

Friday Seminars

Paula Gillespie-Fotheringham: On Self-care: A Creative Approach

Friday 13 September, 6.30pm-8.30pm, free to members, £7.50 to non-members

Venue: The Manchester Institute for Psychotherapy, 454 Barlow Moor Road, Chorlton, Manchester M21 0BQ.

As therapists we focus on the needs and wellness of our clients. Our role can sometimes lead to a depletion of our own energy. This seminar will give attention to how we can both care for ourselves and consider our clients. There will be an experiential element to the evening, no experience of art making is needed - just an openness take part in image-making and discussion.

Paula Gillespie-Fotheringham founded Manchester Art Psychotherapy early in 2011. She has worked extensively with children and young people, particularly around issues of attachment, trauma and self-harm, together with adult work focusing on BPD, DID and attachment based difficulties. Paula worked for over 10 years in mental health settings, including the NHS and Social Services. Prior to building her private practice, Paula held the post of Head of Therapy at a private psychiatric hospital. She is an Art Psychotherapist registered with the Health & Care Professionals Council (HCPC) and accredited by the British Association of Art Therapists (BAAT) to work both as a supervisor and private practitioner.



Autumn Seminars

After our break in August the NWRPA returns for a series of three Friday evening seminars between September and November 2013. We are arranging speakers for October and November now, so watch this space or go to our Website.



Amelia Mangani

The Function of Money in the Analytic Treatment.

Friday 12 July 2013

Our thanks to Amelia for this fascinating talk. She is a consultant clinical psychologist in the NHS and a psychoanalytic psychotherapist in private practice in south Manchester. As she has experience of both private practice and working in the NHS what she had to say was very relevant to all the therapists in our audience. Those who practised therapy where money changes hands and those where it does not directly change hands.

She began by saying that money is difficult to conceptualise and talk about. Money is very abstract. It has little intrinsic value, a piece of metal, of paper, a number somewhere in cyberspace. Its value depends on its support in social relationships and the institutional powers which declare its worth as legal tender.

Amelia is from the large psychoanalytic community in Argentina. She is versed in Freudian and Kleinian analysis but comes to this subject from a Lacanian perspective.

Non-Lacanian analysts offer the conventional fifty minutes for a session for a set fee. With the variable length session Lacanian psychoanalysts abolished the direct relation between the sessional fee and the length of the session. The logic here is that the bulk of the analytic work continues after the analyst ends the session. This difference in technique was sufficiently serious to be a reason for Lacanians leaving the International Psychoanalytic Association.

In his *Observations on transference-love: technique of psycho-analysis (1915)* Sigmund Freud said that real life does not offer a template for analysis and that we cannot apply the same way of interacting with each patient. This also applies to money in analysis. In our real life money is what we charge for our professional services. It is what we use to pay for our trainings and in maintaining our professional and personal life. He said people are happy to pay, say, a music teacher a set fee. But not the fee for a Doctor where the relationship is confused by an expectation of compassion.

Analysis is an unusual profession in that the patient comes to receive a service but the work is done by the patient. In an analogy for analysis Freud says the main aim of the surgeon is to

operate which is beyond compassion. For Lacan the desire of an analyst is to facilitate the person to speak of their suffering. In a parallel with Freud's evenly suspended attention Lacan advocated that the analyst suspend their desire and for this to remain ambiguous to the patient. This approach has been described as the most austere form of psychoanalysis.

Money is treated in analysis like sexual matters. It is treated by the analyst with the same frankness as sexual matters and by the patient with elements of hypocrisy and shame. There is also the well known Freudian association of money with faeces.

Money is not neutral, both for patient and analyst. It has meaning for each patient. Money is a signifier whose meaning is to be worked through in the transference.

Amelia gave case examples of the meaning of money emerging during analysis. I will not include this material here. However it was clear how important the payment or withholding of the sessional fee can become in analysis. It also seems that the meaning of money for the patient is part of the meaning of money in their families and hence a complex part of their sense of their developmental history.

If I have followed Amelia correctly the analyst will usually keep scrupulously to their contract with clients. This includes how payments are to be made, the arrangements for cancelled sessions and so on.

Her vignettes also showed how money becomes part of the transference. Money is a signifier of something that is at stake for the patient. For example non-payments of fees can be defensive and part of the resistance and arguments over money with the analyst can illuminate the ways in which conflicts play out in a patient's family. Or indeed the place of money in the sessions is related to the place of money in the patient's wider culture. For example where women have no financial independence then the fee may well be paid by a male family member. Here the analyst can also end up occupying the same financially dependent position as the patient.

Some of our members at this meeting are not in private practice and do not have fees paid directly by their clients. Amelia's talk was sufficiently complex and rich to prompt our thoughts about the place of money in all kinds of therapy. For example clients may have fantasies about how wealthy their therapist is. Money is still involved as the therapist is paid by the State, or an insurance company and so on. And of course both client and therapist may have thoughts about the value of what is being offered. Would you double your usual fee for an obviously wealthy client, or reduce it for someone with less?

Freud's idea that compassion may seem incongruous with being paid a professionally respectable wage may haunt both patient and therapist. It also seems that therapists may have a great ambivalence about their own wealth particularly with clients who have dramatically less or dramatically greater wealth than they do.

As an aside can I add that I am still trying to work out the complexities that Amelia talked about. This is partly through my finding the Lacanian approach to psychoanalysis difficult to grasp. It is more because she offered so much. If I may use a confused metaphor about money and food, it is rather like paying for a snack and being served with a banquet.

Contact the Association:

Frank Kelley, Secretary NWRPA, 53 Milford Drive, Levenshulme, Manchester M19 2RY

Phone: 0161 432 8653 (Evenings)

Email: nwrpa2010@ntlworld.com

Website: www.nwrpa.org.uk
