



Models of Therapeutic Action Spring 2018

Section I: Janet Witte, MD, MPH

Section II: Michele Baker, M.D. and Janet Noonan, LICSW

Section III: Frances Arnold, Ph.D. and Trude Kleinschmidt, M.D.

This course we will explore the question of how psychotherapy helps people change. It is not obvious why sitting and talking to another person should be helpful in symptom relief or character transformation. Although psychoanalysis has always emphasized the role of insight in change, it became clear to Freud and his followers that insight alone often did not lead to change. What else is necessary? In recent decades, theories about therapeutic action have centered on the importance of insight versus therapeutic relationship factors. More recently, the therapeutic influence of the treatment relationship has gained increasing specificity, clarity and importance. Different theoreticians have proposed different ideas, and we will look at a few. As we read these articles together, we hope that you will try to think about the following questions: What does this author think is helpful to patients? Is this one of the ways that I think I have helped my patients? Can I use this author's ideas in my clinical work? Does this article bring to mind any clinical vignettes, which either confirm or refute its arguments?

For our first class session, please bring your own vignettes or thoughts about your experiences of movement, or moments of change, in psychotherapy.

Session I: March 22 History and Fundamental Tensions: Relationship vs Insight, Experience vs Interpretation, and Evolving Theory

In this session, we will discuss the first person, retrospective account of an analyst's experience in two very different personal psychoanalyses - with two well-known British Object Relations Theorists, Fairbairn and Winnicott. This account brings into focus many of the themes and questions we will be exploring throughout this course: what are the respective roles of insight versus the therapeutic "relationship;" what makes for an effective and alive interpretation; what is the impact of the therapist's life and character; what is the role of mourning in the therapeutic process?

Guntrip, H. (1975). My Experience of Analysis with Fairbairn and Winnicott. *International Review of Psychoanalysis* 2: 145-156 [PEP Web Link](#)

Optional Reading:

Greenberg, J. (2011). Theories of Therapeutic Action and Their Clinical Consequences, In Textbook of Psychoanalysis, Gabbard, Litowitz and Williams (Eds.), Am. Psychiatric Publishing, Washington D.C., pps 269-282. [Available in the library. Check the reading folder or request from library@bps.org]

Session II: March 29 The Nature of Therapeutic Action

In this session, we will discuss two classic articles that consider the essential elements of therapeutic action. “Remembering, Repeating and Working Through” is considered is one of Freud’s best known “technique” papers. In it, he lays out his ideas about the importance of the patient’s communications through remembering and repeating in the transference, as well as ideas about the complex issue of resistance. The Strachey paper is a dense, but classic theoretical work which takes up Freud’s original ideas and elaborates on the role of resistance, considers the analyst’s function as a new good object who can alleviate the patient’s self-criticism, and attempts to define what makes for an effective interpretation that will lead to insight and change.

Freud, S. (1914). Remembering Repeating and Working Through. SE 12. pages 147-165. [PEP Web Link](#).

Strachey, J. (1969 reprint of 1934 article). The Nature of the Therapeutic Action of Psychoanalysis. Int J. Psychoanalysis. 50:275-292. [PEP Web Link](#)

Session III: April 12 Therapist as New Good Object

In this session, we will discuss articles that will consider the role and function of the analyst/therapist in regard to therapeutic action. Winnicott’s timeless paper takes up the difficulty and importance of tolerating and working with hate in the counter-transference, and the therapeutic action inherent in doing so. Loewald’s paper is a complex, but beautiful paper about the analyst/therapist’s function as a new good object, which presages intersubjective two-person theory, characterizing the analyst/therapist as “a participant observer,” and “a co-creator on the analytic stage.” Drawing from multiple theoretical perspectives - ego psychology, drive theory, developmental theory, and object relations - Loewald gives us a surprisingly modern account of how development resumes and leads to change. His ideas about transference as a life force, in which “ghosts may be brought alive....in order to be laid to rest as ancestors” is one of the more moving accounts in our literature.

Winnicott, DW. (1949) Hate in The Countertransference. Int. J. Psycho-Anal. 30:69-75. [PEP Web Link](#)

Loewald, Hans. (1960). On the Therapeutic Action in Psychoanalysis. Int J. Psychoanalysis. 41:16-33. [PEP Web Link](#)

Session IV: April 19 Defense Analysis and Self-Psychology

American Ego Psychology dominated psychoanalytic thinking from the post-World War II era, to the 1980's. Paul Gray is known as a leading founder of ego psychology's defense analysis technique and theory of therapeutic action. In this session, we will contrast his model of change action, focused on drives and resistance, with that of the self-psychologists who approach change from a very different direction - that of empathic immersion in the patient's affective experience and the therapist's function as a mirroring self-object.

Gray, Paul. (1990). The Nature of the Therapeutic Action in Psychoanalysis. JAPA. 38:1083-1098. [PEP Web Link](#)

Ornstein, Paul. (1988). Multiple Curative Factors and Processes in the Psychoanalytic Psychotherapies. Chapter 8 in *How Does Treatment Help: On the Modes of Therapeutic Action of Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy*. International Universities Press, 1988. Pages 105-126. [Available in the library. Check the reading folder or request from library@bpsi.org]

Optional Reading:

Terman, David. (2011). Self Psychology Chapter, In the *Textbook of Psychoanalysis* by Gabbard, Litowitz and Williams, Eds., Am. Psychiatric Publishing, Washington D.C., pps 199-210. [Available in the library. Check the reading folder or request from library@bpsi.org]

Session V: April 26 Listening to Process

What do we listen for when we listen to clinical process? What is the leading edge or lens we try to hear? In this session, we will compare Schwaber's approach, which privileges the leading affective edge and the patient's vantage point, with Roth's approach of listening for deep unconscious impulses, particularly aggression, as well as the ways the patient may resist the therapist's analyzing capacities.

Schwaber, Evelyn. (1990). Interpretation and the Therapeutic Action of Psychoanalysis. *Int J Psychoanalysis*. 71:229-240. [PEP Web Link](#)

Roth, P. (2001). Mapping the Landscape: Levels of Transference Interpretation. *IJP*. 82:533-543. [PEP Web Link](#)

Session VI: May 3 Something More than Interpretation - Contributions from Child Analysis

Child analysts have much to teach all of us about therapeutic action. In this session, we will discuss two, very different descriptions of analytic process and explore their equally different ideas about what brings about change. Herzog's paper demonstrates his talent as a complex theorist, who draws on multiple perspectives and is able to look at the role of intergenerational trauma, object relations and ego psychology in the moving account of his work with a precocious young girl. Harrison, also describing work with a traumatized child, shows us how a non-linear dynamic systems theory perspective might account for therapeutic process.

Herzog, J.M. (2005). Los Degradados: Out, down, dead: Transmitted and inflicted trauma as... Int. J. Psycho-Anal., 86:291-310. [PEP Web Link](#)

Harrison, A.M. and Tronick, E.Z. (2007). Contributions to Understanding Therapeutic Change: Now We Have A Playground. JAPA, 55/3: 853-874. [PEP Web Link](#)

Session VII: May 10 The Use of the Analyst's and Patient's Subjectivities

In this session, we will consider therapeutic action in light of the use of the analyst's subjectivity and its mutative interaction with that of the patient's. We will look at a seminal paper by Lew Aron, a founding relational theorist, in which he considers the importance and centrality of the patient's exploration of the analyst's subjectivity. We will also read a paper by James McLaughlin, a British Independent theorist, who explores the analyst's regressions, during treatment, and the mutative impact of the analyst/therapist's insights into this part of his own subjectivity.

Aron, L. (1991). The patient's experience of the analyst's subjectivity. Psychoanalytic Dialogues 1: 29-51. [PEP Web Link](#)

McLaughlin, J.T. (1988). The Analyst's Insights. Psychoanal Q., 57:370-389. [PEP Web Link](#)

Optional Reading:

Kite, J. (2008). Ideas of Influence: Impact of the Analyst's Character. PQ, 77:1075-1104. [PEP Web Link](#)

Session VIII: May 17 Therapeutic Field and Tensions

Field Theory is a relatively new area of interest in North American Psychoanalysis. Reading the Barangers, we will look at some basic concepts such as "the field," the jointly created narrative, the shared unconscious fantasy of the therapist/patient dyad, as well as the idea that both therapist and patient are attempting to come to terms with a shared emotional experience. In doing so, we will think about how these ideas may reshape our notions of therapeutic action. Drawing from Hoffman, we will think about the therapist's tensions from the field, and the dialectic between theory and analytic freedom.

Baranger, Madeleine & Baranger, Willy (2008) The Analytic Situation as a Dynamic Field. Int. Jour. Psychoanalysis., 89, 795-826. (Originally published, 1961-62, Rev. Urug. Psicoanal, 4(1), 3-54) [PEP Web Link](#)

Hoffman, IZ. (1994). Dialectical Thinking, Therapeutic Action in Analytic Process... Psychoanalytic Quarterly. 62:187-218. [PEP Web Link](#)

Optional Readings on Field Theory:

Ferro, A. (2002). The analytic dialogue: Possible worlds and transformation in the analytic field. In *The Analyst's Consulting Room*. East Essex: Brunner-Routledge. [Available in the library. Check the reading folder or request from library@bpsl.org]

Civitaresse, Giuseppe & Ferro, Antonino (2013) The Meaning and the Use of Metaphor in Analytic Field Theory. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, 33, 190-209. [PEP Web Link](#)

Session IX: May 24 The Challenge of Mourning

In this session, we will explore the nature and transformative role of mourning in the therapeutic process. We will consider the perspectives of two object relations theorists as they contrast mourning and melancholia, and acceptance versus denial, or a manic attitude, toward reality and loss. Finally, we will think about the relationship of these ideas to a sense of aliveness and deadness in life and in psychoanalytic process.

Ogden, T. H. (2002). A New Reading of the Origins of Object-Relations Theory. *Int. J. Psycho-Anal*, 83:767-782. [PEP Web Link](#)

Steiner, J. (2005). The conflict between mourning and melancholia. *Psycholanal Quarterly*, 73:83-104. [PEP Web Link](#)

Session X: May 31 Therapeutic Action: What does this mean and who is changed?

In this session, we will think about what happens between an analyst and patient that makes for an alive experience that is transformative for both, as well as the relationship between them. In doing so, we will read Al Margulies account of an analysis that began during his training and spanned the arc of his analytic development and maturity. Margulies explores the topic of how patient and analyst impact each other, and are both changed by the clinical experience.

Margulies, A., Orgel, S., Poland, W.S. (2014). After the Storm: Living and Dying in Psychoanalysis. *JAPA*, 62:863-905. [PEP Web Link](#)