

Committee on Collective Traumas "No silence"

A. Roy², M. Jabbour¹

¹ *ALDeP, member, Beirut, Lebanon*

² *Indian Psychoanalytic Association, member, Kolkata, India*

Chair of Workshop

Sabina Jahovic

Belgrade Psychoanalytic Society

Content

As psychoanalysts encountering our patients, we are positioned to think about the interplay between external and internal realities and their impact on the analytic process. Analytic neutrality and “no-silence” can be understood as a dialectical opposition. At first glance, they appear as opposing positions: the analyst’s withdrawal into silence versus the active need to speak and bear witness. Yet it is precisely in their tension that the deeper meaning of each emerges. Silence can create space for subjectivity and free association, while speech becomes essential when silence risks repeating socially imposed forgetting and the denial of trauma. In a dialectical sense, neutrality is neither absolute silence nor constant speech, but the capacity to oscillate between these two poles in accordance with the context and the patient’s needs. In this way, a synthesis arises from the opposition: neutrality as an ethically attuned and flexible stance, capable of holding both silence and voice, while remaining faithful to the fundamental aim of analysis—the creation of space for subjective experience and the symbolization of trauma. The two perspectives illuminate the tension at the heart of working with collective traumas, which is precisely the focus of the presentations by Maria Jabbour and Ashis Roy.