

clinical "peer group" workshops dealing with non-verbal communication for analysts not coming from clinical backgrounds, theoretical workshops related to creativity; the addition of more courses relating to the treatment of children and adolescents; a course on "psychoanalysis and the law" in the training institute.

The area of "community outreach" included: activities that would appeal to women who are interested in self-development; Workshops for parents suggesting analytic developmental understanding; Workshops related to "learning" anxiety and "math" anxiety for children; The formation of a committee to encourage contacts with other professionals such as lawyers, sociologists, and physicians; A directory of Members and Members-in-Training, which would reveal special training analysts; And contact with educators and encouragement of psychoanalysts to work with other professionals in the field of literature and psychoanalysis.

There was great interest in the development of a mechanism for an "outreach" program from N.P.A.P. and a continuation of interaction between Members and Members-in-Training. Also, a Speaker's Bureau; and preparation for "grant" proposals to aim at specific patient populations.

As President Sy Coopersmith spoke to the participants, everyone had the feeling of the wide range of talent and interest which accepted Theodore Reik's dream which would bring together analysts from all areas of human relations, pursuing their creativity and the varied aspects of the human condition. The day seemed particularly appropriate as psychoanalysis confronts the 1980's and the areas of interest prophetically touched on these areas recorded in Psychoanalysis in the Future - A Centurian Commemoration of the Birth of Sigmund Freud, published by N.P.A.P. in 1957.

#### PERSPECTIVES ON TECHNIQUE

by Gerald J. Gargiulo\*

#### Reflections on Psychoanalytic Supervision

Last night I happened to see a rebroadcast of the Channel 13 study of the life and works of painter Georgia O'Keefe. While admiring the extraordinary sophistication of form and color evidenced by her Arizona studies, I was struck by what she said about how she learned to paint such distinctive landscapes. Of course, she said the obvious; that's why, I suspect, it was so appealing. She remarked that she was not going to continue painting, at one period of her life, although it was her chosen profession since age twelve because, at that time, she wondered why she should want to paint a still life or landscape better than her teachers, particularly since she admired them so much. They painted well, and she wondered, now in retrospect, what would it mean for her to simply paint well, like them. The obvious issue was her finding her own voice, her own style, her own way of making form fill a space beautifully. Of course, when she found her style, over which she struggled all of her life, it was distinctive, creative, and original, and thus in the best tradition of great painting. Having found her own voice, uniquely, she joined the great artists of history.

The parallel with psychoanalytic supervision is clear, to my mind, anyway. The problem is similar; the solution more troubling, since our students cannot throw away patients as they might a canvas. How, then, can we make it possible for our students to find their own voice?

I have found it helpful as a teacher to realize that when we supervise a case we are, in fact, only supervising the student analyst, not the case. We do not hear the patient, only the student; and, therefore, we can help the student hear the patient better if we show him how we hear his retelling of the analytic process. All too often the student brings in a case with the emphasis on telling us just what the patient said, and then asking what would we do in such and such a situation, what we would do in his shoes. To respond to this at face value might guarantee mastered technique, but I don't think it will help creativity. Somehow the supervisor must find a way of offering his approach as a suggestive model without imposing it as a didactic necessity. Good artists have a mastered technique, and the same must be true of analysts. Clearly, there is a science of hermeneutics, a science of meaning, of construction, reconstruction, and inferential meaning which all analysts must master, repeatedly.

These are serious issues, and I don't believe there is an easily formulated solution. We have to teach students how to paint their own styles, yet they must know what they are doing if they are going to be professionals. Professionalism, I suspect, is more easily delineated by what not to do, but even this is clearly ambiguous. Perhaps one of our pragmatic conclusions might be to be particularly sensitive to the phrase, "My supervisor said to do such and such" because it means the student has not been helped to find a mode of communication with his patients which enables therapeutic play to become a reality. This can come about when a student has been trained to experience and contain, understand and filter out the patient's projective identifications. The handling of projective identifications becomes one of the most significant aspects of a student's growth in mastering analytic neutrality and therapeutic empathy. Therapeutic empathy means understanding the difference, for one, between sharing what is intimate to the analyst with the patient--a practice which generally leads to serious countertransferential complications--and what is personal to the analyst, the telling of which, given a therapeutic judgment, would not feed oedipal curiosity or be experienced as developmentally intrusive by the patient. There is always the temptation, it bears repeating, as supervisors or control analysts, to simply tell a student analyst how to handle a case, rather than focus on how he should handle himself with a given type of patient. Andre Green, in his article, "The Analyst, Symbolization and Absence", reminds us that "an analyst cannot practice psychoanalysis and keep it alive by applying knowledge. He must attempt to be creative to the limits of his ability." All of which means we have to help the student analysts see their landscapes differently.

And other matters . . . .

I don't know if the above is helpful, but perhaps it is enough for one to do further thinking on. I would like to add something more on psychoanalytic technique of a more practical nature. I would like to suggest that as analysts we think about the option of having a "patient's will," so to speak. We are all aware of how suddenly and unexpectedly we have lost respected colleagues. I think it might be helpful for us to make a list, at least every year, of our patients and which colleagues we would like to recommend to them in the case of our sudden death. I think such a list should be kept in our office, and one or two of our colleagues should know where it is and be asked to convey our thoughts to our patients. Such a procedure might be helpful to our patients in a time of traumatic loss and, as long as it is handled sensitively and not in an authoritarian manner, it could have advantages over the well meaning, yet unfamiliar, recommendations of colleagues. Our unconscious may have difficulty coming to terms with our own death, but that need not stop us from making some conscious provisions for it.

\*copyright Gerald J. Gargiulo 1980

\*\*\*\*\*

## NOTES