

# Two-Dimensional Neutrality vs. Three-Dimensional Neutrality: On Neutrality as Exclusion vs. Neutrality as Hospitality

**D. Amir**<sup>1,2</sup>, D. C. von Tippelskirch-Eissing<sup>3</sup>, A. Cordioli<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *University of Haifa, School of Therapy, Counseling, and Human Development, Haifa, Israel*

<sup>2</sup> *Israel Psychoanalytic Society, Israeli Psychoanalytic Institute, Jerusalem, Israel*

<sup>3</sup> *German Psychoanalytic Society, DPV /IPA / DGPT, Berlin, Germany*

<sup>4</sup> *Italian Psychoanalytic Society, Rome, Italy*

## Abstract Content (EN)

My presentation addresses the distinction between two-dimensional neutrality that constitutes a static, sterile state of mind, and three-dimensional neutrality that is based on the capacity to navigate between different inner positions, thus constituting a platform for transformation. If two-dimensional neutrality embodies a position of "neither this nor that," three-dimensional neutrality stems from a position of "both and". Two-dimensional neutrality is based on a planar perception: since a plane is located between two opposite poles, two-dimensional neutrality must negate both. Three-dimensional neutrality, however, is based on a spatial rather than a planar perception: it is not based on the negation of the two poles, but on the identification of what is common between them and on its use as vertex. There is, of course, a constant movement between these two types of neutrality, both in the analytic room and outside it. The possibility of monitoring and mapping different types of neutrality is of great importance, especially in traumatic and explosive areas of being.

These two types of neutrality will be illustrated by a clinical case study of a hostage's family member and an encounter through correspondence with a Gazan doctor, both showing how three-dimensional neutrality turns into a kind of hospitality.