

I am participating in two panels.

In the first, chaired by Myriam Bonifaciono, my presentation is the following:

Allannah Furlong (Montreal): **Can (does) the analyst's working theory act as a container in the matter of informed consent for the publication of clinical material?**

Most analysts find it distressing to decide whether or not to ask a patient's permission when writing about some aspect of psychoanalytic work with that individual. Yet some authors have argued for seeking the patient's permission, even input, into the writing process, not solely as a legal protection or because they believe it is the patient's right to know, but also because they feel that the dialogue created by the consent process can enhance intersubjective understanding. Does an analyst's theory about her work act as a protective and symbolizing container in negotiating the decision to involve the patient (or not) in publication? How intertwined are ethical thinking, clinical technique, and theory? If most analysts would balk at the notion that ethics is completely relative to context, is a spectrum of ethical positions acceptable to present-day IPA membership?

The second, chaired by Andrew Brook, will be a presentation of the work of the IPA Confidentiality Committee created by the IPA Board in 2016 with the mandate to review the ways in which confidentiality pertains to and impacts on the work of IPA psychoanalysts, to draft documents on best practices for the IPA Board to review and approve, and to advise the Board on related issues for the 2019 Congress. Andrew Brook was also the chair of this committee, of which I was a member. I do not yet know what my precise role will be. Neither I suspect does he. Given his busy schedule, I imagine he has asked the programme directors to save a space for this panel and that he plans to work out the details some time before the Congress.

Allannah Furlong