RESPONSE · 2015

Response to Martha Stark — Introduction and Summary

Michael Soth

An introduction to and critical summary of Martha Stark's psychoanalytic work, exploring how her model of therapeutic action relates to the integral-relational approach. Stark's work on the different 'modes of therapeutic action' — interpretation, relationship, and the experience of self-in-relation — provides a useful bridge between classical psychoanalytic and relational perspectives.

KEY THEMES

— Stark's three modes of therapeutic action

— Interpretation vs relationship as therapeutic vehicles

— The self-in-relation and the development of self

— How Stark's model relates to relational body psychotherapy

— Points of contact and productive difference

Stark's Three Modes of Therapeutic Action

Martha Stark has made a significant contribution to the integration of classical and relational psychoanalytic perspectives through her articulation of three distinct 'modes of therapeutic action': interpretation (insight through understanding), relationship (healing through corrective experience), and self-in-relation (the development of the self through the experience of being in relationship with a real other).

Each mode corresponds to a different theory of what makes therapy work. The first — interpretation — is the classical psychoanalytic position: insight into unconscious conflicts and defences is the primary vehicle of change. The second — relationship — is the relational and humanistic position: the corrective emotional experience of being in a different kind of relationship than the wounding one is what heals. The third — self-in-relation — is Stark's distinctive contribution: the development of the self through the ongoing experience of being genuinely met by an other who is simultaneously available as an object and present as a subject.

This third mode is where Stark's model most closely resonates with the integral-relational approach: the recognition that what is most transformative in therapy is neither insight alone nor corrective experience alone, but something which arises in the complex, paradoxical territory between the two.

Resonances with Integral-Relational Approach

Stark's model resonates with the integral-relational approach in several important ways. Her recognition that the therapist must be simultaneously available as an object (to be used, projected upon, constructed as a figure from the past) and present as a subject (genuinely there, genuinely affected, genuinely other) is central to what I have been articulating as the essential paradox of the therapeutic position.

Her attention to the moment-to-moment dynamics of the therapeutic relationship — to the significance of charged moments in which the working alliance is threatened, to the therapeutic use of rupture-and-repair cycles — is also closely aligned with the relational focus of integral-relational body psychotherapy. And her openness to the complexity and difficulty of the therapeutic endeavour, her refusal to offer simple solutions to its inherent paradoxes, resonates with the 'impossible profession' framing.

What is less present in Stark's work is the somatic dimension — the body as a carrier of the transference and countertransference, the way in which the wounding and the healing are both embodied in the here-and-now of the therapeutic encounter. This is where the body psychotherapy tradition, in its most relational contemporary forms, adds

something which is not fully available in Stark's psychoanalytic framework.

Productive Differences

The most productive difference between Stark's model and the integral-relational approach is in the weight given to explicit interpretation versus somatic embodied process. Stark, as a psychoanalyst, maintains a significant commitment to the interpretive mode — to the value of bringing unconscious conflicts into verbal, cognitive awareness. The integral-relational approach is more agnostic about this, seeing interpretation as one possible response to what emerges in the relational field rather than as a defining feature of good clinical work.

This difference is not simply about technique but about implicit theory of change. If the primary vehicle of therapeutic action is the quality of embodied relational contact — the way in which the wound is met and held in the therapeutic relationship at a bodymind level — then verbal interpretation may be one avenue into this, but is certainly not the only or most important one.

Stark's work is valuable precisely because it articulates, from within the psychoanalytic tradition, the recognition that interpretation alone is insufficient — that something more relational, more immediate, more experiential is required. The integral-relational approach takes this recognition further, grounding it in a bodymind understanding of what that 'something more' might be.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

— Stark, M. (1999) Modes of Therapeutic Action. Northvale NJ: Aronson

— Winnicott, D.W. (1969) The use of an object. International Journal of Psychoanalysis 50

— Mitchell, S. (1988) Relational Concepts in Psychoanalysis. Cambridge MA: Harvard

— Soth, M. (2005) Embodied countertransference. In N. Totton (ed.) New Dimensions in Body Psychotherapy. OUP

— Benjamin, J. (1990) An outline of intersubjectivity. Psychoanalytic Psychology 7

Published at soth.co.uk · © 2015 Michael Soth · All rights reserved