwide, the IPA Inter-Regional Encyclopedic Dictionary (IRED) offers *a new way of organizing psychoanalytic knowledge*, uniquely representative of multiple evolving perspectives worldwide.

As the frontline symbol of the IPA unifying scientific vision, IRED strives to fully represent regional and theoretical diversity, including contradictions and cutting-edge controversies. Our protocol of anti-reductionistic complexity, liminality and non-polarization, considering both general and regionally specific conceptualizations, starts with grassroots selection of concepts, and proceeds from regional to inter-regional stage of writing, first the regional drafts, towards inter-regional (tri-regional) entries.

Although we did not set out to prove any theory, it so happens that philosophically and methodologically, IRED is consistent with expanded metanarratives of William James’ (1909/1977) definition of the evolving pluralistic universe, and contemporary epistemologies of complexity and hypercomplexity (Morin 1982, 2008; Da Cunha and da Fontoura Costa 2021 and others). Our findings also are consistent with the broadly defined ‘Logic of the Limits’ (Trias 1991), and related to some contemporary approaches

to the history of science (Galison 1999, Wilson 2015 and others). All of these approaches emphasize *interactivity, incompleteness, unpredictability, and heterogenous routes of evolution.*

*In IRED, the plurality and complexity are organized and contained in a broad-based outline:* Because IRED is an encyclopedic dictionary, there are dictionary/definitional parts and encyclopedic parts. Introductory and Conclusion sections are dictionary/definition parts. Everything in between comprises the encyclopedic parts: the evolution of the conceptual knowledge, which proceeds from the pre-analytic and analytic roots (Freud, Ferenczi, Abraham and others), through further developments in all three regions, towards emerging developments, clinical usage, and where it is pertinent, inter-disciplinary studies.

Working this way, including *not only major but also minor and emerging perspectives*, IRED exposes heterogeneous routes which touch and reveal unforeseen connections — something that had not been apparent before. In consequence, it also reveals a paradoxical relationship between the whole and the parts: *One Psychoanalysis and Many*, where the whole (One psychoanalysis) does not fragment into many, and the many (perspectives) do not disappear (de-differentiate/ “dissolve”) into the whole.

Working this way, we can trace how concepts evolved in reciprocal interaction with clinical experiences, but also how they ‘migrated and mutated’ across different cultural and linguistic spaces. In all IRED entries, the three-way interaction between *theory, clinical experience and culture/language*, is in full view.

To-Date there are 18 tri-regional concept entries, published in IRED Book, 946 pages:

THE UNCONSCIOUS, TRANSFERENCE, COUNTERTRANSFERENCE, CONTAINMENT (2<sup>nd</sup> expanded and updated edition), PROJECTIVE IDENTIFICATION; CONFLICT, OBJECT RELATIONS THEORIES, NACHTRÄGLICHKEIT, ENACTMENT, AMAE, EGO PSYCHOLOGY, SELF, INTERSUBJECTIVITY, SETTING, DRIVES, THEORY OF COMMUNICATION, PSYCHOANALYTIC FIELD THEORIES AND CONCEPTS, and TRANSFORMATION.

In its 10<sup>th</sup> year, IRED has been professionally translated and published in 4 IPA languages (English, German, French and Spanish), and has been gradually translated by volunteer analysts-translators and published in an additional 10 languages (Portuguese,

Italian, Traditional Chinese, Serbian, Romanian, Farsi, Classical Arabic, Hebrew, Japanese and Russian).

Here are some Trends of Conceptual Evolution we are able to observe:

1. **Conceptual Developments frequently start in undertheorized areas, areas of ambiguities, uncertainties and controversies** (*ambiguity* of Ego and Self evolved in conceptualizations and theories of EGO PSYCHOLOGY, SELF and INTERSUBJECTIVITY; '*controversial discussions*' were at the start of OBJECT RELATIONS THEORIES; Freud-Ferenczi *controversy* jumpstarted development of COUNTERTRANSFERENCE conceptualizations; recognized but *undertheorized* area of unconscious communication gave rise to various conceptual developments of INTERSUBJECTIVITY, etc.)

To illustrate:

“As per the European perspective, *controversies* surrounding 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 and perspectives were born....”

[DRIVE(S), Conclusion section, Summary of European perspective.]

2. **Migration-Mutation is linked to various types of encounters with ‘otherness’, creating particular hypercomplex emergent patterns:**

**First – when the psychoanalytic concepts are migrating from historical psychoanalytic centers towards the periphery – encountering ‘other’ cultures, histories of thought and languages:**

“Cultural conditions impose changing patterns that differ from the cultural patterns of the countries where these ideas were born. The history of our profession starts in a center (Vienna, London, Paris). When it moves toward the periphery, new phenomena occur, and more so when it crosses the oceans. There, the fortunate expansion of psychoanalysis intertwines with a variety of factors...” (INTERSUBJECTIVITY; Latin America section).

Among many specific examples there is the extending conceptual formulations beyond their original ones, such as broadening of Bion’s conceptualizations in Latin



America towards intersubjectivity; additional metapsychology of ‘Dramatic Point of view’ of North American Kleinians, and others.

This echoes the contemporary statement of hypercomplexity from Complex Network science about the novel peripheral ‘branching’, which occurs when heterogeneous trajectories head for ‘previously empty spaces’ (Da Cunha and da Fortoura Costa 2021).

**Second, in areas of confluence of several psychoanalytic traditions, and several cultures and/or languages, where the number of interactions exceeds certain threshold,** new developments and re-drawing of boundaries may occur:

Contemporary examples from INTERSUBJECTIVITY and OBJECT RELATIONS THEORIES illustrate how Francophone analysts, 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. Besides ‘the Logic of the Limits’ (Trias 1991), where limit is a territory with its own laws, the contemporary approaches to the history of science suggest that such territories correspond roughly to “trading zones” (Galison 1999, Wilson 2015), which can develop their own ‘trading language’, furthering unforeseen developments.

**Overall,** specific elements of any conceptualization can be prioritized in a new historical cultural-social-linguistic context, and can, under certain circumstances (undertheorized areas, areas of ambiguity) become core elements, of new conceptualizations and even new theories, as in OBJECT RELATIONS THEORIES, SELF & SELF PSYCHOLOGY, EGO PSYCHOLOGY and INTERSUBJECTIVITY. This the liminal point of what we call metaphorically “Migration and Mutation of concepts in their encounter with multiple facets of otherness”.

**At the same time,** as the new theories are spun, there is an immediate flourish of rapprochement between strands of theorizing previously thought of as incompatible, as in Intersubjective Ego Psychology of English-speaking North America (Chodorow 2004).

And especially, with **the second expanded and updated editions** we can see the circular spiral motion when the contemporary ‘up-dates’ also force reaching deeper into ‘pre-dates’, expanding on the historical roots. This happened with the second updated expanded edition of CONTAINMENT: The inclusion of novel neuro-psychoanalytic studies led to ‘discovery’ of implicit pre-Kleinian roots in Freud, which came as a complete **surprise**.

For me, personally, this journey ‘into the uncharted sea’, has been full of such surprises. And as long as we undertake this journey together, I am looking forward to many more.

Congratulations to 10 years of IRED!

\*\*\*

## **MARIE FRANCE DISPAUX**

IRED EU Contributor

### ***OPENNESS TO THE DIVERSITY OF PSYCHOANALYTICAL CONCEPTS: MY EXPERIENCE***

Dear IRED colleagues,

10 years already! It seems to me that time has flown and that the passage of the Covid has disrupted our notions of time. When I was contacted by Arne in May 2014 to take part in the encyclopedic dictionary, I accepted enthusiastically: the idea of a dictionary, an encyclopedic one, covering psychoanalytic concepts and reflecting the diversity and richness of the different theories and traditions in the IPA regions appeared to me to be an ambitious project, almost pharaonic certainly but exciting and indispensable. I was especially interested in the idea of sharing with colleagues working on the same concept our personal ways of thinking about a concept according to our different cultures, theories and traditions. I had no idea what an adventure we members of the IRED team had embarked upon, an adventure that is far from over!

Today I'd like to share with you my experience of this work, first with the methodology and then with some of the discoveries I've made from the different concepts I've worked on. So far, I've worked on three concepts: transference, the field concept, as coordinator, and Michael Sebek and I have just finished our draft on internalization for the EU.

The methodology was put in place little by little, learning it began with the first concept, transference, and at the beginning we tried to find a way.

Laurence Khan and I started working on transference in June 2014 (unfortunately Christine Diercks, who planned to join us, finally was not available). A little wink for those who know the speed of progress in our way of working: I found an email from Arne dating from mid-July 2014 asking us to write and finish our EU draft and to send it to him

by 31 October 2014 of course....Evidently, this was without taking into account the research needed for a concept like transference which is fundamental in psychoanalysis and the many writings devoted to it. The EU draft was completed in May 2015 and the integration of the texts from the three regions was finalized in May 2017... We had to find a rhythm between our different activities and the research for each concept - of course that's not all we do - and coordinate between ourselves in our region and then between each region. There were, of course, some more complicated moments, most sadly the illness and death of Richard Gottlieb, our NA colleague during the course of the work, but Eva took over as enthusiastically as ever. Also, the moment when our LA colleagues decided that they would not do as we did but would instead respond to the drafts received... a moment of suspense, then finally Adriana Sorrentini sent us a very dense draft with the developments in LA. What was astonishing - I'm not talking about the work with Laurence, whom I knew, but about the exchanges between the three regions - was to see that, despite the diversity of points of view, in the end the integration of the whole seemed very coherent. Another exciting opening, as Stefano had foreseen, was *to discover the diversity and richness of psychoanalytical thought*, with its specificities of course, but I believe that the final result preserved both the specificity of each person's thinking by reflecting a plurality of theoretical conceptualizations, but we were also able to see that the affirmation of transference as movement, movement within the psyche, movement between the self and the other, and movement between the past and the present remains fundamental, because it absorbs and transcends the divisions of the pluralist psychoanalytical universe.

Another discovery that struck me was how ideas circulate in different regions. In Europe, Paula Heimann published her seminal article on counter-transference in 1949, which was to have a major impact on analytic technique in the EU, even if it would take some time for it to be known and even recognized in its full importance. At the same time in LA, in 1948, Racker published his first studies in which he emphasized the interpersonal or relational aspects of transference-countertransference. Thus, the mutual impact of transference and counter-transference and their interaction were being developed at the same time by authors from different analytical cultures. We can clearly see the same discoveries emerging in different parts of the world, as if at some point, after a period of ripening, the fruit could be picked. The integration of different conceptions in the IRED makes it possible to highlight this kind of point, which cannot be done by reading each regional dictionary, which reflects its own culture.

The other way in which concepts circulate is not within the region but between regions, which is very striking with the concept of Psychoanalytic Field. These paths differ from region to region. The concept forged by the Barangers would arrive in Italy, France and Belgium, the Barangers being French and having kept links in France, but also through the arrival in the EU of LA psychoanalysts fleeing the military dictatorship, who brought these notions with them. I'm thinking of Haydée Faimberg and Luisa de Urtubey in France, and Jorge Canestri and Jacqueline Amati-Mehler in Italy. In addition, Nino Ferro enriched this concept by incorporating Bion's ideas on transformations. At the same time, Roosevelt Cassoria in LA linked the field to dreams and Bion ideas, while in NA, Robert Langs was the first NA analyst to be interested by Barangers' field concept. He incorporated the notion of the field and Bion's thinking in what he called the «bi-personal-communicative field». Here, ideas circulate from one region to another along these different paths, but they can at the same time converge and retain their specificity to the culture of the country.

One last point: I said at the beginning that Christine Diercks was unfortunately unable to work with Laurence and me on the transference concept. When we finished, we were told that the text sounded a bit too 'French thinking', even though we had introduced several British authors. I'm currently working with Michael Sebek on the notion of internalization and it's a new experience to see where our respective interests lie. I think it's important to be able to work with colleagues from different psychoanalytical cultures, not only between regions but also within the same region, in order to have the broadest possible view of the richness and evolution of each concept.

I hope I've shared with you the pleasure of participating in this major project and what each new concept we work on can bring us. Thank you for your attention.

\*\*\*

**DIMITRIS JACKSON**

IRED EU Contributor

### ***IRED'S UNIFYING PLURALITY OF PSYCHOANALYSIS***

When Arne Jemstedt first contacted me back in 2016 if memory serves, to ask me if I would like to participate in this new project, the Inter-Regional Encyclopedia

Dictionary, I thought to myself ‘Oh no not another dictionary’. But Arne and I went back a long way and so I thought, ‘why not...why not give it a go’. However, quite soon after becoming involved with the first entry, ‘containment’, it started to dawn on me that there was more to IRED than meets the eye.

Let me backtrack somewhat. Some years ago, Wallerstein posed the question ‘One psychoanalysis or many?’ arguing in favor of accepting the plurality of approaches within our discipline. Sandler a little later, pointed out that the formal theories we adopt do not necessarily conform to our internal theories, the ones we call forth when we actually practice psychoanalysis. This is something David Tuckett has also taken up with the Working Party of Comparative Clinical Methods, something I was involved with some years back and where I had first met Arne. As a personal example, let me say that the direction I took after qualification was within a Kleinian context and this continues. However, I also find many of Winnicott’s ideas clinically useful and use them in my work. For example, the idea of destruction and survival of the object is central in both Winnicott’s paper on ‘The Use of an Object’ as well as Klein’s movement from the paranoid-schizoid position to the integration of the depressive position (something Jan Abrams has recently pointed out in her book ‘The Surviving Object’). Such points of convergence and divergence are important in my work, although these are not always ‘neat and tidy.’ Finally, I could also point to the work of Meltzer, Bick and Tustin, analysts brought up in the Kleinian tradition, but whose work with autistic patients, made them realize that there may be a phase prior to that where projective identification becomes functional, prior to the recognition of mental space and three dimensionality. This too, I see as bringing them closer to Winnicott’s position. Major differences do of course remain.

The point I am trying to make is that as in physics, where Newtonian physics and quantum theory, rather than cancelling each other out, sit side by side, each useful within its own context, similarly in psychoanalysis, we will probably never have a unified field theory, psychic reality is too complex and multilayered to fit within one all-encompassing theory. What IRED attempts to achieve, is to lay out our theories in full view, even though some may not sit comfortably side by side, and allow analysts, the younger ones in particular, to make their own synthesis if they so choose, while gaining clinical experience over time.

The importance of IRED is that it makes no attempt at integration, it simply brings together the main viewpoints on a particular topic, leaving the work of integration, if that

is what is sought, up the reader. This is particularly important for candidates, who unfortunately are often told what and how they should think, rather than developing a capacity for ‘remaining in uncertainties and doubt’ as Keats put it, or in Bion’s terms, being openminded as ‘without memory and desire’. This allows younger colleagues to develop in their own way, which after all is or should be, a basic tenet of psychoanalysis...that of freedom of thought.

For those of us who have been involved in IRED, the process itself, that of writing from one’s own perspective, sending this out to other colleagues to review, and then looking again at what one has written, can be an enriching and creative experience. Contributions come from all three regions and from a variety of authors. This is important because our judgment can be distorted by our narcissistic investments in theory and in our predecessors. This was recently brought home to me when I submitted for initial review by colleagues what I had considered a balanced contribution to a particular topic, only to find that someone else’s ‘third eye’ or ear, saw that my contribution was not quite as balanced or impartial as I had imagined.

Now, coming up with a balanced and comprehensive entry is no easy task. Not only do we have different metapsychological approaches, but also a variety of different writing styles. How to end up with an entry that is coherent, readable and reflects the diversity of approaches, rather than being a patchwork and babble of tongues, is a challenge. This is a challenge that IRED must come to terms with.

Whether we meet this challenge and are able to produce a text which will be of value to analysts now and in the future, will be up the readership to decide, through its use and application over time. Since it is over time, that some, but not all psychoanalytic approaches will prove to be of equal value. I referred previously to Wallerstein’s call for acceptance of plurality, but plurality does not mean that all theories are or will be equally relevant. That would lead to a kind of ‘anything goes’ approach, which would obliterate differences through a kind of destructive homogenization where everything is the same, and nothing has real meaning. Clearly, there are many different approaches to psychoanalysis, but then would come the question, what makes us distinctive and sets us apart from other psychotherapeutic modalities, while still acknowledging our differences? This by the way, is a fundamental question that at the IPA we are constantly confronting. Once again, I refer to Bion, who pointed out that psychoanalytic theory, as opposed to philosophical treatise is **made to be used**, and through its use, its value greater or lesser will be established.

Yet, another challenge we face, is how best to promote IRED as a basic teaching aid in our training institutions. I believe that beyond paying lip-service to it, I would not be surprised if we come across resistance to using IRED as a basic teaching text, where a particular approach is presented as the ‘true psychoanalysis’, as opposed to other so-called ‘dissident’ approaches. And this by the way, leads to the unfortunate byproduct of authoritarianism in our training system and institutions. But this is not the time or place to go into this now. Resistance to ‘difference’ is of course, both an individual as well as a group related matter. But beyond preaching freedom of thought, I wonder how often we do actually practice it in our institutions?

And finally, there is the challenge of change. Psychoanalysis is in a state of continuous change. From its inception, and that of making unconscious memory conscious, to the dream as the ‘royal road’ to the unconscious, to focusing on the transference in a one-person psychology and then shifting to the transference/countertransference interaction of a two-person psychology, and from there from an emphasis on past events to the dynamics of the ‘here and now’ in the session. Psychoanalysis is evolving, although this may seem imperceptible, as this evolution becomes evident only by taking the long view over time. I think that IRED has a significant role to play by bringing this evolution to light under one banner, and argues against what is sometimes heard, that psychoanalysis has reached a dead-end, having nothing more of significance to offer.

I believe that IRED is a valuable contribution and one we are able to offer the next generation of analysts, who will take psychoanalysis forward, in which direction we do now know, but always in a search for truth... the truth contained within psychic reality. If psychoanalysis is ‘an impossible profession’, then IRED is an impossible publication in its conception and actualization, yet one which is well worth our best efforts.