

***Contemporary Psychoanalysis in America: Leading Analysts Present Their Work*, Edited by Arnold Cooper, American Psychiatric Publishing Company, Washington, DC, 759 pp., \$70.00.**

Our psychoanalytic field has changed radically these past 50 years. This reviewer grew up in times of schisms, of ideological power struggles by fighting schools of thought, which created an atmosphere hostile to new or, as they would be called, deviant ideas. But gradually ideological boundaries lost their animosity. Schools of thought became approaches with many variations. We are, though with great ambivalence, navigating in a sea of theoretical pluralism. This ambivalence is suddenly lifted off our shoulders. Arnold Cooper welcomes this change with open arms. Positive phrases abound: "The flowering of ideas: our willingness to embrace new ideas and new research efforts"; "the magnitude of innovation and experimentation that is now acceptable"; "have released great bursts of creativity"; "ideas and practices that were considered heretical just a few years ago are today accepted or at least seriously considered within the mainstream" (p. xiii). But how can one adequately present such a rich pluralism of ideas and approaches? Cooper meets this daunting task by asking 30 established leaders in the field to contribute the paper they each thought best represented his or her current thinking or his or her major contribution. The editor wisely refrains from grouping them according to any kind of classification, and instead lists them alphabetically by author. Each chapter is preceded by a short biographical sketch, as well as an explanation by the author indicating why he or she chose this particular paper. These invariably interesting explanations help to immediately orient the reader.

A brilliant detailed introduction by Peter Fonagy helps to guide the reader to areas of interest. Half of the papers aim at the systematization of theory, making distinctions and identifying convergences either in general theoretical abstractions or by focusing on specific developmental, cultural, or clinical concerns. The other half relate to clinical practice, subdivided by Fonagy by highlighting issues such as elements of the therapeutic countertransference and the analytic context, the analyst's basic attitude, and the intersubjective models of the clinical process. Fonagy's title of his introduction, "Walking Among Giants," well reflects the high quality of the papers, their clarity, their accessibility, and their freshness of approach. My review can only offer some tidbits that may entice the reader. My selections are necessarily subjective and my summaries sketchy. I felt much apprehension when first confronting this awesome volume (as one might walking among giants), but then as

my reading journey progressed, I became more and more enthusiastic. I felt less awed, more befriended and affirmed.

Two authors, Fred Pine and Otto Kernberg, attempt an overview of the different theoretical persuasions in our field with a hope of achieving some integration or at least highlighting some convergences. Kernberg points to three major currents of psychoanalytic technique, namely the "mainstream" school, represented by the gradual integration of the ego psychology, the Kleinians, and the Independent British approaches; the relationists' school, represented by a combination of the interpersonal, intersubjective, and self psychological approaches; and the French school, represented by the non-Lacanian French approaches. His paper attempts to spell out significant rapprochements and significant divergences of these schools of thought. A brilliant, orienting and instructive paper!

Fred Pine's paper delineates the "Four Psychologies of Psychoanalysis and Their Place in Clinical Work." He refers to the psychologies of drive, ego, object relations, and self. Though outlining their different characteristics, Pine proposes that all four psychologies are part of a single psychoanalytic theory of mind. Pine's presentation is remarkable for its clarity, for reflecting his ability to bring theoretical abstractions into the realm of clinical experience. Theoretical abstractions, he states, define and differentiate, while clinical experience is a ground where we can meet.

Robert Wallenstein comes to similar conclusions in his paper, "One Psychoanalysis or Many." He believes that our common clinical work rests on our basic clinical theory of transference, resistance, conflict, and defense. He further expresses his challenging belief that our general pluralistic theoretical perspectives, within which we try to construct general development, represent mainly our cherished scientific metaphors that mostly satisfy our needs for closure and coherence. This is a realm of its own, containing what George Klein calls unnecessary general theories that we should cast out. We should perform a "theorectomy." Many of us would welcome such a daring operation, but, as Ethel Spector Person reminds us in her paper, our desire to create or to submit to ideologies and thus gain power will most likely predominate.

Robert Michels joins this chorus that hopes to impart a different perspective to theory-making. He explains his choice of his paper, "Psychoanalytic Theories." He writes: "As I have become less and less certain of the validity of psychoanalytic theories, I have become more and more convinced of their importance to our work. In this paper I address that apparent paradox" (p. 402). He refers to Freud having said that the right abstract ideas produce order and clarity to the raw material of observation. Theories, he states, are essential to codify and crystallize what has

been learned. Without theories the field cannot progress. Yet theories remain only guidelines for approaching ever-new clinical material. Apart from knowing the public theories in their field, psychoanalysts also create their own subconscious fragmented theories that have arisen from successful clinical experience.

One of the most exciting and important papers (to this reviewer) is by Daniel Stern, in co-authorship with the Boston Change Process Study Group. The paper, "Some Implications of Infant Observations for Psychoanalysis," gives an overview of infancy studies that affirm the existence of intersubjectivity from birth on. We naturally try to seek out the experiences in others that we can resonate with. Our mental life is co-created. This continuous co-creative dialogue with other minds is referred to as the intersubjective matrix. Mirror neurons as well as adaptive oscillators have been discovered providing some neuro-biological mechanism that creates intersubjectivity. Mirror neurons allow us to participate in another's action without having to imitate it. This system is particularly sensitive to goal-directed actions. Adaptive oscillators help to perceive and adapt to the speed of incoming signals, facilitating coordinated movements with others. Research shows that preverbal infants are especially sensitive to the behavior of other humans. The capacity for intersubjectivity grows and expands as the infant grows. Evidence for this capacity becomes dramatic when compared with the responses from autistic children who do not mirror behavior. The overview of research findings leads to Stern's incisive, clear delineation of the implication of these findings for psychoanalysis. Our traditional phases of infant and child development disappear. Attachment/being with and separation/individuation are continuous simultaneous tasks that exist parallel throughout our life. The most important implication is the existence of implicit knowledge. Infants remember and form representations of complicated social and affective situations long before their verbal symbolizing functions have evolved. The realm of the "nonconscious," a term Stern prefers to "unconscious," can be divided into three areas: a) the dynamic unconscious, b) the preconscious, and c) the implicit, which is not conscious because it resides in a different system that is non-symbolic and nonverbal, but not repressed. This implicit area is vast and constitutes the most important domain of psychoanalysis. Its level of enactive representation encodes the most profound aspects of human experiences, including elements of conflict, defenses, and affective resistances. This paper is like a breath of fresh air. New evidence gives us new perspectives with profound clinical significance, evidence that is scientifically grounded.

I would like to draw your attention to one other important paper, "Knowledge and Authority: The Godfather Fantasy," by Ethel Spector

Person. She highlights the important role of our innate drive for power, our ambivalent relations to authority, our tendency to embrace ideologies, and our quests for transcendent meaning of life—topics that have not been inadequately dealt with in our psychoanalytic literature. These drives characterize human history and cannot be solely explained by attention to fears and traumas of childhood. Person defines power as a drive, a motivational force, an innate force as important as sex, bonding, and aggression. Its earliest manifestation is self-assertion, self-will. It co-exists with an opposite desire to belong, submit, to surrender, creating an ever-varied vital dynamic in each individual, as well as in cultures past and present. We tend to yearn for the protective power of God, or we seek to have the power of a god, or we give a mere mortal the cloak of godly power. The desire for certainty and transcendent meaning of life, generated by our sense of vulnerability as well as by our fears of death and oblivion, is evidenced in our fierce attraction to ideologies, be they religious beliefs or other schools of thought, an attraction too often leading to a fanatic willingness to kill or die for one's belief.

Cooper brilliantly achieved an almost impossible task of selecting those authors and their papers that represent the exciting vanguard of contemporary psychoanalysis. This is a very important book that opens up a completely affirmative perspective of the often disturbing pluralism we encounter in our psychoanalytic enterprise. Such open-minded perspective will enhance our communications with each other, stimulate our curiosity, and thus enrich our creative quests and functioning in our challenging field.

Marianne Eckardt, MD
Laguna Woods, California