

AAPC DIPLOMATE PAPER

Spiritually Integrated Supervision: Facilitating Supervisees' Competence as Expressions of Somebodiness while Avoiding "Extractive Introjection"

Matthias Beier

The literature on the theological or spiritual dimension of pastoral counseling supervision is as varied as the theories and theologies that inform it. The rich variety includes an "intersubjective" perspective inspired by liberation theology's "throwing off the shackles of objectivity"¹ in God-talk and God-walk and an attachment-theory-based "incarnational theology," that sees the supervisory process as enabling supervisees to "discover the divine 'Secure Base.'"² At the other end of the spectrum, is "Word of God" theology, employed as an interpretive resource for supervisees of experiences of therapeutic change.³

In this paper, I propose that pastoral counseling supervision or "spiritually integrated psychotherapy" supervision,⁴ facilitates a process in which the supervisee finds her or his own voice as a spiritually integrated psycho-

Matthias Beier is Assistant Professor of Pastoral Care and Counseling and Director of the Masters Program in Mental Health Counseling at Christian Theological Seminary, 1000 W. 42nd St., Indianapolis, IN 46208, and an AAPC Diplomate (Email: mbeier@cts.edu).

Reflective Practice: Formation and Supervision in Ministry

ISSN 2325-2855

© Copyright 2014 *Reflective Practice: Formation and Supervision in Ministry*

All rights reserved.

therapist who facilitates patients' experiences of finding the voice of their own unique being in and through treatment. "Finding voice" within a relational context is at the heart of the spiritual dimension of both supervision and psychotherapy. Finding voice here refers to the expression of what Martin Luther King Jr. called one's "somebodiness." He added: "Don't allow anybody to make you feel that you're nobody. Always feel that you count... always feel that your life has ultimate significance."⁵

FACILITATING EXPERIENCES OF COMPETENCE AS EXPRESSIONS OF SOMEBODINESS

Unlike other forms of psychotherapy, spiritually integrated psychotherapy pays explicit attention to the "spiritual domain." Pargament argues in *Spiritually Integrated Psychotherapy* that "we enter the spiritual domain when the sacred becomes the ultimate destination in the individual's search for significance."⁶ I see spiritually integrated psychotherapy as an intersubjective process in which the sacred is found in, and recognized through, the experience of both party's sense of ultimate significance. The sacred is embodied in both party's expression of the unique voice or tone of their existence. This is a process like that of a composer or musician, such as Beethoven or Duke Ellington, when finding their tone and style; or like that of the artist's creative discovery of a sculpture from within a block of wood or stone. In psychotherapy and supervision this process is intersubjective and appreciates the unique ways a person expresses their culture, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, spiritual orientation, and talents.

Listening for the unique tone or voice emerging in relationship is something I associate with the notion of a "spiritual calling." Responding to this spiritual calling does not mean doing something someone else wants one to do, but rather it means following the call to express one's true self in relationship. The embedded theology that undergirds this understanding of finding one's voice in supervision, as in psychotherapy, is the belief that we are called. Through this calling we are given absolute and sacred support by an absolutely loving person whom we may call "God," "the divine,"⁷ or by other names that express our unique personhood in the presence of the other. Theologically, I see the absolutely loving person as the condition for the possibility of finding ultimate support for the somebodiness of the self in relation to the other. When there is fear in the self of having no ultimate ground and an attempt is made to create, out of nothing, one's ultimate ground—the emergence of violent images of God may occur in which the self, the other, a

group, or anything else may be turned into a “god.”⁸ In supervision this can occur, for instance, through the mechanism of “extractive introjection” as I will show in this paper. In line with the shift from a focus on explicitly conscious and verbal insight as a result of “interpretation” in classical psychoanalysis to a focus on, for the most part, implicit unconscious relational shifts in intersubjective psychoanalysis, I assume that spiritually integrated supervision not only takes place if explicit talk of God or spirituality occurs—it takes place when experiences of “somebodiness” and of “finding voice” are facilitated also. Theological or spiritual reflection explicates the embedded theology or spirituality in *spiritually integrated supervision*.

In supervision, the intersubjective process of finding voice as an expression of one’s somebodiness is facilitated by the supervisor’s work of recognizing and encouraging the supervisee’s emerging competence. This reflects an intersubjective philosophy of supervision in which “the supervisory process, because it involves significant interactions between all the dyads involved, has shifted from an ‘authoritarian model’ with a didactic approach, to a relational model in which the interpersonal dynamics between supervisor and supervisee are seen as central to a productive learning experience.”⁹ An advanced supervisee, for instance, stated in a conversation about the process of supervision that while she appreciates me helping her see symbolic affective connections in the cases she presented, she finds supervision most helpful when it facilitates a process in which she can make those connections on her own.

The challenge in supervision is, of course, to facilitate the process of helping a supervisee to find their voice, while being cognizant of the fact that supervision does, by definition, involve some difference in expertise in some areas between supervisor and supervisee. The supervisor’s expertise should be employed in such a way that it “calls on” the voice of emerging competence and expertise of the supervisee, rather than making the supervisee feel, in whatever subtle way, “less than” the supervisor or like a “nobody.” Focusing on each supervisee’s unique voice and competence also recognizes that supervisees (or supervisors) are not expected to be competent in everything or that each would be the same as the other, and that one’s limitations do not take away from one’s unique somebodiness. Not shaming supervisees for their limitations or for the emerging nature of their unique competence requires sensitive attunement on the part of the supervisor.

PROJECTIVE IDENTIFICATION AND EXTRACTIVE INTROJECTION

Coming primarily from a psychoanalytic theoretical framework for doing supervision, I will use Christopher Bollas' concept of "extractive introjection"¹⁰ as a tool for gauging whether supervision does or does not facilitate the process of "finding voice," or, in King's language, whether it makes the supervisee feel like a "somebody" rather than a "nobody." Bollas developed the concept of "extractive introjection" to bring attention to a psychological dynamic different from the well-known concept of "projective identification."

Projective identification, first introduced by Melanie Klein, refers here to the process in which "one person compels another to 'carry' an unwanted portion of himself."¹¹ In the supervisory process this could, for instance, happen if a supervisee presents a case where the patient comes notoriously late, the supervisee feels frustration about the lateness, the supervisee enacts the dynamic in a parallel process by coming uncharacteristically late to supervision when presenting this particular case and the supervisor feels compelled to feel frustrated about the supervisee's lateness. In this process, the supervisor could be seen to identify with the projection of the role of someone frustrated by lateness. We can see a parallel process between supervisee-patient and supervisor-supervisee around lateness-frustration. Psychodynamically, the frustration might, for instance, hint at internalized object relations from the patient (and/or supervisor): perhaps it was a parent who often came late leaving the patient frustrated, and that very dynamic might now be played out in the transference-countertransference dynamic.

In contrast to the projection put upon somebody in projective identification who then feels compelled to identify with it, Bollas defines extractive introjection as a kind of reverse process. Rather than something being projected into another person, extractive introjection takes something psychically away from another person and introjects it. This occurs "when one person steals for a certain period of time (from a few seconds or minutes, to a lifetime) an element of another individual's psychic life."¹² In the intersubjective field, the person arrogates to themselves the psychic capacities of the other. In supervision this might, for instance, occur when a supervisee is ready to put pieces of the dynamics of a case together, but the supervisor does it for the supervisee. This would be an instance in which a supervisor effectively "steals" the voice and mind of the supervisee, in that the supervisor takes the supervisee's sense of somebodiness away. While a supervisor may have no conscious intention of stealing a supervisee's voice, mind, or

“thunder,” often this can happen in subtle ways and may interfere with the goal of supervision, namely, to facilitate the supervisee’s experience of their own voice as a competent caregiver.

Extractive introjection is usually accompanied by some form of projective identification.¹³ The story of the Gerasene “demoniac” in the Gospel of Mark 5 in the Christian scriptures can be illustrative. Also, this story highlights the spiritual and theological dimension involved in finding one’s own voice in supervision and psychotherapy, including the working through of extractive introjection and projective identification. The interpretation presented here is guided by the depth psychological interpretation of a story by Eugen Drewermann¹⁴—this story is an example of a man who is afraid that others come only to torture him. His ability to speak for himself has been extracted and hence he is not in his “right mind.” A legion of other voices has colonized him in place of his own voice and he has apparently identified with these voices projected onto him. After Jesus asks the man what his own name is, the voices are ‘driven’ out of him and enter into a swine. From an intersubjective perspective, this may symbolically express that he felt others had related to him in such a way that he felt terribly “dirty” and ashamed of himself. By the voices moving into the “pigs and drowning,” the man symbolically gives back to the outside all the projections of piggishness and uncleanness previously deposited onto him.

Seen in this light, the Gerasene man’s story is about successfully working through extractive introjection and projective identifications. What allows this man to succeed is that in the encounter with Jesus he is asked to speak his own name—in his own voice—which prompts him first to express the ambivalence he experiences toward “God.” On one hand, he fears God as an extractive introjector, robbing him of himself like others did and he fears God as a projective identifier who colonizes his spirit. On the other hand, in his search for his “right mind” he turns to Jesus and “God” in his plea to be spared further torture. Eugen Drewermann’s interpretation of the healing of the Gerasene demoniac emphasizes that the psychological and the theological are connected like two sides of the same coin: the theological deals with psychological questions in the existential search for a sense of a right to exist as oneself and to speak with one’s own voice in relation to others—affirming the ultimate value of a person within a community.

Similarly, I propose that supervision is a process that uses the supervisee’s psychological experience in developing and expressing their own competent voice; in other words, to foster the supervisee’s right to express their

unique somebodiness. In contrast, if a supervisor uses extractive introjection, not just the supervisor's arrogation of the supervisee's psychological capacities takes place, but essentially the appropriation of the supervisee's somebodiness also. Through extractive introjection, the usurper denies another person's right to exist by denying their unique ability to express themselves. At worst, extractive introjection sucks the soul out of the person to whom it is done, much like the metaphor of the "dementors" as portrayed in J. K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* series.¹⁵ Theologically, the extractive introjector plays the role of a violent, extractive "god," who commandeers for themselves omnipotence while reducing the other person to a sense of nobodiness.

A CHALLENGE OF SPIRITUALLY INTEGRATED SUPERVISION: AVOIDING EXTRACTIVE INTROJECTION

My philosophy assumes that the primary goal of spiritually integrated supervision is to provide a space in which supervisees experience—and give voice to—their own emerging sense of expertise and are able to make discoveries in the clinical process on their own. My effort to help supervisees make their own connections of pre-symbolic¹⁶ and symbolic experiences embodies a key aspect of this philosophy of supervision: to facilitate—in the intersubjective space of the supervisor-supervisory relationship—the supervisee's ownership and development of their abilities and potentials as a therapist. Attention to affect attunement or mis-attunement in the supervisee-supervisor relationship is paramount in spiritually integrated supervision. The concept of "extractive introjection" can serve as a tool to understand when this attunement process breaks down and how such breakdowns may potentially shed light on the psychodynamics within the relationship as well.

Extractive introjection has not yet been addressed within supervision in general or spiritually integrated supervision in particular. It deserves to be given a prominent position as an indicator when the intersubjective process expressing the somebodiness of either party in the supervision encounter breaks down. Christopher Bollas calls extractive introjection a form of "intersubjective violence"¹⁷ and, not surprisingly, provides a few examples of interactions with four- and five-year-old children. While the professional supervisor-supervisee relationship is obviously quite different from the parent-child relationship, there are some experiential similarities around questions of learning and teaching. For instance, if under pressure of time I click the seatbelts of my young children when they are able and willing to buckle up in

the car (“I want to do it myself!”), I am stealing in that moment their sense of competence, ability, and mastery (“Don’t do it for me.”). “I want to do it myself” is not something I had to teach my sons: they spontaneously gestured this as soon as they could, even before they had words for it. The “inborn” urge—it does come across as an urge (!)—to master¹⁸ seems strongly tied to the child’s early very sense of self, highlighting the inextricable connection between the psychological (mastery) and the spiritual (somebodiness).

As indicated earlier, a supervisor-supervisee relationship is very different from a parent-child relationship. Yet the pitfall of extractive introjection looms large, I believe, in this particular professional intersubjective relationship. In fact, I would argue that the more a supervisor casts supervision like a parent-child relationship, whether consciously or unconsciously, the more likely it is that the debilitating dynamic of extractive introjection is at work—it automatically implies that the supervisee is not seen or treated at the level of her or his development, that is, not as capable as an adult but only as capable as a child. Playing parent in this way would spiritually be the usurpation by the supervisor of the supervisee’s developmentally appropriate, adult somebodiness. In this way, theologically, the supervisor would assume the role of a violent, extractive “god” vis-à-vis the supervisee through the extraction of the supervisee’s psychic life and somebodiness, and reducing them to an affective state of nothingness. Spiritually integrated supervision pays particular attention to the transference-countertransference dynamics involved in the expression, or lack thereof, of each party’s somebodiness.

THE TRANSFERENCE-COUNTERTRANSFERENCE DYNAMIC IN SPIRITUALLY INTEGRATED SUPERVISION

Working with the spiritual dimension in psychoanalytically-oriented, spiritually integrated supervision involves paying attention to transference-countertransference dynamics around experiences of somebodiness or nobodiness. The spiritually intersubjective perspective on supervision proposed here grounds the intersubjective, relational model in a belief in, and recognition of, the absolute value and respect for the somebodiness of both parties. Its postmodern appreciation for the value of each person’s subjectivity in the co-creation of socially constructed, intersubjective meaning is motivated by a belief in the sacredness of each person.

Gill emphasizes, from a view of supervision in a relational psychoanalytic model, that just as psychotherapy requires a good therapeutic alliance,

supervision requires a “positive supervisory alliance,”¹⁹ which includes features such as trust, careful listening, empathy, and appropriate timing. A spiritually integrated supervision model, such an alliance, is grounded in the belief in the other’s sacred somebodiness. Sue Cardwell, the first woman elected President of AAPC and my Diplomate supervisor, gave an example of just such an intersubjective response when I reflected to her that what I appreciated about her style of supervision was a gentleness, yet sharpness, in zooming in on significant points. She replied “It takes one to know one,” both receiving my appreciation and acknowledging my own contribution to the supervisory process.

While the traditional debate in “classical” psychoanalytic supervision was whether to “teach or treat,”²⁰ the spiritually integrated intersubjective approach recognizes that supervision is more than teaching—it involves the relational dimension of “being,” in the sense of attention to the somebodiness of both supervisor and supervisee. This exemplifies the shift from the “classical” view of supervision, in which the supervisor is the expert on cases presented by the supervisee, to the “relational” view, in which the supervisor and supervisee are both experts on their subjective experience of the interpersonal dynamics between them. This shift highlights the dynamics of “parallel process”²¹ that goes hand-in-hand with a shift in the understanding of countertransference.

With the redefinition of countertransference from the “classical” notion of simply unresolved issues in therapists,²² to the “totalist,” and intersubjective, notion of “preconditioned patterns of relating developed in the helping professional’s own childhood”—which “may also be strongly influenced or even evoked by the *transference* of the helpee”²³—the power dynamics in the supervisory relationship have changed as well.²⁴ No longer can the supervisor simply point to “issues” in the supervisee that “get in the way,” but instead must acknowledge that the dynamics in the therapeutic relationship are co-created between therapist and patient. Similarly, the supervisor may co-create enactments, in the supervisory transference-countertransference dynamic with the supervisee, that parallel those in the therapeutic relationship. This was stressed in my own supervisory training with Arthur Robbins.²⁵ Take, for example, the following dynamic of extractive introjection:

[A] supervisee presents material from a session and says that he feels really confused about what was going on in that session; the supervisor then suggests that it seemed that the supervisee was several times on the verge of saying something in the session, but then stopped himself [simple ob-

ervation inviting supervisee's response]; the supervisee then says that, yes, he noticed that as well—and then breaks off the sentence. Next the supervisor makes an interpretation that the supervisee stopped himself from saying something just as the patient has described herself doing vis-à-vis her father [an interpretation as an extractive introjection]; the supervisee then reveals to the supervisor that he had that very thought about stopping himself, but instead of expressing it hesitated to say it, adding that he wishes that he could have said it himself. The supervisee continues, saying that he now is left with feelings of shame and confusion. The supervisor and supervisee look at this dynamic together and the supervisee eventually observes that with his father he never felt quick enough to make his point and, hence, felt incompetent and confused in the presence of his father. The supervisor acknowledges the enactment and from then on both parties pay particular attention to this dynamic when it emerges.

In this example, the supervisor enacts extractive introjection by giving an interpretation rather than finding ways to have the supervisee name his own experience. However, by becoming aware of this, as well as of the parallel processes in the therapist-patient and patient's significant-other dynamic, it can be used for better understanding between them by including both parties' self-experience in the process. Alternatively to making an extractive introjective interpretation, the supervisor might, for instance, simply observe phenomenologically to the supervisee at the moment that he breaks off his sentence: "You just now stopped all of a sudden. Would you like to explore what happened?"

ATTUNEMENT AND SUPERVISION

Power dynamics in supervisory relationships, especially in formal training programs, make it a clinical and ethical imperative that supervisors attend to their own "unresolved conflicts, blind spots, or inappropriate expectations," which Teitelbaum calls "supertransferences."²⁶ The "totalist" notion of the supervisor's countertransference sees it as a combination of the supervisor's dynamics with the supervisee's dynamics. The example given in the case above shows how subtle the affective mis-attunement to a supervisee's somebodiness can be and raises two questions: 1) How can such mis-attunement in the form of extractive introjection be repaired?, and 2) How does the teaching aspect of spiritually integrated supervision relate to facilitating the supervisee's experience of finding the unique voice of their somebodiness?

Bollas argues that extractive introjection can be repaired without a sense of lasting violation if the sense of self and ability of the other is typically

respected in a relationship, and if the premature 'stepping in' is processed openly with the other.²⁷ In supervision, this could occur around issues that might evoke a fair amount of anxiety, such as the handling of suicidal ideation presented by a patient. Working in supervision with novices entering a practicum in a psychoanalytically-focused Masters counseling program (such as the one I direct at Christian Theological Seminary in Indianapolis), requires balancing attunement to the unique level of preparation each student brings to the task and teaching skills of assessment and intervention in response to that level of preparation. For instance, during the review of the assessment of suicidality, some supervisees may come prepared with an assessment based on their prior learning in coursework and in line with the suicide assessment protocol of the training clinic while others may not. Those who are prepared might experience extractive introjection if the supervisor goes step-by-step over the suicide protocol without letting the supervisee take the lead in this. However, what happens if a supervisee, for whatever reason, does not feel prepared to assess suicidality in a presented case?

This is where the question of how the supervisor's teaching²⁸ stance and the facilitation of supervisees' finding their unique voice are related and can be usefully addressed. The act of the supervisor providing content or modeling process does not in itself conflict with a supervisee's finding their own voice. It only does so if it is done in a way that is not attuned to the supervisee's existing skills and abilities, that is, if it speaks *for* the supervisee rather than *with* the supervisee. A central task of spiritually integrated supervisors is, first, to inquire where each supervisee is in terms of their own preparation for clinical work in order to be attuned to it and, next, to tailor the teaching to facilitate the supervisee's experience of their own competence as an expression of their somebodiness.

INTERSUBJECTIVE SUPERVISION AND ETHNIC/RACIAL DIVERSITY

Martin Luther King Jr. emphasized faith in one's somebodiness in the context of a long history of ethnic/racial discrimination against which he lifted his voice. Assumptions about another person's culture that minimize or negate the person's experience are among the more harmful forms of extractive introjection that may occur in supervision. Extractive introjection in the supervisory relationship around cultural issues may take the form of either the supervisor or supervisee making assumptions about the other's culture. For instance, Robinson and Needham²⁹ described racial and gender

myths as key factors in pastoral supervision where unspoken assumptions are made when either party decides for the other what they think or feel in the supervisory relationship.

While a key aspect of spiritually integrated supervision requires supervisors to be aware of and try to avoid extractive introjection in their work with supervisees, extractive introjection can work in the reverse direction, from supervisee to supervisor as well. From an intersubjective perspective, it is important that the supervisor be aware of his or her own experiences of having one's mind or spirit stolen. For instance, at the beginning of a supervision group focused on cultural competence, an African-American supervisee shared that she did not think that I as a supervisor, whom she perceived as white, could understand what it would mean to be oppressed. As we each shared the complexities of our "multicultural lived realities,"³⁰ I shared with the group my background as a German-Turkish person who lived in foster care with a white German family who nicknamed me "Schwarzer" ("Blacky"), due to my having a darker skin complexion than their biological children. During much of my teen years, I was treated like a servant, felt like a slave, and was pejoratively called a "Turk," and even by the "n" word. Thus, my subjective identity is one of both a person of color and a white person. How I am perceived by others culturally and how I experience myself in any given moment depends not only on what I share of my inner cultural psychic experience, but also on the context in which I find myself.

This became an important moment in the intersubjective supervisory process for all of us, highlighting how important careful listening to each person's subjective experience is regarding cultural issues. What became clear to me was that while the subjective experience of oppression of the African-American supervisee and my subjective experience of oppression as a German-Turkish-American supervisor were each unique, we could use similarities in our experience to understand each other, as well as the experiences of any oppressed patients we might encounter. Acting on unverified assumptions about another's inner experience based on the perception of color alone can function in the transference-countertransference dynamic as a way to "steal" from the other person their ability to express their psychic and spiritual reality. Within a supervisory relationship, it is important to address these kinds of extractive introjections openly and promptly in a safe and non-blaming way so that they can be plumbed for the intersubjective potentials of healing around issues of cultural dynamics. Consultation with a group of diverse supervisors in our academic program's weekly supervi-

supervisor meetings was helpful for processing issues of cultural dynamics within the supervisory process also.

What applies to intersubjective relationships between supervisor and supervisee, and supervisee and patient, also applies to the teaching of psychodynamically-oriented spiritually integrated supervision. By focusing on the transference-countertransference dynamic and parallel processes, my teaching of supervision³¹ involves an experiential element in which trainees have an opportunity—through examples of their personal work with supervisees—to explore how their own countertransferences relate to the case material. There is also a didactic element where I introduce some recent psychoanalytic concepts since supervisors, while they all have had some coursework or training in psychodynamic theory, come from a variety of theoretical orientations.

Since each supervisor may resonate with some theoretical and technical approaches more than others, I incorporate into my teaching an appreciation for their unique preferences while facilitating a process in which all supervisors understand the value of—and come to learn from—each other's perspective as well as mine. This respect for the unique voice of each supervisor and supervisory candidate spiritually models my entire philosophy of supervision—that supervision is a process in which all participants find their own competent voice as expressions of their unique somebodiness.

In teaching supervision, extractive introjection could appear if a supervisor casts the parallel process in their own theoretical orientation and insists on their theoretical framing of the process for their supervisees. Through explicit reflection on the theological or spiritual dynamics, particularly around experiences of somebodiness or nobodiness in supervisor's work with supervisees, I encourage supervisors to engage in intersubjective dialogue with their supervisees about the supervisee's sense of mattering or not mattering within their relationship.

CONCLUSION

In this paper, I have argued that spiritually integrated psychotherapy supervision is distinct in the facilitating of a supervisee's finding their unique voice in an intersubjective context and as an expression of their somebodiness. Encouraging a supervisee's competence empowers the unique voice of someone whose "calling" involves helping patients find their own voice within the context of pastoral care. I explored Bollas' concept of extractive

introjection as a key tool for assessing whether or not the psyche and spirit, the mastery of the somebodiness of the supervisee is encouraged and expressed within the dynamic of supervision. Also, I stressed that spiritually integrated supervision need not explicitly engage in God-talk, but attending to experiences of somebodiness or nobodiness, of mattering or not mattering, implicitly address, as Tillich put it, ultimate concerns.

Spiritually integrated supervision emphasizes that all parties of the supervisory triad—patients, supervisees, and supervisors—matter ultimately and that each party's unique voice matters. This unique voice includes the way each person expresses their spirituality. Theologically, I understand God as absolutely supporting and facilitating the process of each person's unique expression of their somebodiness. Because of the uniqueness of each person and because of their intersubjective and cultural context, "God" is seen not as imposing particular content which this expression needs to fit. Rather, God is seen as guarantor of the right of each person to freedom in the process of discovery or liberation of their own unique voice. I find "extractive introjection" at work whenever I assume that spiritual dynamics expressed by my students, with their extraordinary spiritual and religious diversity, could simply be expressed by the way I use theological or spiritual language. For instance, the assumption that theological language can be "objective" and already be known in advance, arrogates to a supervisor (or theologian) a kind of "naming rights" to experience. For example, using Christ-language to describe dynamics that a Jewish or agnostic student brings would be a case in point.

The history of pastoral care and counseling has often fallen victim to this kind of "colonizing"³² naming rights assertion, as the 2010 Report of the AAPC Anti-Racist Justice/Multicultural Competences Task Force has shown. By adopting the Task Force's Anti-Racist Multicultural Competencies, AAPC has committed itself to continuously address and prevent extractive introjections and projective identifications around dimensions of race and culture by, for instance, analyzing "critically how AAPC's training, certification, and accreditation standards may reflect racism and monoculturalism."³³ Eugen Drewermann has termed this combination of extractive introjection and projective identification dynamics "conceptual fetishism"³⁴ and traces it to a tendency in organized religion to arrogate to itself the capacity to look over God's shoulder and speak God's mind.

One might say with Bollas that much of religion and theology's dangerous pitfalls stem from exercises of "extractive introjection" in which a

human being presumes to steal the mind of God or the divine while, on the one hand, denying their own mind—namely the fact that what they are saying is said from their own position of subjectivity and humanity, their own faith, and on the other hand, using God-talk to steal another person's mind.

In line with AAPC's commitment to prevent the appropriation of the psyche and spirit of those experienced as "the other," both spiritually integrated supervision and the teaching of spiritually integrated supervision have a key role to play in facilitating a culture of spiritually integrated psychotherapy in which all participants, as the healing stories of the Christian Gospels would put it, find their own voice, see with their own eyes, or stand on their own feet.

NOTES

1. William R. DeLong, "From Object to Subject: Pastoral Supervision as an Intersubjective Activity," *The Journal of Pastoral Care and Counseling* 56, no. 1 (2002): 51–61.
2. E. Wayne Hill, "A Collaborative Pastoral Care and Counseling Supervisory Model," *The Journal of Pastoral Care* 55, no. 1 (2001): 69–80.
3. Brid Long, "Theological Reflection in the Supervision of Pastoral Care," *The Journal of Pastoral Care* 52, no. 2 (1998): 117–131.
4. Going forward, I will use in this paper "spiritually integrated supervision" or simply "supervision" as shorthand in accord with language adopted in the 2010-2014 Mission and Vision Statement of the American Association of Pastoral Counselors (AAPC), accessed March 21, 2014, <http://www.aapc.org/home/mission-statement/>.
5. Robert Jakoubek and Heather L. Vagner, *Martin Luther King, Jr: Civil Rights Leader* (New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 2004), 11.
6. Kenneth I Pargament, *Spiritually Integrated Psychotherapy: Understanding and Addressing the Sacred* (New York: Guilford Press, 2011), 78.
7. Chris Schlauch, "Being-There-With-and-For: Contemporary Psychoanalysis Characterizes Notions of Being Religious," *Pastoral Psychology* 56, no. 2 (2007): 199–221.
8. Matthias Beier, *A Violent God-Image: Introduction to the Work of Eugen Drewermann* (New York: Continuum, 2004).
9. Helen K Gediman, "Review of Susan Gill, ed., 'The Supervisory Alliance: Facilitating the Psychotherapist's Learning Experience, (Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 2002),' " *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 51 (2003): 1060-1066, 1061.
10. Christopher Bollas, *The Shadow of the Object* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1989), 157–169.
11. *Ibid.*, 158.
12. *Ibid.*

13. Ibid., 160.
14. Eugen Drewermann, *Das Markusevangelium, Teil 1: 1:1-9:13* (Olten: Walter, 1990), 360–366. Eugen Drewermann, *Tiefenpsychologie und Exegese, Band II* (Olten, Switzerland: Walter-Verlag, 1985), 247–277; Beier, *A Violent God-Image*, 215–219.
15. J. K. Rowling, *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban* (Richmond, BC, Canada: Rain-coast Books, 1999).
16. Beatrice Beebe, Steven Knoblauch, Judith Rustin, and Doriene Sorter, *Forms of Inter-subjectivity in Infant Research and Adult Treatment* (New York: Other Press, 2005); Thomas H. Ogden, *The Primitive Edge of Experience*, (Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 1992).
17. Christopher Bollas, *The Shadow of the Object* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1989), 158.
18. Jack P. Shonkoff and Deborah Phillips, *From Neurons to Neighborhoods: The Science of Early Childhood Development* (Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press, 2000); Richard M. Ryan and Edward L. Deci, "Self-Determination Theory and the Facilitation of Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development, and Well-Being," *American Psychologist* 55, no. 1 (2000a): 68–78.
19. Susan Gill, ed., *The Supervisory Alliance: Facilitating the Psychotherapist's Learning Experience* (Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 2002), xv.
20. Joan E. Sarnat, "Supervision in Relationship: Resolving the Teach-Treat Controversy in Psychoanalytic Supervision," *Psychoanalytic Psychology* 9, no. 3 (1992): 387–403.
21. Howard F Searles, "The Informational Value of the Supervisor's Emotional Experiences," *Psychiatry: Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes* 18, no. 2 (1955): 135–146. Rudolf Ekstein and Robert Solomon Wallerstein, *The Teaching and Learning of Psychotherapy* (New York: International Universities Press, 1972). Helen K. Gediman and Fred Wolkenfeld, "The Parallelism Phenomenon in Psychoanalysis and Supervision: Its Reconsideration as a Triadic System," *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 49, no. 2 (1980): 234–255.
22. Sigmund Freud, "The Future Prospects of Psychoanalytic Therapy," in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Volume 11, James Strachey, trans. (London: Hogarth Press, 1910), 139–152; Sigmund Freud, "Observations on Transference-Love (Further Recommendations on the Technique of Psycho-Analysis III)," in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, vol. 12, James Strachey, trans. (London: Hogarth Press, 1915), 157–171.
23. Pamela Cooper-White, *Shared Wisdom: Use of Self in Pastoral Care and Counseling* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2004), 5.
24. Felicity Kelcourse, "Theological and Intersubjective Contexts of Pastoral Counseling Supervision," *Encounter* 72, no. 1 (2011): 61–70.
25. Arthur Robbins, *Between Therapists: The Processing of Transference/Countertransference Material* (Philadelphia, PA: Jessica Kingsley, 2000).
26. Stanley H Teitelbaum, "Supertransference: The Role of the Supervisor's Blind Spots." *Psychoanalytic Psychology* 7 (1990): 243–258, 244.
27. Bollas, *The Shadow of the Object*, 159.

28. To help supervisees gain mastery of psychodynamic and spiritual assessment and diagnosis, I utilize handouts created from Nancy McWilliams' *Psychoanalytic Diagnosis*, 2nd ed. (New York: Guilford, 2011); *The Alliance of Psychoanalytic Organizations', Psychodynamic Diagnostic Manual* (Silver Spring, MD: The Interdisciplinary Council on Development and Learning [ICDL], 2006), accessed March 22, 2014, <https://sites.google.com/a/icdl.com/pdm/home>; the classic summary of ego functions by Leopold Bellak, Marvin Hurvich and Helen K. Gediman, *Ego Functions in Schizophrenics, Neurotics and Normals: A Systematic Study of Conceptual, Diagnostic, and Therapeutic Aspects* (New York: Wiley, 1973), 76–79; and Drewermann's correlation between personality disorders and spiritual dynamics in Eugen Drewermann, "Sünde und Neurose: Versuch einer Synthese von Dogmatik und Psychoanalyse," in *Psychoanalyse und Moralthologie: Volume I: Angst und Schuld* (Mainz, Germany: Matthias-Grünewald-Verlag, 1991), 128–162, described in detail in Matthias Beier, *A Violent God-Image: Introduction to the Work of Eugen Drewermann* (New York: Continuum, 2004), 108–123.
29. Eugene Robinson, Jr., and Miriam A. Needham, "Racial and Gender Myths as Key Factors in Pastoral Supervision," *The Journal of Pastoral Care* 45, no. 4 (1991): 333–342.
30. K. Samuel Lee, "Becoming Multicultural Dancers: The Pastoral Practitioner in a Multicultural Society," *The Journal of Pastoral Care* 55, no. 4 (2001): 389–395.
31. Cheryl L Storm, "Teaching Therapists to Become Supervisors," in Thomas C Todd and Cheryl L. Storm, *The Complete Systemic Supervisor* (New York: Author's Choice Press, 2002), 363–372; Cheryl L. Storm, Thomas C Todd, Teresa McDowell, and Tim Sutherland, "Supervising Supervisors," in *The Complete Systemic Supervisor*, 373–388.
32. Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth (1963): A New Translation from the French by Richard Philcox, with a Forward by Homi K. Bhaba and a Preface by Jean-Paul Sartre* (New York: Grove Press, 2004), portrays dynamics of extractive introjection by the colonizers of the colonized when he refers to "the demoralization buried deep within the mind by colonization" (p. 135) and to "ruined consciences" (p. 212). In his preface to Fanon's classic text, Jean-Paul Sartre describes the same dynamic as an attempt in which "the master...seeks to deaden their [the colonized's] mind..." (p. lii).
33. American Association for Pastoral Counselors, "Anti-racist Multicultural Competencies," *Report of the AAPC Racial Justice/Multicultural Competence Task Force* (Fairfax, VA: AAPC, June 2010), accessed March 22, 2014, <http://www.aapc.org/about-us/anti-racist-multicultural-competences>.
34. Eugen Drewermann, *Glauben in Freiheit oder Tiefenpsychologie und Dogmatik: Dogma, Angst und Symbolismus* (Düsseldorf, Germany: Walter, 1993), 67. Cf. Matthias Beier, *Gott ohne Angst: Einführung in das Denken Eugen Drewermanns* (Mannheim, Germany: Patmos, 2010), 181, 13. Eugen Drewermann, *Der sechste Tag: Die Herkunft des Menschen und die Frage nach Gott* (Zurich, Switzerland: Walter, 1998), 53–55.