

Carlos Moguillansky is Full Member and Training Analyst of APDEBA; FEPAL and IPA. He was Scientific Secretary and former President of APDEBA. Member of the Board of the Int. Journal of Psychoanalysis and current Member of the IPA Publications Committee. Author of many papers and books, published in Argentina, Armenia, Germany, México, Spain and UK.

My contribution will be short, as I only edited the book and the authors deserve to have now the opportunity to share their ideas. This book offers an unusual debate. In the first place, a debate on the meaning of the Spanish term encuadre. This discussion seems to be academic, but it conceals a political controversy about what is meant by psychoanalytic practice. I believe that some authors are going to refer to this in this meeting. Second, the pandemic brought the issue of remote encuadre to the fore. All analysts wonder what to do with the difficulties that remote contact offers. And with the new possibilities offered by the internet for contact between different regions of the planet. Bleger did not invent the term encuadre, but he questioned it as an important clinical factor. He problematized the role of invariance in clinical practice. And he showed some effects when this invariance is broken. These examples showed the silent place of the encuadre as a repository of conflictive denied aspects of the patient and the analyst.

Its title is already controversial. How to translate the Spanish term encuadre, as frame or as setting? Why can't we use the notions of limits and scope? These little nuanced differences in translation lead to different ways of thinking about psychoanalysis and different ways of practicing it. The reader of this book will find this debate open in the light of clinical exemplifications that illustrate the way of thinking of each author. And you will even see the controversies that these different versions generate in the discussion. Behind the debate on translation, there are other elements at stake. Is the environment or the establishment a fixed institution? Should the encuadre take over the contact function of communication? Should the encuadre be the repository of the denied aspects of the personality? Is the encuadre the context of the discourse in the psychoanalytic dialogue?

I think that the development of this debate merits more the use of the term and than the use of the term or. We need to add and see the different versions in perspective instead of creating an opposition or a fight between them, because each position establishes a point of view, but also adds details, synonyms and nuances that deepen the problem as a whole. In

order to solve the problem in the future, we cannot miss any details. The encuadre described by Bleger was remarkable because he could see that it was a fixed establishment. But we must not forget that the encuadre evolves, when the patient is able to survive the tumult of this earthquake, when the encuadre is mobilized.

Finally, anyone has the right to read a text as one likes. But it seems to me it is not a good method the use of other author ideas to back or authorize one's own.