

Cultures and religions in the crisis of post-modernity

Gian Giacomo Rovera

Abstract. *Among the anthropological foundations of society, the sacred/religious element makes the greatest contribution to developing value orientations, both at individual and community level. Upon these foundations lies the basis for the development of the notion of religion and religiosity, intertwined with concepts of cults and cultures. Comparative Individual Psychology (CIP) configures a network model that, already in the epistolary exchange between Alfred Adler and Rev. Jahn (1930-33), made a distinction between the “Idea of God” (Deism) and the “Revelation of God” (Theism). This approach can be developed and enriched also through the study of neuroscience, transculturalism and psychopathological/clinical/psychotherapeutic practice. The complexity of these concepts (especially in the current phase of the passing of post-modernity) is faithfully reflected by multiethnic, multicultural and multi-religious contexts. Above all, it is important to consider the impact that these might have on New Age philosophy, “new psychotherapies” and “psychotherapy cult”. The ensuing debate reveals the importance of cultural psychiatry and of Cultural Dynamic Psychotherapy, enabling the development of a New Humanism.*

Keywords: Religion, Culture, Theism, Deism, Network Model, Culturally Dynamic Psychotherapy

WCPRR June 2011: 21-34. © 2011 WACP
ISSN: 1932-6270

INTRODUCTION Today, cultures and religions are facing new problems that arise from the crisis of post-modernity. Themes like spirituality, the pursuit of the absolute and transcendence, magic, Value Orientations (VO), and the sense of (cultural, religious and linguistic) belonging may be addressed on the basis of a common argument. These different areas of interest configure an interdisciplinary network whose arguments are complementary and create new research horizons (Buffardi, 2009; Rovera, 2005; Rovera & Fassino, 1979; Rovera & Gatti, 1990; Terranova-Cecchini, 2010) embracing epistemological problems, research in neuroscience, anthropological and cultural issues, cultural psychiatry and Cultural Dynamic Psychotherapy. (Conlan, 1999; Cozolino, 2002; Edelman, 2006; Gabbard, 2000; Gallese, 2003; Hobson, 2003; Kandel, 1998, 1999; Rovera, 2006b, 2008, 2009a, 2009b; Rovera *et al.*, 2009). The mentioned complex meshwork of arguments lays down the historical and conceptual grounds for the theoretical and practical model of Comparative Individual Psychology (CIP), which was founded in Vienna a century ago by Alfred Adler (Hoffman, 1994).

THE EPISTOLARY EXCHANGE BETWEEN JAHN AND ADLER (1930-1933) When speaking about religion and culture, it is interesting to highlight that many contemporary international contributions (Bartocci *et al.*, 1998; Bartocci 1990, 1994, 2000, 2004; Boehnlein, 2006) were in some way breaking new ground as early as in the 1930s. Indeed, this was the

Correspondence to: Gian Giacomo Rovera MD, PhD, Honorary Professor of Psychiatry
Department of Neuroscience, Università degli Studi di Torino, Italy

Honorary President of the International Society of Individual Psychology, Vienna, Austria.

mailto: ggrovera@hotmail.com

Received June 1, 2011. Accepted June 20, 2011.

time span that witnessed a well-known exchange of letters between the Berliner Rev Kurt Jahn and Alfred Adler (Adler, 1933, 1935a, 1935b; Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1956; Joannes, 1971; Rovera *et al.*, 2009), containing a debate on the theological and psychological approach to Theism and Deism. This epistolary debate was configured into an argumentative confrontation between religion and culture that even now bears the merit of being extremely topical thanks to the argumentations made on the sacred, the New Age philosophy, on the crisis of post-modernity, and on the new psychotherapies, leading up to what is proposed as New Humanism.

The idea of God is better definable under dynamic psychology as the pursuit of divinity: and this is why in this paper the term ‘religiosity’ is preferred over religion. The contributions made by Powers (1997) on cult, culture and cultivation remind us that in traditional cultures, worshipping a fetish, a phallus, a lizard, etc, or an ancestor or a superior entity (Airenti, 2003; Godelier, 2009), are hard to find a scientific explanation. It is true however that an albeit primitive conception of divinity could favour (even in civilized contexts) on the one hand the ‘sentiment of sacredness’ (Kaufman, 2008) and, on the other, the ‘religious sentiment’. It would appear to provide a sort of protection to the individual, to the community and also to the sub-culture of belonging (Garfinkel, 1967; Geertz, 1973; Le Bras, 1967; Jilek, 1982; Prince, 2000). These sentiments can be found in the value orientations (VO: Bartocci, 2004; Ponce, 1998; Prince, 2000), and might also endorse some of the assumptions made under post-structuralist anthropology (Remotti, 1971; Godelier, 2009). This is precisely the reason why we deem it useful to refer to the epistolary exchange between Jahn and Adler (1930-1933) as it represents a commendable exchange of ideas. Religion and Individual Psychology appear to have some “things in common”: in thinking, feeling and willing, with specific focus on Man’s pursuit of perfection (Adler, 1933).

- A. In this debate, the emphasis is focused on the explicative/shared understanding of the role played by sentiments in one’s psychological life. Adlerian Individual Psychology is grounded on, and is conducive to, the assertion that sentiments too, like all other psychological processes, are oriented towards a unitary goal. By relying on a religious state of mind, it might be possible to understand God in an intuitive way: but even if individuals pursue humane ideals, sentiments are thought to be driven by a final goal. As a creature born on Earth, the individual is driven by a *movement* that derives from him and is pursued through intuitive knowledge and scientific testing.
Adler’s above considerations appear to be important insofar as humanitarian movements should be correlated not only to religion but also to science.
Conversely, Jahn affirms that what drives Man towards community interests is a profoundly felt faith and that the only appropriate way of solving human problems is by producing benefits for an *ideal community*.
- B. Comparative Individual Psychology (CIP; taken as a psychological model) should not use religious dogmas but should rather leave Christianity in the hands of those who are qualified for the task. However, it is not possible to banish God from this world. Moreover, it is also essential to consider the man-environment relationship. CIP «shall unfailingly welcome the change that makes one’s experiences available to the Ministers of the Cult, as well as to all the Educators of Mankind: meaning thereby those who take the lead of great humanitarian movements» (Adler, 1990 [1933] **Note 1**).
- C. According to Father Jahn, Individual Psychology can be considered as an «heir of significant movements» aimed at the well-being of humanity. By its very nature, it strives to receive stimuli from every field of knowledge, experience and science.
- D. The very same opinion is synthetically expressed in a letter written by Adler on the 3rd of April 1933, in reply to a letter by Reverend E. B. Rohrbach. The letter reads: «Dear unknown friend, I am glad to know one man in the church who has so thoroughly understood how Individual Psychology struggles hard to interpret in a scientific way the highest ideals in the right development of mankind. What I have been working out had been only a contribution to *understanding* what mankind had known in the main parts long ago and

what has created all the great streams in mankind, the high good of mankind in the current of evolution. Yours Sincerely, Adler» (Adler, 1970).

The epistolary exchange between Jahn and Adler is a very articulated reading (Rovera, 2010). It clearly reveals not only the difference between the two: from their religious approach to the conception of God and of Religion (Theism for one and Deism for the other), but also concomitantly discloses both of their constant search to making different conceptions aimed at improving humanity compatible and possibly even correlated and plausible.

Even some of the current disputes thereon (Pera & Ratzinger, 2004) reveal an objectionable post-modern relativism of knowledge: not only in scientific research, but also in Value Orientations and in critical and practical applications (including Cultural Dynamic Psychotherapy).

VALUE ORIENTATION, NEW AGE AND THE NETWORK MODEL

Cultural and religious Value Orientations (Ponce, 1998; Rovera, 2008, 2009a; Rovera *et al*, 2009; Morin, 2011) have always been considered to be aspects of Man's existence (Okpaku, 1998), inherent to the considerable complexity of anthropological and cultural (Bastide, 1965; Moro *et al*, 2006), psychological (Aletti, 1998), and historical and philosophical (Brancaleone *et al*, 2008; Rossi, 1983; Weber, 1958) issues. They are underpinned by neurobiological structures (Edelman, 2006; Gabbard, 1996, 2000), even when they express a sentiment, an idea, a tendency towards a superior entity. The conception of god can be defined as Theism, meaning thereby a supernatural derivation from a transcendent God (this was Pastor Jahn's thesis), or as Deism, intended as an ideal of perfection and a striving for the absolute (Adler's thesis).

Sentiments of religiosity and deity are engendered by cultural roots that are both general (etic) and particular (emic) (Tseng, 2001). These can be variably outlined also from the perspective of Psychology of Religion (Rossi & Aletti, 2009) as an aspiration towards supremacy, absolute knowledge, immortality. Moreover, said sentiments are drivers concomitant or consequent to feelings of inadequacy, finiteness, guilt.

Questions like: 'What is the purpose of my life?' 'Is there life after death?' 'Why is there evil in this world?' 'Why me?' 'Why now?' (Powers, 1997) are not only inherent to the complexity of human existence but also evoke orientations and contents that are different from the concept of Deity and Religiosity.

Religiosity pertains to both believers and non believers (including so-called 'devoted atheists') and can manifest itself in different ways and in diverse cultures, with ritual practices and ceremonial events that arise from the historical and social frameworks of the specific context of belonging. It is here opportune to take into consideration:

- *Structuralist* theories (Levi-Strauss, 1962), which are now considered to be outdated by several anthropologists (Godelier, 2009);
- *Relativistic* theories, which suggest that beliefs can be correlated to different paradigms constituting reference values: this presumably leads us to believe that there is common grounds to value orientations;
- Ongoing disputes arising from positions that are sometimes antithetical and that refer to hierarchized pluralistic, or relativizable, or reductionist approaches (scientific, psychological and sociological).

The issues that characterized modern Western thought (from the end of the 19th to part of the 20th Century), both in continental Europe and in the UK, had a matrix essentially based on universalism (the epistemology of "great truths"), which was generally positivistic in nature (Rovera, 1990a, 1990b, 1994). It was thought that *science* had to coincide with *reason* and with the progress of culture, intended precisely as *civilization* and not as *civilizing* (more specifically aimed at cooperation between individuals and peoples).

In the post-modern global society (Boisvert, 1995; Ceserani, 1997; Lyotard, 1979), the sentiment of deity (Deism) and religious convictions (Theism) are mixed with a fragmentation and a sort of pseudo-independence of the individual, often driving him towards neo-paganism.

This cultural mutation (Cavalli Sforza, 2004) is characterized by the eclecticism and pluralism arising from the dissolution of great ideological discourse, which is replaced by a deconstructionist and pragmatic attitude to knowledge and by scientific reductionism.

The individual immersed in a global context should in fact reveal some common culture-dependent characteristics: consumerism, erratic thinking, the destabilization of individual identity (at times combined with a form of nihilism); social nomadism (with a strong drive towards migration); neo-tribalism (consisting in an individual joining a group of persons sharing common values); emphasis on diversity (Rovera, 2006a, 2006b).

New-Age (Terrin, 1993) characterizes the sentiment of deity or religiosity in the post-modern era by a continuous wavering between interpretation/ belonging/ difference/ disorientation. This thought system swings from a (also) constructive critical position to occasional neo-pagan stands.

In respect of the sentiment of deity and religiosity in modern-day socio-cultural contexts: the New Age Philosophy wavers between old traditionalism and neo-gnosticism.

These approaches are not always mutually coherent (Bartocci *et al*, 1998; Bartocci, 1990, 1994, 2004; Cerri *et al*, 2008; Roggero *et al*, 1998; Rovera 2002a, 2002b, 2004a, 2004b, 2004c, 2009a, 2009b).

They propound:

- The prevalence of intuition over reason;
- Immanentist conceptions;
- Methods of “dilating states of consciousness”, from “a spiritual to a cosmic dimension”;
- The “loss of belief in eternity” among traditional cultures and the recovery thereof through particular ceremonies or beliefs (Jilek, 1982; Prince, 2000)
- Gnostic and panentheist or even sectarian postulates (see Scientology).

In the New Age philosophy, the sentiment of deity or religiosity might derive from an extreme aspiration to superiority and the Absolute.

The Compared Individual Psychology (CIP) model is therefore configured as an alternative to those schools of thought that rely on ideologies and religious beliefs; pseudo-scientific movements coming from spurious cult forms not infrequently self-endowed with a therapeutic mission. In these contexts, God is often addressed directly (‘god-talk’), theology is mingled with theology and with existential advice (‘psyche-talk’) and promises of recovery (shamans, gurus, ‘curanderos’). Moreover, we are now witnessing a change in the significance of values or, better said, a «breakdown of values» (Piancastelli, 1998) also because of the change in their orientation. Suffice it to think of the «cynical lies, deceits, illusions and make-believe» that we are subjected to by the media and even by culture institutions, which should differently be expected to comply with rules of ethics, codes of conduct and scientific rigor, and instead often lead opinions towards religious scepticism (Rovera, 1976, 2004a, 2004b, 2004c).

Value orientations, in the guise of a new mastery, intermingle the need for magic, the sacred and healing (Bartocci, 1990, 1994, 2004; Bartocci *et al*, 1998) with the rites and taboos of organized neo-religions that subsequently give rise to new ways of solving the problems of life through post-modern neo-tribal techniques.

These situations have a strong grasp on the emotionality and suggestibility of individuals and collective groups alike, especially when they propose new values that are expected to educate entire communities through a deep transformation of the individual.

THE ANTHROPOLOGY NETWORK While the Structuralism expounded by Lévi-Strauss (1962) suggested an interpretation that was intended to testify to the symbolic origin of

society through the primacy of language, namely of the ‘symbolic’ over the ‘imaginary’ and the ‘real’: conversely, the anthropological school of thought headed by Godelier (2009) considers that one of the most important issues relates to beliefs and sacred/religious objects.

In Godelier’s opinion, in case of having to establish a hierarchy, the primacy should be of the imaginary over the symbolic, because holy or precious objects are first and foremost objects of belief, the contents of which are imaginary before being symbolic (e.g. shells given in exchange for a woman or to compensate the death of a warrior are configured as the imaginary equivalent of life). This imaginary value translates the fact that these objects can be swapped with human life and can be considered the equivalent of human beings. Godelier’s assumption (studied in several traditional societies) might also be confirmed by neuroscience (Buffardi, 2009).

An anthropological network would contain at least four founding keys of interpretation of society.

- That there are things that should neither be sold nor given away but that should be kept like, for example, sacred/religious objects;
- That economic relations like the ones binding individuals and groups are correlated to production performances and the allocation of means of subsistence and material wealth;
- That (from a structuralist perspective) family relationships and sexuality (relationships and groups) have an inevitable role in societies and in their persistence: «It should take more than one man and one woman to make a baby»; meaning thereby that an individual is born «into a pre-interpreted cultural universe» (Rovera, 1984; Rovera *et al*, 1984).
- That, in order for a society to distinguish itself from neighbouring societies, it should start off being a ‘tribe’, in the sense that it has control over a territory, a name, as well as collective political and religious institutions.

Consequently to new migration processes, societies are increasingly multi-ethnic, multi-religious and multi-lingual (Sapir, 1932).

This makes it useful to have an inter-disciplinary model that might not only reinforce the specific approach of anthropologists but that might also lay the grounds for more rigorous reconstructions of a more in-depth knowledge of the wide variety and complexity of these phenomena.

Understanding in order to explain and explaining in order to understand (namely the ‘explicative/shared understanding’ envisaged in the CIP) attempts to compare the different methods that human individuals and groups have adopted in the course of history in organizing their life in common and raising existential questions on the deity, birth, life and death and power.

INTERCULTURAL METHODOLOGICAL OPTIONS Nowadays a cultural method (based both on transcultural psychiatry, ethnopsyoanalysis and inter-culturalism) raises a problem in relation to whether the hermeneutic circle of the interpretation given by psychotherapy, psychology, psychopathology, or medicine itself is scientifically based or not (Gadamer, 1960; Ferrero, 2009; Rovera, 2002a, 2002b; Wallin, 2007; von Weizsäcker, 1940; Wittkover, 1964).

Already in 1932 von Weizsäcker methodologically configured the fundamentals of clinical anthropology through the innovative theory of the ‘Circle of the Form’ (*Gestaltkreis*). This theory succeeded in leaving behind the traditional bipolarity between Natural Science and Spiritual Science. This entailed establishing a close link between a scientific-clinical (‘objective’) explanation and psychotherapeutic (‘subjective’) understanding and, above all, endorsed the inescapability of this dyad in the performance of the therapeutic action.

From this point of view, he was forerunning the thought of Gadamer (1960), according to who any unitary interpretative process could be referred to its application. Implicitly underscoring the importance of some assumptions on the unity of psychic life and the uniqueness of the individual (Adler, 1933; Jahn & Adler, 1933; Parenti *et al*, 1975; Rovera, 1994, 2002a, 2002b) methodologically implies the fact that ‘applying to Oneself’ the concrete situation of the patient is followed by the

recognition of equally belonging to a practical order whereby the clinician identifies with the Other, thus achieving an empathetic order or conscious counter-attitudes (*enactment, micro-actions, disclosure, etc.*) also and especially in subjects belonging to different religions and cultures (Fassino, 2002; Fassino *et al*, 2007; Gill, 1983; Giovacchini, 1989; Ponsi, 2006). This occurs without coming short of an ethical coherence and a social sentiment and actually gives more depth to the clinician's clinical competence and comprehensively improves the creativity and the quality of life of the individuals who he/she is taking care of (Rovera, 2000, 2004a, 2004b, 2004c, 2005).

In order to achieve these goals, a dialogical and open confrontation (Inter-Individual, according to CIP) on different disciplines should be encouraged (Rovera, 2004a, 2004b, 2004c, 2006b; Rovera & Fassino, 1979; Rovera *et al*, 1984). This discourse embraces both a critical and clinically useful approach.

In this way, the meshwork that can be configured into an intercultural methodological approach to the sacred/religious dimension, forms a network that recognises qualitatively diverse disciplines, as already mentioned above.

Posing the Sacred in relation to Religiosity again may provide an interconnection between Nature and Culture, between Structuralism and History, between mind and body, while pursuing research into different Cultures (Geertz, 1973).

The Sacred falls within the realm of a fundamental religious sentiment (Sacred/Religious Dyad) and is an important criterion on the basis of which to define both the rational and irrational aspects of a founding element of anthropology (Kaufman, 2008; Rovera, 1990a, 1990b, 1994, 2006a).

The Sacred/Religious aspect can give rise to the possibility of expressing oneself imaginatively and not scientifically, which can subsequently take root into something in the sacred dimension that is heterogeneous to man or experienced as such.

This belief in the Sacred can be closely interlinked with the concept of religiosity (originally comparable to the concept of Taboo, awe and signs of a superior power). All religions in which magical elements survive, albeit in the spiritualised form of a charismatic priest or the power of the demon, feature sacredly powerful persons (see shamans).

A Sacred/Religious dimension of this type can be easily correlated to the theories of the mind, both to neuroscience and the bio-psycho-social approach to psychiatry and also, as in the case at hand, to the theoretical and practical model of an Individual Psychology opened to Culture (Paoletti & Rovera, 1984; Rovera, 1976, 1984, 1994; Rovera *et al*, 1984).

An intercultural research methodology on the dimension of the Sacred and Religiosity leads us to ponder over both cultural and general problems (Bowlby, 1969; Garfinkel, 1967; Roggero *et al*, 1998). Depending on the model of reference taken, both the conceptualisations and the research methods vary: not only with respect to a psychopathological approach but also to the type of clinical research performed in an inter-cultural context.

It is therefore necessary to keep in mind the debate between faith and critical reasoning, whose aim should be to lead to a sort of secular prophecy of a society open to scientific and philosophical conceptions, bringing with it a tolerance towards diversities and differences, and to an inter-religious dialogue with the end of achieving a cultural evolution. In this perspective, the preliminary conditions enabling us to know the world and ourselves need to be historic and not unchanging.

Knowledge of these conditions would be compatible with the application of a heritage of ideas and models (cultural heritage), similar to a sort of pre-understanding (implicit memories) of a pre-interpreted cultural universe (Rovera, 1976). This embraces single experiences that are diversely configured according to the different language of the interpreter, extending the dialogue among cultures as they evolve (Habermas, 1976; Huxley, 1914) until it ultimately becomes a pragmatic relational cultural interaction that includes inter-cultural psychopathology (Rovera, 1990a, 1990b, 1994).

It is well-known that the method of Science is one and one only and that consequently (albeit maintaining the validity of an explanation as intended by Jaspers (1923)), attention should be focused on clinical and experimental research aimed at recovering a theoretical value.

A fundamental aspect of the Sacred/Religious dimension is rooted in several cultural, social, economic, family, political and religious structures addressing (as previously recalled) a God (Theism) or a variety of Gods (Polytheism) or ideas of God (Deism). These can engender founding structures for and a characterisation of cultures (myths, rites, foods, taboos, power struggles, job-allocating economic institutions, family relations, personological structures, attachment styles). And, let us not forget, these represent the creative and artistic aspects and great religious languages.

Complex research efforts are now taking hold in many fields of knowledge: these too should be understood in terms of the wealth of a plurality of cultures that are articulated through a plurality of languages and of social, technical, economic and religious scenarios. Plurality does not exclude uniqueness: it is possible that, alongside a plurality of local expressive and religious forms of the Sacred (emic), it might be possible to single out an underlying unitary and general aspect (etic; Tseng, 2001).

The experience acquired in reorganizing the methodology of cultural knowledge is not so much oriented towards establishing the supremacy of one or the other discipline (neurobiology, descriptive statistics, anthropology, general psychopathology, linguistics, etc.) as much as towards a better inter-disciplinary coordination (in a network model), whose points of reference could also lie in the Individual-Cultural Psychology reference model and in the variety of existing clinical practices.

THE EXPRESSION OF “DISTRESS” IN DIFFERENT CULTURES AND RELIGIONS

The expression of somatic, but especially psychic, distress in different cultures and religions raises issues that range from an array of clinical conditions that are different in terms of their symptomatological expression but that are equal from a psychopathological and somatic point of view, to conditions that are phenomenally similar but different in terms of the structure of their psycho-somatic significance. These problems lead us to an inter-disciplinary approach to: culturalism (intended as a cultural-relational plurality), to the eventual specificity of clinical psychopathological parameters, to ethical value orientations and to the significance of individual life experiences. They also leads us to assume that at least one of these concurrent pathogenic causes are the expression of a psycho-biological mouldable modelling process whereby what is normal, deviant and pathological can only be detected in respect of a given culture. The definition of the expression of physical and psychic distress, including predictor and success indicators relative to the proposed treatment, arises from the realization that different cultures – as already stated – are not configured as a unitary whole, although they share some common grounds. This means that a comprehensive cultural assessment must be addressed as a comparative survey of the different cultural groups involved and as a research into the interconnection pathways (quality, entity, significance of the disorder).

Moreover, a multiplicity of cultures raises the problem of eventually establishing a hierarchy among them and also of cultural relativism, which leaves no possibility of comparison, or of assuming (as again already stated) a cultural relational plurality. This makes it possible to address the issue from a culture-specific psychopathological and clinical approach in which cultural specificities are maintained but without having to resort to a hierarchization system scaling cultures from post-modern to traditional.

Coming now to religiosity and deity in the relationship between ethics and science and in respect of the multitude of clinical conditions, it is important to have and provide information that is as accurate as possible and correlated with the plurality of cultures involved:

- The *first type of information* is aimed at making a systematic review of the effect that cultural differences might have within the patient-doctor and/or patient-caregiver relationships in helping relations;
- The *second type of information* concerns cultural evaluations, especially relatively to:
Cultural identity; cultural factors associated to the patient’s psycho-social environment and functioning levels; the cultural elements contained in the relationship between the patient and the psycho-socio-health caregiver; an overall cultural assessment aimed at issuing a diagnosis and treatment plan.

- The *third type of information* relates to Culturally characterised Syndromes (CCS, see DSM IV-TR and other Cultural Psychiatry studies DSM V Draft).

NEW PSYCHOTHERAPIES AND PSYCHOTHERAPY CULT Within the socio-cultural context of post-modernity, New Age philosophy and the ‘New Psychotherapies’ professional practices are established with new scenarios and settings characterized by considerable differences from theoretical and practical models and from psychotherapeutic practices, especially if with a dynamic orientation (Boisvert, 1995; Ferguson, 2000; APA, 1994; Rovera *et al.*, 2004; Wallin, 2007).

- A. New Age may be referred to a network model, which entails a sufficiently inter-disciplinary, interactive articulation compatible with natural science, spiritual science and socio-cultural sciences, whose complementarity is now essential for a comprehensive-explicative-shared approach.
This model of reference is important for the empathetic components in the work of the inter-cultural therapist (Ferrero, 1995) in dealing with patients with different religious and cultural traditions. Today’s culture not only gives shape to new anthropological models but also to innovative therapeutic approaches to the presentation of symptoms.
- B. CDP (Cultural Dynamic Psychotherapy) influences both the “interpretation pathways” (including work on dreams; Rovera, 2008) and the interaction between therapist and patient in the flow of transference and counter-transference as well as in the meeting moments. The relational paradigm favours the notion of a relational mind towards the attainment of the so-called multi-cultural mind (Anolli, 2011). This entails an intertwining of micro-actions (*enactment*) and of openings (*disclosure*; Filippini & Ponsi, 1993) that are useful both in psychotherapeutic practice and theory.
It also impacts the evolution of the identity of the psychiatrist or of caregivers in the helping professions.
- C. These approaches go under the common denominator of new psychotherapies and refer, among other things, to the transition from drive to relational paradigms and subsequently to the model of Cultural Dynamic Psychotherapy (CDP). A critical review of these models and of the theory of psychotherapeutic techniques and methods becomes evident in therapeutic helping relationships that put in place intervention models through cultural *identification* or through cultural *mediations* facilitating the encounter with the Other.

Consequently to this “new psychotherapy”, and not to be confused therewith, there is a mushrooming of the most varied and bizarre interventions that lead to “abusive” therapies. These include the *psychotherapy-cult*, which presents methods that are “adjacent” to so-called “traditional treatments” (of shamans, gurus and curanderos) while, at the same time, offering a fictional “as if” image (Rovera, 2010) surreptitiously pretending to be an unprecedented edition of “new values” oriented towards science, philosophy, anthropology, psychology and sociology. The charismatic ministers of this pseudo-therapy no longer dress up as medicine doctors but “disguise” themselves as managers or reborn apostles often supported by legally recognised professionals.

This sort of post-modern tribalism proposes a new scientific spirituality and draws vital lymph from problems related to dis-identity, a new pseudo aspiration towards perfection and towards the pursuit of immortality.

These “treatments” are often exercised by legally framed “Organizations” that propose psychological interventions mixed with God-talk practices, psycho-motivational consulting sessions (‘psycho-talk’) and life-orientation guidelines. Their declared purpose is to obtain benefits of different types: physical, psychological, spiritual and social, making predictions on one’s love, sex and working life and, even more often, promising miraculous recoveries. The individual is incorporated into the organization through a neo-tribal religiosity (relying on esoteric practices) that ranges all the way to satanic rites: full-fledged resuscitations of the devil (Bartocci *et al.*, 2000; 2004).

From the ethical, deontological and scientific perspective, the psychotherapy cult and religious sectarianism are considered to be disculturization phenomena. In addition, they (in their multifarious realizations) can variably be defined as:

- an *iatrogenic abuse* of medicine and psychiatry;
- a *flagrant non-performance* of one's professional responsibilities, albeit in the presence of a fictitious bureaucratic cover-up;
- a *psychotherapeutic malpractice* deviating from the theory of clinical techniques and practices and from institutional codes of ethical conduct.

THE CRISIS OF POST-MODERNITY Also post-modernity (Lyotard, 1979) is undergoing a situation of crisis: tending both towards a further breakdown and towards novel needs of metamorphosis.

Religion is taking on new faces that, at first glance, are not strictly religious: it is the so-called 'liquid religiosity', which is analogous to the 'liquid identity' (Bauman, 2005).

This is allegedly one of the outcomes of the New Age philosophy, characterized by believing without belonging and by religion without a setting. The aforesaid liquid religion no longer provides guidelines for making everyday choices.

All of the above is in open contrast with revealed religions (Theism) and with the religious sense of the idea of God (Deism; as mentioned in the epistolary exchange between Adler and Jahn).

By tracing the roots of ancient conceptions, it would now be advisable to redefine culture and religiosity by focusing on the contributions made by the contemporary knowledge that dismantled the biological theory of race, thus making it possible to reconcile the concept of universality with the variety and uniqueness of individuals and human experience.

Human nature is biologically incomplete and only the intervention of culture (Mead, 1934), by transferring unwritten knowledge and practices onto the genetic code, can compensate the original shortcomings (this well fits in with the Adlerian conception).

Also neuroscientific disciplines (at times excessively reductionist) have embraced the incompleteness model. Culture has moulded an incomplete nature and is not only limited to overlapping a predetermined biological structure (Kandel, 1998, 1999, 2005). For the encephalon to develop, it requires to be immersed in and interact with a cultural environment and a linguistic structure which include value orientations and sacred/religious beliefs: all this has a decisive effect on forming neural connections, as envisaged by the brain plasticity theory.

Leaving aside the genetic determinism of race (or biological racism) insofar as obsolete, the contribution of culture through anthropological fundamentals (such as the sacred, kinship organization, the conception of one's body and sexuality, all the way through to the pursuit of power) risks, among other things, giving birth to a new cultural racism.

Human cultures are dynamic insofar as they consist not only of models representing and interpreting reality, but also express themselves in an innovative way through the creative Self, in behaviours, practices, actions, beliefs and values: cultures are incorporated into human beings.

RETHINKING CULTURE AND RELIGION Rethinking culture and religion is now thought to be essential, not necessarily through the now outdated interlinking of reason/progress/civilization but rather through a new relational/neo-humanistic/civilizing model. If culture and religion once referred to specific territories (in ethnic, linguistic and political terms), today, with the current migratory flows, we are witnessing numerous relocations and dynamic connections.

Cultures are made into the object of political discourse, sacralization, evolutionary openings and sometimes even of the clash of civilizations, which would be deplorable if it did not lead to a dynamic connection versus integration.

The evolution of culture is turning out to be a very complex matter. Furthermore, the inter-connection between religiosity and culture with psychological and clinical aspects makes it all the more complex, both when studies are considered like socio-cultural surveys of behaviour and also when they are connected to different disciplines like neuroscience, psychology, anthropology and history (Ellenberger, 1970). Indeed, each one of these disciplines develops methods and theories that are consistent with its own scope, to the extent that they could give rise to a sort of co-evolution of different psychological models (and cultural changes).

Shared norms and rules within ethnic-social-religious groups are not only correlated to beliefs and symbolic meanings, giving rise to an intense dynamism between modes of perception. Changing inter-individual relations (also in terms of sexuality, aggressiveness, creative expression, etc.) determines the moulding of cultural models that shape choices, trends and even the taste and banning of food.

As the theory and practice of Comparative Individual Psychology is focused on religious and cultural value orientations as well as on the orientation of biology and neuroscience and, above all, on clinical psychotherapeutic models, it cannot avoid raising specific questions on the new professions practiced in the field of mental health (Larson *et al*, 1998).

The risk that might derive from the range of helping relations is that they could lead to a heterogeneous fragmentation more based on “commonplace” than “common sense” (Ehrenberg, 1992). What is important to underscore in this respect is that a cultural dynamic psychotherapy might be developed and recognised in parallel with other therapeutic practices.

Helping relations rely on individuals that opt for a helping profession that uses different methods but relies on motivational or vocational reasons that are very similar to a social interest and a community sentiment (intended in the Adlerian sense).

Within the context of CIP, professions are expected to provide criteria that are useful to understand and tackle emerging problems, also within a socio-political-health care framework, raising questions on the right to assistance in general, on the relationship between caregiver and patient (also of different cultures and religions) and on the principles and values that should orient helping relation activities.

The principle of equal dignity guiding the way we approach the differences between different cultures, religions and ethnic groups theoretically, methodologically and practically requires solutions aimed at guaranteeing non-discrimination in the access to disease prevention services, diagnosis and treatment, as well as promoting mediation actions among this multitude of diversities.

Today it is very difficult to foresee if the Universal Declaration of Human Rights can, in the future, turn into a platform for a legal ethics universally shared by all the people of the world, capable of configuring and consolidating into a theoretical and practical cultural relational plurality model.

REFLECTIONS Many indicate the usefulness of attaining a new humanism, which is nonetheless differently interpreted by the scholars that propose it.

- Corrado Piancastelli (1998), a decade or so ago, had predicted a ‘New Humanism for a New Europe’, centred on «development, growth and knowledge of the individual» (Note 1). In this perspective, he set forth the need to underwrite a scientific-philosophical manifesto of Italian neo-humanists aimed at redesigning a change of style in relating to medical patients and interacting with the world, as well as re-defining the significance of moral values.
- Eric Kandel (2005), in his studies, presented a «new humanism [...] based in part on insights into our biology». In his opinion, this new approach would lead individuals to acquire a new awareness of his/her limits and to a sort of ‘religion of science’ (in this latter case, psycho-biological and neuroscientific).
- Umberto Galimberti (2009), in his essay *I miti del nostro tempo*, highlights the fact that, in order to overcome the friend/enemy contrast in a variety of conflicts, it is necessary to put

in place a ‘secular culture’ educating people in the culture of brotherhood. He propounds a ‘new humanism’ that might be compatible with the deep reasons of life and not with the “destructiveness” prevailing over individual rights, thus achieving «a culture of human rights and the rights of people» (Note 1), ultimately realizing a ‘global community’.

Thanks to its theoretical and practical groundwork and its focus on Social Sentiment, the Comparative Individual Psychology model can be proposed as authentically humanist. It has been long included among the major social movements useful to mankind by encouraging the realization of single individuals – albeit respecting individual and collective diversities – and respect for different cultures and religiosities. Such model is also compatible both with scientific research and with helping relations.

This cross-border and multi-disciplinary network calls for critical contributions in order to establish a cultural psychiatry and dynamic psychotherapy: a challenge for future studies and research.

NOTES

1. Translated into English by the author (GGR) himself.

REFERENCES

- Adler A. *Il senso della vita*. Novara, De Agostini, 1990 [Trans into Italian by Parenti F from *Der Sinn des Lebens*. Frankfurt a/M, 1933]
- Adler A. Der komplexzwang als teil der persönlichkeit und neurose. *Internationale Zeitschrift für Individualpsychologie*, 13: 1-6, 1935a
- Adler A. The fundamental views of Individual Psychology. *International Journal of Individual Psychology*, 1: 5-8, 1935b
- Adler A, Ansbacher HL (Ed), Ansbacher RR (Ed). *Superiority and social interest. A collection of later writings*. New York, W.W. Norton & Co., 1970
- Airenti G. *Intersoggettività e teoria della mente. Le origini cognitive della comunicazione*. Torino, Bollati Boringhieri, 2003
- Aletti M. Psicoterapia, psicoanalisi e religione: spunti per un dibattito. *Formazione psichiatrica*, 19: 135-150, 1998
- American Psychiatric Association (APA). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. Fourth Edition*. Washington (DC), American Psychiatric Association, 1994
- Anolli L. *La sfida della mente culturale. Nuove forme di convivenza*. Milano, Raffaello Cortina, 2011
- Ansbacher HL, Ansbacher RR. *The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler*. New York, Basic Books, 1956
- Bartocci G (Ed). *Psicopatologia cultura e pensiero magico*. Napoli, Liguori, 1990
- Bartocci G (Ed). *Psicopatologia cultura e dimensione del sacro*. Roma, Edizioni Universitarie Romane, 1994
- Bartocci G. *Igiene mentale transculturale: Tecniche di trascendenza, esperienze del sovranaturale e vita inautentica*. In: Fassino S, Leombruni P, Rovera GG (Eds). *La Qualità della Vita. Percorsi psicologici, biomedici e transculturali*. Torino, Centro Scientifico Editore, 2000
- Bartocci G. Transcendence techniques and psychobiological mechanisms underlying religious experience. *Mental health religion & culture*, 7: 171-181, 2004
- Bartocci G, Frighi L, Rovera GG, Lalli N, di Fonzo T. *Cohabiting with magic and religion in Italy: Cultural and clinical results*. In: Okpaku SO (Ed). *Clinical methods in transcultural psychiatry*. Washington (DC), American Psychiatric Press, 1998
- Bastide R. *Sociologie des maladies mentales*. Paris, Flammarion, 1965
- Bauman Z. *Liquid Life*. Cambridge, Polity Press, 2005
- Boehnlein JK. Religion and spirituality in psychiatric care: looking back, looking ahead. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, 43: 634-651, 2006
- Boisvert Y. *Le postmodernism*. Québec, Boréal, 1995
- Bowlby J. *Attachment and Loss*. New York, Basic Books, 1969

- Brancaleone F, Buffardi G, Traversa G. *Helping. Le professioni d'aiuto dall'antropologia esistenziale alla consulenza filosofica*. San Felice a Cancellio (Italy), Melagrana, 2008
- Buffardi G. Antropologia clinica esistenziale e neuroscienze: Confronti e compatibilità. *L'Altro*, 12: 9-14, 2009
- Cavalli Sforza LL. *L'evoluzione della cultura*. Torino, Codice, 2004
- Cerri A, Malpelli M, Visca D. *Oltre il New-Age. Il futuro della religione e le religioni del futuro*. Roma, Bulzoni, 2008
- Ceserani R. *Raccontare il postmoderno*. Torino, Bollati Boringhieri, 1997
- Conlan R (Ed). *States of mind. New discoveries about how our brains make us who we are*. New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1999
- Cozolino IJ. *The neuroscience of psychotherapy. Building and rebuilding the human brain*. New York, W.W. Norton & Co., 2002
- Ferguson ED. *Social interest and social equality*. In: Fassino S, Leombruni P, Rovera GG (Eds). *La Qualità della Vita. Percorsi psicologici, biomedici e transculturali*. Torino, Centro Scientifico Editore, 2000
- Edelman GM. *Second nature: Brain science and human knowledge*. New Haven/London, Yale University Press, 2006
- Ehrenberg DB. *The Intimate edge. Extending the reach of psychoanalytic interaction*. New York, W.W. Norton & Co., 1992
- Ellenberger HF. *The discovery of the unconscious. The history and evolution of dynamic psychiatry*. New York, Basic Books, 1970
- Fassino S. *Verso una nuova identità dello psichiatra*. Torino, Centro Scientifico Editore, 2002
- Fassino S, Abbate Daga G, Leombruni P. *Manuale di psichiatria biopsicosociale*. Torino, Centro Scientifico Editore, 2007
- Ferrero A. *Insula dulcamara. Studi di psicologia e psichiatria psicodinamica*. Torino, Centro Scientifico Editore, 1995
- Ferrero A. *Psicoterapia psicodinamica adleriana: Un trattamento possibile nel dipartimento di salute mentale*. Torino, Centro Studi e Ricerca in Psichiatria, 2009
- Filippini S, Ponsi M. Enactment. *Rivista di Psicoanalisi*, 39: 501-516, 1993
- Gabbard GO. Integrating biological and psychosocial perspectives. *The American Psychiatric Press Review of Psychiatry*, 15: 527-548, 1996
- Gabbard GO. A neurobiologically informed perspective on psychotherapy. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 177: 117-122, 2000
- Gadamer HG. *Wahrheit und Methode*. Tübingen, 1960
- Galimberti U. *I miti del nostro tempo*. Milano, Feltrinelli, 2009
- Gallese V. La molteplice natura delle relazioni interpersonali: La ricerca di un comune meccanismo neurofisiologico. *Networks*, 1: 24-47, 2003
- Garfinkel H. *Studies in ethnomethodology*. New York, Prentice Hall, 1967
- Geertz C. *The interpretation of cultures*. New York, Basic Books, 1973
- Gill MM. The interpersonal paradigm and the degree of the therapist's involvement. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis*, 19: 200-237, 1983
- Giovacchini PL. *Countertransference. Triumphs and catastrophes*. Northvale (NJ), Jason Aronson, 1989
- Godelier M. *Al fondamento delle società umane, ciò che ci insegna l'antropologia*. Milano, Jaka Book, 2009 [Trans into Italian by Carbonelli G from *Au fondement des sociétés humaines*. Paris, Editions Albin Michel, 2007]
- Habermas J. *Kultur und Kritik. Verstreute Aufsätze*. Frankfurt a/M, Suhrkamp, 1976
- Hobson J. *La scienza dei sogni. Alla scoperta dei segreti del sonno*. Mondadori, Milano, 2003 [Trans into Italian by Russo G from *Dreaming. An introduction to the science of sleep*. New York, Oxford University Press, 2002]
- Hoffman E. *The drive for Self. Alfred Adler and the founding of individual psychology*. Reading (MA), Addison-Wesley, 1994
- Huxley Th. *Evolution and Ethics and Other Essays*. New York, Appleton & Co., 1914.
- Jahn E, Adler A. *Religion und individual psychologie: Eine prinzipielle Auseinandersetzung über Menschensführung*. Vienna, Leipzig, 1933
- Jaspers K. *Allgemeine Psychopathologie*. Berlin, Springer Verlag, 1923
- Jilek WG. *Indian healing. Shamanic ceremonialism in the Pacific northwest today*. Surrey (BC), Hancock House, 1982
- Joannes FV (Ed). *Psicanalisi e fede cristiana*. Milano, Mondadori, 1971
- Kandel ER. A new intellectual framework for psychiatry. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 155: 457-469, 1998

CULTURES AND RELIGIONS IN THE CRISIS OF POST-MODERNITY

- Kandel ER. A new intellectual framework for psychiatry revisited. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 156: 505-524, 1999
- Kandel ER. *Psychiatry, psychoanalysis and the new biology of mind*. Washington (DC), American Psychiatric Publishing, 2005
- Kaufman S. *Reinventing the sacred. A new view of science, reason and religion*. New York, Basic Books, 2008
- Larson D, Greenwold Milano M, Lu F. *Religion and mental health: The need for cultural sensitivity and synthesis*. In: Okpaku SO (Ed). *Clinical methods in transcultural psychiatry*. Washington (DC), American Psychiatric Press, 1998
- Le Bras G. *Problemi della sociologia delle religioni*. In: Gurvitch G. *Trattato di sociologia*. Milano, Il Saggiatore, 1967 [Trans into Italian from *Traite de sociologie* by Solaroli L]
- Levi-Strauss C. *Le pensée sauvage*. Paris, Presses Pocket, 1962
- Liotard JF. *La condition postmoderne: Rapport sur le savoir*. Paris, Minuit, 1979
- Mead GH. *Mind, self and society*. Chicago/London, University of Chicago Press, 1934
- Morin E. *La Voie. Pour l'avenir de l'humanité*. Paris, Fayard, 2011
- Moro MR, de La Noë Q, Mouchenik Y. *Manuel de Psychiatrie Transculturale. Travail clinique, travail social*. Grenoble, Pensée Sauvage, 2006
- Okpaku SO (Ed). *Clinical methods in transcultural psychiatry*. Washington (DC), American Psychiatric Press, 1998
- Paoletti N, Rovera GG. *L'espressione del sintomo in psichiatria: Considerazioni preliminari e di metodologia della ricerca*. In: AAVV. *L'approccio transculturale in psichiatria*. Torino, Massaza e Sinchetto, 1984
- Parenti F, Rovera GG, Pagani PL, Castello F. *Dizionario ragionato di Psicologia Individuale*. Milano, Raffaello Cortina, 1975
- Pera M, Ratzinger J. *Senza radici. Europa, relativismo, cristianesimo, islam*. Milano, Mondadori, 2004
- Piancastelli C. Il manifesto scientifico-filosofico dei neo-umanisti italiani. In: *Uomini e idee*. Napoli, Guida, 1998
- Ponce DE. *Cultural epistemology and value orientations: Clinical application in transcultural psychiatry*. Okpaku SO (Ed). *Clinical methods in transcultural psychiatry*. Washington (DC), American Psychiatric Press, 1998
- Ponsi M. *Acting (in e out), enactment, agire*. In: Barale F, Bertani M, Gallese V, Mistura S, Zamperini A (Eds). *Psiche. Dizionario storico di psicologia, psichiatria, psicoanalisi, neuroscienze*. Torino, Einaudi, 2006
- Powers RL. Cult, culture and cultivation: The contributions of individual psychology. *Individual Psychology: Journal of Adlerian Theory, Research & Practice*, 53: 9-22, 1997
- Prince R. *Grieving for a lost eternity*. In: Fassino S, Leombruni P, Rovera GG (Eds). *La Qualità della Vita. Percorsi psicologici, biomedici e transculturali*. Torino, Centro Scientifico Editore, 2000
- Remotti F. *Levi-Strauss: Struttura e storia*. Torino, Einaudi, 1971
- Roggero G, Simon D, Valperga Roggero MA. *Religiosità e cultura. Dal progetto positivistico al dialogo interreligioso*. Torino, Il Segnalibro, 1998
- Rossi G, Aletti M. *Psicologia della religione e teoria dell'attaccamento*. Roma, Aracne, 2009
- Rossi P. *Cultura e antropologia*. Torino, Einaudi, 1983
- Rovera GG. *Psicoterapia e cultura: Prospettive su base adleriana*. In: AAVV. *Psicoterapia e cultura. Atti del Convegno organizzato dalla Sezione di psicoterapia medica della Società Italiana di Psichiatria*. Roma, Il Pensiero Scientifico, 1976
- Rovera GG. *Introduzione epistemologica ed operativa in psichiatria transculturale*. In: AAVV. *L'approccio transculturale in psichiatria*. Torino, Massaza e Sinchetto, 1984
- Rovera GG. *Demonologia, psichiatria e transculturalismo*. In: AAVV. *L'autunno del diavolo. Atti del convegno di Torino, 17-21 ottobre 1988*. Milano, Bompiani, 1990a
- Rovera GG. *Problemi transculturali in psicopatologia*. In: Bartocci G (Ed). *Psicopatologia cultura e pensiero magico*. Napoli, Liguori, 1990b
- Rovera GG. *Spunti metodologici per uno studio sulla dimensione del Sacro*. In: Bartocci G (Ed). *Psicopatologia cultura e dimensione del sacro*. Roma, Edizioni Universitarie Romane, 1994
- Rovera GG. *Presentazione*. In: Fassino S, Leombruni P, Rovera GG (Eds). *La Qualità della Vita. Percorsi psicologici, biomedici e transculturali*. Torino, Centro Scientifico Editore, 2000
- Rovera GG. *Das Netzwerkmodell in der Individualpsychologie aus erkenntnistheoretischer Sicht*. In: Zapotoczky HG, Fischhof PK (Eds). *Psychiatrie der Lebensabshnütte. Ein Kompendium*. Wien/New York, Springer, 2002a

- Rovera GG. L'espressione del malessere fisico e psichico nelle diverse religioni e culture. In: AAVV. *Etica e cultura*. Torino, La Grafica, 2002b
- Rovera GG. Iatrogenia e malpratica in psicoterapia. *Rivista di Psicologia Individuale*, 55: 7-50, 2004a
- Rovera GG. Il modello adleriano nelle relazioni d'aiuto. *Rivista di Psicologia Individuale*, 56: 9-14, 2004b
- Rovera GG. I significati dei valori nella "psychotherapy-cult". *Psichiatri Oggi*, 2004c
- Rovera GG. Psichiatria Transculturale: Aspetti teorico-pratici e nuove professionalità. *Società Italiana di Psichiatria Transculturale*, ACTA, Roma, 2005
- Rovera GG. Cultura, potere, spiritualità. *Giornale Italiano di Psicopatologia*, 12: S37-S38, 2006a
- Rovera GG. The Biopsychosocial paradigm: Evolutionism vis-à-vis creationism, cultural construction of the spiritual self. *Presentation at 1st World Congress of Cultural Psychiatry*, Beijing (China), September 2006b
- Rovera GG. Il sogno tra neuroscienze e psicoterapie: Un dibattito postmoderno. *Rivista di Psicologia Individuale*. 64: 127-146, 2008
- Rovera GG. Adlerian psychodynamic psychotherapy. Which psychotherapy for which person? *World Cultural Psychiatry Research Review* 4: S69, 2009a
- Rovera GG. The postmodern sentiment of deity and religiosity: Observations. *World Cultural Psychiatry Research Review* 4: S27-S28, 2009b
- Rovera GG. Religiosità e cultura in Psicologia Individuale. *Rivista di Psicologia Individuale*, 67: 23-64, 2010
- Rovera GG, Fassino S. *Problemi sul transculturalismo*. In: Rovera GG et Al. *Il sistema aperto della Individual Psicologia: temi di psicopatologia, psicoterapia, sessuologia e transculturalismo*. Milano, Quaderni della Rivista di Psicologia Individuale, 4: 171, 1979
- Rovera GG, Fassino S, Ferrero A, Gatti A, Scarso G. *Il modello di rete in psichiatria. Considerazioni preliminari*. Rassegna di Ipnosi Minerva Medica, 75: 1-9, 1984
- Rovera GG, Gatti A. Folli, Diavoli e Psichiatri. In: AA.VV. *L'autunno del diavolo. Atti del convegno di Torino, 17 - 21 ottobre 1988*. Milano, Bompiani, 1990
- Rovera GG, Delsedime N, Fassino S, Ponziani U. *La ricerca in Psicologia Individuale. Contribuiti teorici, metodologici e pratici*. Torino, Centro Scientifico Editore, 2004.
- Rovera GG, Bartocci G, Bianconi A, Gatti A. Cultural Psychodynamic Psychotherapy in evolution. Issues and challenges. *World Cultural Psychiatry Research Reviews*, 4: S72, 2009
- Sapir E. Cultural anthropology and psychiatry. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 27: 229-242, 1932
- Terranova-Checchini R. *Presentazione*. In: Castiglioni M, Riva E, Inghilleri P (Eds). *Dispositivi transculturali per la cura degli adolescenti. Un modello di intervento*. Franco Angeli, Milano, 2010
- Terrin AN. *New Age. La religiosità del postmoderno*. Bologna, EDB, 1993
- Tseng WS. *Textbook of cultural psychiatry*. San Diego (CA)/London, Academic Press, 2001
- von Weizsäcker V. *Der gestaltkreis*. Thieme, Leipzig, 1940
- Wallin DJ. *Attachment in psychotherapy*. New York, The Guilford Press, 2007
- Weber M. *Il metodo delle scienze storico-sociali*. Torino, Einaudi, 1958 [Trans into Italian from *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre* by Rossi P]
- Wittkower ED. Perspectives de psychiatrie transculturelle. *L'Information psychiatrique*, 40: 521-525, 1964