The growing use of the Internet by academics, practitioners, and clients alike is having a major impact on clinical research and practice. Many clinicians are already familiar with the client who walks into the consulting room, having done extensive research on what diagnosis they might have and what treatment they should get. Projective tests are no exceptions to the rule: Thousands of pages are now dedicated to them, some of a better quality than others.

The Rorschach, in particular, has recently been the object of much attention in the media following the publication by the online encyclopedia Wikipedia of the ten cards together with the main responses. The move was prompted by a professional who was frustrated with the debate over whether one inkblot should have been published or not and decided, out of frustration, to upload all the cards (Sample, 2009 in The Guardian). This set the stage for heated exchanges between supporters of the test and other groups of individuals (some of whom certainly dislike the test), who stated that removing the cards was an affront against the freedom of information. Organizations such as the ISR rightly pointed to the ethical and clinical implications of such action (Smith, 2009).

Many have argued that resources such as Wikipedia have generally democratized access to knowledge by enabling millions of users to access information in a quick and simple manner. But is knowledge solely a matter of simplicity? Systemic and cybernetic theories demonstrate that information and knowledge involve complex processes. This also applies to the Internet, which is not just an accumulation of knowledge and information on billions of pages, but also a multitude of interdependent systems. For example, the ranking of a page by the search engine
Google depends, among other things, on the number of times other pages have been (hyper)linked to that page—not by the quantity or quality of the information per se. Searching “Rorschach” on Google does not necessarily give you the most relevant page to consult, but rather the page that has the highest level of interdependency on the Web. And what about quality and the source of the information? As argued in the French journal *Books* (March 2010), instruments such as Wikipedia are helpful to individuals who can read “between the lines” but present risks to others because of the lack of validation. In the end this leads to an impoverishment of knowledge more than anything else. In addition, “web knowledge” can be easily manipulated by individuals or lobby groups. Information is therefore always contained within a complex system because it is dependent on the context. Knowledge remains a complex issue, and as Bachelard (2000) notes, we can simplify the object of our study but it will never really be simple. Our collective endeavors, in both research and clinical practice, show us that projective methods allow an understanding of the complexity of human functioning. As Morin (2005) demonstrates, the study of reality is a task that involves recognizing that contradictory elements need to be seen as co-existing and complementary. Projective assessment would seem to represent a method that can take into account what Morin (2005) has defined as the “complexity paradigm.”

The availability of *Rorschachiana* as an online publication is thus one of the many ways to counteract the simplification of our tools. Still, more needs to be done. It is important not only that we remain vigilant and spot knowledge that is being made available online, we also need to learn and use the same tools to increase the visibility of our own views. The Editorial Board of *Rorschachiana* is currently exploring other ways to make our journal more visible on the World Wide Web.

The content of *Rorschachiana* volume 31 reflects the richness of practice and the depth of thinking necessary to engage with complexity. Iwasa and Ogawa share the results of their study on the relationship between texture responses and attachment theory. Grønnerød and Hartmann take a different position by offering a fresh perspective on scoring the Rorschach they developed in Norway. Flahault and Sultan demonstrate how the Rorschach can be useful research tool when exploring the impact of parental cancer on their children. Sendin discusses treatment planning and discusses how the Rorschach, combined with a comprehensive assessment, can lead to more effective treatment outcomes. Pe-
terson looks at the importance of the percept behind the Rorschach and proposes some innovative reflections, helpful to both practitioners and trainers. Finally, Serge Sultan, Special Section Guest Editor, has collated a series of thought-provoking articles for the second issue of this volume, dedicated to projective techniques and psychosomatic disorders.
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