Frances LaBarre

Proactive Mindfulness May 2009

Dr. Frances La Barre is a psychologist and psychoanalyst working with children and adults, families and couples in private practice in New York City. She teaches and supervises at the Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy Study Center, The Institute for Contemporary Psychotherapy, and The Center for Somatic Studies, and has frequently presented her work in the United States and Italy. She is a member of the International Association of Relation Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy. Her clinical work integrates psychoanalysis with her studies of nonverbal research. Her approach is multi-disciplinary, drawn from the fields of psychology, sociology, anthropology, and neuroscience. Dr. La Barre's clinical and theoretical perspective is presented in her book, *On Moving and Being Moved, Nonverbal Behavior in Clinical Practice*, (Analytic Press, 2001), and in articles including "The Kinetic Transference and Counter-transference" (*Contemporary Psychoanalysis*, April, 2005), "Stuck in Vertical" (*Psychoanalytic Dialogues*, May-June, 2008), and "Movement Theory and Psychoanalysis," forthcoming.

Serge Prengel, LMHC is the editor the *Proactive Mindfulness* project.

For better or worse, this transcript retains the spontaneous, spoken-language quality of the podcast conversation.

Serge Prengel: So we're going to talk about your work as a psychoanalyst and also somebody who's very interested in movement, and it must have been quite a journey to get there?

Frances La Barre: Well it was, yes, yea. I would say about a forty-year journey, but maybe longer since I've been dancing since I was three.

S P: Wow. So it started with movement?

F LB: It did, yes. In fact, if I go back that far, it started with a teacher who was very creative in using movement with children to help them understand themselves, so I would say she was probably the beginning.

S P: Ah.

F LB: But maybe that's too much to go into right now.

S P: So at some point you…

F LB: So, yes I was a dancer. I left college, well, I had a lot of interests – one was biology and the other, dance… and who would've thought that they went together, but I did find a way. And so when I left college, I wanted to dance, but also I was teaching nursery school and teaching children and adults dance, and gradually that evolved into having a greater interest in children's psychology and adults' psychology and how that relates to the body, and body movement, in particular. And I was fortunate to have come out of college in the 70's, and then there was a huge amount of exploration in nonverbal behavior going on, and a great deal of research going on, which sadly

ended pretty much in the 80's--except that it was sort of kept going by infant research. But just backing up, so there I was dancing and exploring mind-body therapies and mind-body theories in the 70's when you could, you know, trip over dancers—there were so many dancers and companies in New York City, and I was among them. So let me see, from there, though, I got more and more interested in the children that I was working with and in adults that I was working with as a movement therapist, and decided that I would study as a psychologist and eventually also as a psychoanalyst.

S P: So you had to go to psychology and psychoanalysis?

F LB: Yes. I mean, for me, that was what I wanted to do because I was very curious about what, I guess you would say, what underlies the phenomena. I had started out, as I said, I was a teacher, so I studied early the way in which children's body styles reflected their cognitive styles, and how they approached learning and that was the first paper that I did at Bank Street College, and then went on to study psychology.

S P: Yeah. So as you then went on to study psychology and to study psychoanalysis and become a psychoanalyst, did you for a moment maybe transition away from this emphasis on movement, and only later rediscover it?

F LB: Yes, there was a period of time when, certainly in my training period, when I was trying to learn what my teachers had to teach me… At that time, most psychoanalysts were still very involved primarily with what is conveyed in words: and looking at word content, word associations, fantasy, imagery, that kind of thing. And not that they weren't also at times interested in body phenomena, the symbolism of the body and so on… but that was always kind of a side. The main focus was what were people saying, and what did it mean? And what did their dreams mean and what did their fantasies mean and understanding the transference. And, as I said, it was always a part of what psychoanalyst thought about, but never the central feature of it. So I learned what they had to offer and there was also a strictness when I began training, which has gone away, but there's still residues of it, which restricted really how the analyst could behave in the room. There's still that, to some extent for good reasons, perhaps, and I probably shouldn't go into this because it's too long of a story, but that affected me as well because, having been a movement therapist, of course, I was moving with people and using touch and it was a very different approach. So, now…

S P: So how did you rediscover movement as a psychoanalyst?

F LB: Right. Well, what I found was that the thing that psychoanalysts don't see, necessarily, is how much movement occurs when people speak. Now, part of that was because in the history of psychoanalysis, people were on the couch. But even when people are on the couch, there's a great deal of movement that occurs in their bodies, and between the body of the analyst and the patient, because words are movement, speech is movement—there's a rhythm, there's a tonality, there are changes in intensity, there are shapings of the body that occur, and that have an interactive impact that's really highly significant.

S P: So, the first step was actually not so much to reinvent or bring movement, but to find that it was already there, and simply notice it. And it was your ability to notice it where other psychoanalysts maybe wouldn't have?

F LB: Right, right. Not in the same way. As I said, they would notice things as an aside. Like Felix Deutsch early on looked at positions that patients took, but again it was seen in the lens of drive theory, so if the patient put his hands over his chest, it was seen as a defense against the wish to nurse, things like that. There were very sort of prescribed ways of seeing movement that occurred in line with Freudian theory, or in line with Sullivanian theory, or in line with object relations theory.

S P: Right, whereas you were noticing movement in line with being conscious about movement and not necessarily based on preexisting psychoanalytic theories?

F LB: Right. Right, actually what I did was I took a wide… I decided to study it… Actually, it was part of my doctoral work, to study a very wide range of nonverbal research that was not based in any psychoanalytic theory, and look at what that had to say about body movement in general and whether any of that was applicable. And of course it's all applicable. I also found that within psychoanalytic, within nonverbal research there were also disputes, similarly, along the lines of nature-nurture, mind-body, um, well maybe more primarily nature-nurture, that is what's innate in the body and what is learned. And there are big controversies about that in the literature. But, again, when you look at what psychoanalytic theories have to say about the body, and body movement meaning, and when you look at what nonverbal research has to say about it, what you find is that they talk about very different things. So they use… they find different pieces of action to look at; so that it becomes a question of putting it together as a whole. It's all complementary, not contradictory, as they might've wished. It's not a question of, well, looking at the same movement—it means two different things. We have a controversy then, but…

S P: Right, do you actually observe two different movements?

F LB: Two different aspects of movement, right. I think I got off the track of your initial question, but I think it had to do with…

S P: Well, we're, it's getting there. The question was, in a way, how did you come back to movement, having for a moment set it aside as you were a pure psychoanalyst?

F LB: Right, right. So what I found in the literature was a lot about the movement of conversation—there was a lot about what happens when people talk, and there's rapport versus argument. When there's… Well, that's one really important one. And then I looked at other kinds of theories that delineated temperament, and what's innate in the body. And then I looked for what that might mean to a person in treatment with me. So…

S P: So when you talk about temperament, for instance, as similar to character structures?

F LB: Right. Now character was understood, for example, by Reich as being imposed on a person… That the various restrictions you might see in a person were imposed by upbringing. The research that I looked at suggested that a lot of it was innate, but there was a nature-nurture, obviously, a combination of things that might further restrict or reinforce an early preference or limitation (I'll explain with an example), versus an environment that would help a child expand. But it wasn't that the restriction was imposed entirely, it was the person would use what was innately readily available both to…

S P: So, reinforce an innate tendency?

F LB: Yeah. So the person would use that innate preference, in a sense, to engage the world as well as to defend from assault. So that was a big eye opener, because you can't expect then always to change that so easily. Not that anybody ever thought it was so easy. But it gives you a different sense of what's really possible, and a different sense of respect for a person's defensive structures.

*S P: So there, we're in the middle of movement as part of the defensive structure? Not necessarily the same way as Reic**h** viewed it, but still in that mode, as opposed to movement as part of the natural flow of things that happens, in a way, regardless of a defensive structure?*

F LB: Right. So there's different layers. There's the movement that happens, just because it has to happen because it is part of… By the way, thinking and reaching words, the whole other conversation about what does it take to be able to think and speak, there's a whole bunch of movements that are required for that. Then there's the movement that expresses who I am, and who I am with you right now, and it isn't just defensive, but it's… I have a repertoire, I have my own repertoire of movements that I use, and you have your repertoire, and how do we come and share a repertoire?

S P: The interaction.

F LB: And what does that shared repertoire mean, and what's its extent, and can we expand it, or are we contracting it? You know, things like that.

S P: So, there is all this richness that exists in the middle of the talk therapy, of the conversation…What happens because of your background in movement, of your interest in reading about it in different ways… you develop the capacity to be more aware of it... So, was there a moment in your career as a psychoanalyst where there was an "aha", about using this? Or was this something that happened progressively? And at some point you noticed how were using more of that awareness of movement as part of your therapy?

F LB: I would say both. I mean, I think that I sort of embarked on a very… I decided to embark on a study of how did this go together… and in that, I studied with Judith Kestenberg and with Margaret Rustin London at the Tavistock. What I studied with Judith Kestenberg is the Kestenberg movement profile, and she studied with the Laban people. For those who are not familiar with it, it's a system of analysis of body movement to such a fine degree that it can be recorded and repeated. So it's like a musical score for the body. And the great advantage of that is you simply can talk about what is being done. It doesn't have a theory about what is being done, although one could say its phenomenological theory, because it breaks down movement in particular ways and I suppose one could do it in a variety of ways, and therein lies movement theory and questions of movement theory. But, in any case, for me it was… and I think for anybody… It's a highly detailed way to specify movement to such a degree that another person could repeat it. She used… she was a Freudian, and she worked with children and she used this… She devised this system of analyzing a child's movement, and then analyzing a parent's movement; and used it to help them understand the areas of clash and areas of merger of their movements… to help them both with differentiation if it was too merged, and help them attune to one another if it was too different. And she found that… She was one of the very early researchers who found that it was… how significant it was that a parent could physically attune to a child… that that made a huge difference in that child's feeling well-being and trust. Okay, so that was one piece of study that I did. And then I worked with Margaret Rustin.

Now, in England they have a system called infant observation, which I think now is so well regarded that every psychoanalyst in training goes through at least a year of doing infant observation. And what that means is the analyst goes to a newborn's home and for 45 minutes a week, just visits and watches and observes the parent and the baby, then goes out and writes and tries to record what they saw and experienced. And then they go to a seminar to discuss it. So I did that for two years here in the States, and used to send my recordings to Margaret in London, and we would have this dialogue. Now, what I found is, if I used the work that I was doing with Kestenberg as a way to help, it augmented my perception of what was happening. That is, I could really begin to see more of what was in the interactions when I thought about "oh! posture", or "oh! movement" qualities… or you know what is the relevant piece of information here?

S P: I want to just interject something in what you said. In that year of observation… if I understand correctly, it's just observation during that time. You're not giving any advice to parents, so there is the development of the ability to observe, and restrain from taking action. So the skill that you develop is that capacity to just observe… develop that ability to observe instead of just immediately acting from it.

F LB: Yes, and that's an immense skill, and I think I would really recommend it to anybody to do this. It doesn't have to be with a child, but with even an older person, maybe in nursing home. Someone who wouldn't mind, and would enjoy a visit. To just try watching and being with the person, or the baby, and then going away and writing what you saw. Now I evolved this into what I call writing the kinetic text. And I made a huge amount of discovery for myself about that. So, what that means is when I with a patient, and particularly if I get into situations where I'm uncertain about what's going on, I go away and I write the kinetic text. That is, I write out everything I can pull out about how did the person walk into the room, how did they sit, how did I sit, how did I move in my chair, how did I move, how was my postural change, what was my gesture like, what was the patient's gestures, what were they like, was there a shift in the session from… But I literally write it out as though I were writing a script, you know, or better: a script plus a choreographic record.

S P: Which obviously means that you have the capacity to observe, notice, remember those things, which to the untrained eye would just be things that flow away without being very much noticed

F LB: Exactly. But what I discovered both with myself, because what I do is I write this over maybe several days. I do one round with it, and then I go back and I read through it, and I add details that come to me as I'm rereading it. And then, that was interesting in itself that I could dredge up more information as I went along: That it was in my mind. And then when I worked with supervisees who are not trained to do this, and asked them to write a kinetic text, they first wrote one that was rather, you know, superficial—the patient walked in, sat down, you know? So then I'd say: well, how did they walk in, and I'd really sort of push them to get to more and more detail. And what they and I discovered was how great the detail was that they did have in their minds, that they weren't using… that it was there in their image of the person, all that detail, but they weren't able to access it, and therefore they couldn't use it to help them understand what was going on between them and the patient. So that was an immense aha moment, but it took many years of work to get to that point.

S P: Yes, to really discover that that is really at an implicit level, there's all this observation going on, but actually that's not used. And that, as you pay attention to it, it helps the therapist actually notice that they noticed much more than they thought they had.

F LB: Yes. Yeah, that they could really get at things… Maybe they would have an intuition somewhere about it but, really, that wasn't there much. I think this is the source of what we call intuition, but we're not used to understanding what that's based on.

S P: Right. So it's unpacking that little implicit process into something that's more intelligible?

F LB: Yes. Right. Exactly.

S P: So, we're talking about this in the context of bringing the interest in movement together with psychoanalysis… And it came from that very conscious decision, for you, to study people who had been paying attention to that, and apply this, and use very careful deliberate observation in your work?

F LB: Right. Exactly.

S P: So, in what way did you notice something changing in the kind of interaction you would have with patients? Is it something that was only for your own interpretation, your own sense of the patients, or did something start to evolve in the way you would interact with patients?

F LB: At first, I think it was just my own… for my own thinking. But that said, one of the things I thought was that when you understand something differently, you automatically behave differently. So, there's no… There's a seamlessness that goes between seeing something, and incorporating it, and how you move and behave and think… and then something else is occurring in the patient. So it's always difficult to pinpoint that. People say to me, "Well how do you use it?" I say, "How do I not use it?" It's not possible to not have an effect once you know something. Okay, but, you're asking about maybe more specific things…

S P: That's a very an important point.

F LB: It is an important point. I mean, even the task of searching for something with a patient creates a whole style of body interaction that is very distinctive and different, you know? Okay, but that said, what else do I do? I also use this information and try to engage people with it. I'll talk about, sometimes, how they tend to move, or how they might be afraid of moving. For example, I wrote about a patient in the paper on kinetic transference and counter-transference… I wrote about how I talked with her about her difficulty of sitting up and expanding wide in her chest, and feeling like she could be open and take on the world. And as I was telling her about this, I sort of demonstrated it, and could trust with her that she, somewhere in her, she would mirror that .I mean, we're now talking about mirror neurons and neuroscience. This was before we had heard about mirror neurons in humans. And, indeed, there would be a little shadow movement that she would do to kind of mirror me, and that over time got to be bigger. Of course, this was in the context of analyzing her relationship with her mother, and the way in which she caved in, and held back, and felt frightened and intimidated by people. So there were…

S P: So this was a case of you pointing out to her the quality of her movement, maybe the caving in, the tightening, and then, at the same time, demonstrating what opening up could be. And as you did, you noticed there was a tendency of her to follow you?

F LB: Yes, yes. There's a whole interesting sequence that, I found it fascinating, that I do report in that paper. One of the things I'm very careful about is I don't imitate patients necessarily, or without a lot of thinking, because I don't want to make them self-conscious about their movements… especially since the context in which they understand what they're doing with me is not that. They don't come to me as a body therapist, they come to me as a psychoanalyst. So, when I'm moving in that direction, I do it in a very sort of gingerly way. With her, I think the demonstration of that movement might have started out with demonstrating what her mother might have been like, and her difficulty of being like her mother. Her mother was big and out there and tough and intense. And she was small and retreated, and one of the things she discovered was she didn't want to be like her mother. because to her. being out there meant being big and tough and intense and too much.

S P: So you…You became too much…

F LB: In a sense. Just to say: Is this how she was like? And I did it, and saw when I was doing it, it already was not quite as big and intense and horrible, because I'm very tiny like she is, and can't be quite as intense as her mother was… but it was enough, so then she could follow me a little bit, and be able to say "Yes, that is what she is like." Get into it a little more… It was safer to be a little bit more like her mother, and then differentiate what was like her mother from what could be just enjoying bigness and being as out there as you could be and not intimidating other people.

S P: So, as you're using this as an example, it's not so much about movement in abstract as if movement could exist in abstract, but it's also related to the meaning this could have to the bigness, the bigness related to the mother, the mother related to the interpersonal relationship. So all of this being in a shortcut in the movement?

F LB: Yes. Yes, and otherwise one would have to talk about it in relationship to feelings and attitudes… which is also related, you know, the attitude of feeling sure of oneself and what movement goes with that… but if you don't get into the movement and you have people who are very restricted in movement, I think it's hard for them to get it. I think it's useful to be able to do movements and talk about movement and free associate with movement as much as we free associate with words. But I began in a very kind of careful way. I would say I still do that.

S P: Yeah. Yeah, so that was a beautiful example.

F LB: Oh good.

S P: So, you say you're still careful. So what's your sense of what you feel comfortable doing, what you feel not comfortable doing …

F LB: Well, it varies with patients, from patient to patient, you know? Some, first of all, now that I have written a lot on body, some of them come in knowing that I work with bodies, and think about bodies. And so they, themselves, are probably a bit inclined in that direction already, or very inclined in that direction. With those people I can do more, be very much more explicit about it. With others, I might invite, but I don't get a response. So there, I'm using it much more implicitly. I might do things that I might even… I both find myself doing things that are the reciprocal, or the opposite, of what the patient is doing. It just kind of happens as a matter of course, and then I'm watching a

response happen that I can then talk about with them. “Did you see what happened between us?” for example.

S P: So, just in doing that… Even in there, there’s already an interaction that exists and is different from the very traditional psychoanalysis, where you would just try to claim objectivity and neutrality and hiding because there is that interaction going on?

F LB: Right. And just let me interject that I think most psychoanalysts, certainly the ones that I know best in the relational camp, and I would say in many others, are, have recovered from that position... and are experimental, and are experimenting with what they can do and say, and how to be with people.

S P: So, in that sense, you don’t view your using movement as something that is outside the mainstream of contemporary psychoanalysis?

F LB: No, I don’t think so, and I don’t think that my colleagues would regard me in that way, though they would say I privilege movement more than many others and it’s just because I study it so much and know more, let’s say, than many other people would know.

S P: Yeah. So it’s part of a context where people are more experimental, and paying attention to a wider context of the relationship, what happens between the therapist and the client… and you have a particular vantage point in movement?

F LB: Right, right. Yes. Exactly. And I guess I have a language and a way of seeing that isn’t, well it’s not part of the training. I’d love it to be part of the training. I think it would be immensely useful for people to learn the basics of certain kinds of movement theory and nonverbal research, which is why I wrote my book. But it’s hard to learn in a book, entirely. You could learn a lot, but you need, you probably need more hands on and in-person learning.

S P: Yeah, so do you actually… Is that something you teach people?

F LB: Yes it is. I do. I train people just in supervision with me to use this idea of the kinetic text, and I sort of teach them the basics of… I mean, the concepts that I think are most valuable, at the moment, for psychoanalysis to understand, are how do we recognize temperament, and the kind of basic fundamental movements that every person does. So, I don’t know if you want me to go into this right now?

S P: Yes, that would be interesting. So, temperament is something that would go into that question of say the character structure or…And the other part is the vocabulary of movement and related to any question of defensive reactions or…

F LB: Right. Just ways of defining how do people move. The temperamental characteristics which were defined by Warren Lamb and Judith Kestenberg coming out of the Laban tradition. Warren Lamb developed something called action profiling where he delineates the dimensions of space that individual bodies use most, and he also defined something called posture gesture merger, which is… There are different kinds of movements. There are gestural movements, which are kind of peripheral to the body—a hand movement or a head movement. But, when it merges with a posture, that is to say, when the movement becomes part of spinal movement, that is your whole

body shapes in a particular way, that's called a posture gesture merger. And those movements, he thought, were very much at the core of one's repertoire.

S P: So… I just want to interject something there because it's a very interesting experience. We happen to be talking in front of each other and, as you were talking about the posture gesture movement, you had not only the hand movement but also the movement with your spine. And so, when I hear the 'sentence posture' gesture it might take me a moment to really get what it is, but just following your movement was an instant getting it, in a very powerful way. Very much to your point about how difficult it is to follow this without the in-person presence.

F LB: Yeah, yeah. Right, it is tricky, but, maybe someday I'll make a DVD…

S P: You should.

F LB: Anyways, so there are the three dimensions, when you think about it it's obvious—they're horizontal, and vertical and sagittal. So it's side to side and around. Flat horizontal plane, and then vertical is up and down, and then sagittal is forward and backward. And people tend to prefer one or two over three. In other words, they lean to one or two of the dimensions more than having all three, although there are people who have all three but they're rarer. And then there are aspects of how adaptable the person is. Can they move from one to the other easily, or not easily, and use different dimensions and different contexts as needed? He also talked about how the use of dimensions was related to action taking and thinking. So that the horizontal plane, which is this sort of wide, moving, flexible, focused: I'm looking around as I'm saying this and moving side to side and front to back, is very useful for exploration, looking for and seeking and seeing what's what. And then, the vertical, which is a narrowing into the body, getting in touch with your core, straightening up, is about forming an intention, what do I want, what do I want to do? And then the sagittal is about doing the action, getting on it, being operational. And that just makes a certain amount of logical sense. But in some ways, when I first read it, I was like, oh this is just really too pat. But then, when you really begin to actually look at people and think about them and what aspects of action do they prefer and what they're really good at, it really just opens so much about who they are, what their struggles are in the world and what their talents are. So, that's one element that I work with a lot

S P: And so, that's something that is a styl-- a question of style as an opposed to a pathology. But, on the other hand, it's something that tells you, because of this style, how a person is going to interact with the world?

F LB: Yes. And it's not neurotic. Its kind of rock, bedrock. Now it can get to be problematic because you engage in a culture that may demand something else of you, or your parents evaluate your talents and limitations in particular ways that become difficult. So, anyway, so that happens. But it is just part of who you are, and it has to be understood and respected, I think, so that you can work with it. If it's denigrated or exploited, that's the area where it becomes a problem that I have to deal with.

S P: Right. So, what it is, it's not something that's a clue to something that you need to correct, but it's a clue to understanding how a person views the world and interacts with it and a typology, in a way, of how people are going to react and engage the world in different ways?

F LB: Yes, yes. And then the other piece of temperament comes from Judith Kestenberg's work and she sort of noted… She started writing notation, she invented a notation to look at infant's changes of tension level and, what I mean by that is muscle tension, binding the muscle and freeing the muscle, so that level of tightening and releasing. And that changes all the time in our bodies, or it doesn't, and that's another, and that's one kind of tension style… and she delineated these qualities of movement and there are, I think, eight of them and, you know, I could name around three—gradual change, or abrupt change or, even, tension or flow-fluctuating tension that changes all the time, and you really can see this in people, as well as see how well they can adapt their basics.

S P: In people, not just in infants?

F LB: Not just in infants. This is something that stays in us life-long and it's there all the time. And the other thing, let me just think for a minute, I feel like I'm forgetting something.

S P: That's okay, that's okay. So, part of what's happening there, when you were saying earlier, that this Labanotation, it's a notation, it's not a theory, but, certainly in the case of these tensions, there is an implicit theory there, because instead of just calling it tension, recognizing the different kinds of tension opens up a totally new field that you don't have when you just consider that it's just tension.

F LB: Right, and it's not, I'm not quite sure what you mean actually?

S P: Well, I mean by that that there's… it's not, you know, it's not just oh by the way, it's just different… But by paying attention to it and noticing the differences, it opens up a new… it's also a theory, in the sense that it says that it's important, that it's worth paying attention to and what happens is important.

F LB: Yes, yes, yes. Yes, and what she did was she noticed that these tension patterns were highly significant in how a parent experiences a baby, and how a baby experiences a parent, so that, right away, it becomes a part of how interaction occurs and how well a parent can adjust, early on, to the baby's tension patterns really matters.

S P: So, so as you're talking about this, what comes up for me is that your work is very much also about observing the client, the patient, at this very deep level, that any therapist, any psychoanalyst is, of course, observing, but there is a more complete sense of observing the complete person by not just paying attention to the words but these very subtle movements. So there, even if you did nothing with it in terms of specific interventions, just being in tune with these very subtle movements would be recreating the attunement of the early attachment, the parents' attunement with the child?

F LB: Yes. Then, also, when the attunement creates a difficulty. That's also important. For example, one of the people I've written about in my book is a woman who speaks very rapidly, and so rapidly that what happened was, she also needed a rather close attunement from me or she would get highly anxious, and this all occurred sort of unconsciously between us, so I was attuning very closely because I knew if I sort of stopped and got a breath, she would go on out of her own anxiety. So, I got to be very close to watching her movements as she spoke so much that I couldn't speak with her, it was very difficult for me to find the rhythm I needed for my own speech patterns because that's another thing, your speech pattern is part of your body rhythm patterns, not vice versa and so I was stumbling for words and couldn't…

S P: So you were overwhelmed by her own rhythm?

F LB: Totally, totally. She was speaking fine and very coherently, well, fairly coherently in this rapid style, you know, sort of spurts and abrupt rhythms, and I was falling apart because my rhythms are very different and… But what we discovered was that there was a kind of meaning in this, that the speechless person became me, even though she felt herself to be speechless in a way and unable to find her own voice and her own sense of groundedness. And then we even discovered that when she was between one… two and three, she had stopped speaking all together in her family, and that some of what had gone on in her family was kind of what I was experiencing with her, was that there were these rapid speaking people who paid no attention to her and just kind of went on and on and on and on and on. It was very interesting.

S P: Yeah. It was carried into the rhythm, the pattern, and by immersing yourself with it, you were led to actually discover the impossibility of communication with somebody who has this kind of a history, this kind of a pattern?

F LB: Right, right, right. And it had of to do… to go back to it, she did have an innate tendency to flow-fluctuating, abrupt movement, that's quick change, abrupt as opposed to, say, kind of quick change and, kind of, oozy. Hers was quick change, abrupt, staccato and… but she exaggerated it when she was anxious. So it was, it was never going to go away completely, but the exaggeration and the need for me to be that closely connected to her eased up with her reduction in anxiety as we got to know one another better, and then I could speak in my own rhythm and we could find ways of connecting that didn't require me to completely lose myself in her.

S P: Yeah, yeah. So that happens as a result of really paying attention?

F LB: Right. But, I guess, just to say, this was her temperamental characteristic and it became her. One could call it a strength, in a sense that this was how she could hold on to herself and make sure that she wasn't going to get overwhelmed by, in a way, becoming a bit overwhelming to me.

S P: But at the same time cut off communication with others or cut off the possibility of others being able to meaningfully relate to her?

F LB: Right. So, I think I covered the temperamental characteristics.

S P: Very nicely, very nicely.

Francis La Barre: Okay, good.

S P: So, actually, I want to just check, we're actually, we're coming to the end. So, I wanted to just see if there's anything you would want to say as some kind of a conclusion to this?

F LB: Well, I guess I could say to people, just notice more, and look more, and work with it, and believe your eyes, and believe your experience, and know that you know much more than you think you know about people, if you write down descriptively what you see. But, also, I would say, the cross fertilization between fields is a very good idea. And part of why I enjoy doing this, is that I think that there's a lot we can learn from each other, as I certainly discovered in my studies of the nonverbal research field, as well as various theories of psychoanalysis.

S P: Thanks Franny.

This conversation was transcribed by Dasha Jensen.

© 2009 Proactive Mindfulness. All rights reserved. Proactive Mindfulness and its web address (proactivemindfulness.com) should be properly cited when these contents are used in any form.