

This text does not have the finished quality of a published paper, but I decided to include it here because this conference was exceptional and the invitation to give a keynote speech gave me the opportunity to pull together a range of ideas and experiences that have been pivotal in my professional life.

## ***Our enduring ambivalence toward living in groups***

William F. Cornell

Keynote Address: Come Together—The power of group dynamics  
ITAA/FTAA Conference, Sydney, Australia  
July, 2015

Groups  
The group  
Individuals  
The individual  
The Social  
Communities  
Group analysis  
Group psychotherapy

It has been so important these past two days to have keynote addresses from outside our community, from outside *our* group. As we have listened to Andrew Samuels and Farhad Dalal these past two days, we heard these words over and over again. You'll be hearing these words yet again this morning. Each of these words has technical, theoretical definitions. Each of these words has personal meanings, conscious and unconscious. Each of us hear these words, speak these words, and never quite mean the same thing. Give yourselves the freedom to ascribe whatever meanings and feelings these words evoke for you.

To be a member of a group, of a community. What does it mean to belong?  
What do we gain in belonging? What is the price of belonging?

The individual. How often do we attribute our theories and methods to an individual? Freudian psychoanalysis. Jungian analysis. Kleinian analysis. Bernian transactional analysis. It is as though these methodologies have sprung from the mind of a single individual. We lose the social fabric and turmoil, the lived group realities that are in fact the social and historical grounds for these theories. One of the things I hope to do this morning is to situate the ideas that we call "theory"--that we often confuse with reality, concretize, and all too often

turn into scripture—to ground these ideas in the social realities within which they arose. It's my belief that the theories that form our work are efforts of marginalized individuals and their communities to make the unbearable bearable and to create spaces and places of belonging.

*In his goodbye address as ITAA president in 2010, Gianpiero Petriglieri called upon us as transactional analysts to stand proudly and competently for respected marginality. This takes courage. In respected marginality we relinquish the comfort joining the majority, of conforming to the norm. Living at the edge? Longing to belong? What might we gain in respected marginality? What might we lose? Respected marginality.*

*The leaders in the evolution of group analysis and group psychotherapy have often stood at the margins of their professional groups and social norms. They sometimes suffered the pains and losses of sanctioned social violence. This was certainly the case for Eric Berne.*

Two weeks ago, I attended the EATA conference in Rome with the focus being on empirically validated research that I found stimulating, educational, provocative, and infuriating. So, two conferences back to back on different continents: the first on empirical research and now on groups—two of my very favorite topics!

On the plane home from the Rome conference I “entertained” my partner, Mick, with a lengthy, impassioned rant on the absurdity and irrelevance of empirically validated outcome research. As is his habit, he listened patiently. Then, as is also his habit, he offered an interpretation. As Mick spoke, I took notes: **“Demand for outcome measures is a symptom of something happening in the culture and our professional groups as psychotherapists. We bring our skills and efforts to understand the meaning of symptoms. That’s what we try to do. But we don’t always do it. We all react to symptoms. We do that all the time, but if we are locked into our countertransference reactivity, we cannot think. When we react to the symptom, like you are to all this pressure around outcome measures, we can’t seek the underlying meaning. We can’t do our work. The demand for outcome measures is a symptom of something troubling our professional communities, so people react to it--anxiously, dismissively, or they capitulate to it, as we saw sometimes at the conference. It does not engender thinking. When a client comes to us with a symptom, if we capitulate to it or dismiss it, we don’t help the client. What is this current pressure, demand for empirical research symptomatic of in our current cultural and professional context? If you would stop reacting, you might be able to start thinking.”**

So, what's a guy to do but start to think? I started thinking. But my thinking did not come in thoughts. I did not find myself thinking about the relevance of research. Rather, associations to Mick's accounting of social symptoms began to call my attention. A series of memories and associations to the frequent violence connected to belonging to a group, a society, and socially sanctioned identities held my attention. I found myself unexpectedly thinking about the past century of wars, and the impact of those wars on our efforts to work together in groups and live in community. I didn't understand these associations at first. But gradually they gathered force, and then they began to give this speech its final form and meaning.

So we'll start with some history. It is a history of some of the international violence over the past century, violence that has often severed civilized ties. Violence that then engendered efforts of repair and reparation in group and community life--efforts only to be torn apart repeatedly by further wars.

I will be reading some rather extensive quotes, not so as to turn this talk into an academic paper, but as a way to invite you more directly into the times and dilemmas in which these radical experiments with group life were forged. As you listen to these quotes, let the words infect you, affect you. What happens in your body? What images or memories are evoked?

I'll begin with Freud. Many of his most personal and troubled writings were a product of the impact that the First World War had upon him, his family, and colleagues. In an essay, "Timely reflections of war and death," written in 1915, Freud lamented:

**"In blind fury it [war] demolished everything that stands in its way, as though there would be no future and no peace among men once it has passed. It severs all common bonds among warring nations and threatens to leave behind a bitterness that will make it impossible for them to renew those bonds for a long time to come."** Freud had opposed his sons' fighting in the war. At the war's end his son Martin was still interred in a prisoner of war camp—not released until 9 months after the war was over. The war years left Freud deeply troubled.

In 1918 the International Psychoanalytic Association met in Budapest. The war was still ongoing. It was within that context that Freud delivered a paper entitled, "Advances in psycho-analytic therapy". Freud sought to remind his colleagues of the psychoanalytic project and re-assert the urgency of their work. He closed his talk in a remarkable fashion:

**"...it is possible to foresee that at some time or other the conscience of society will awake and remind it that the poor man should have just as much right to assistance for the mind as he now has to the life-saving help**

**offered by surgery; and [it will be seen] that the neuroses threaten public health as much as tuberculosis.... “**

He then proposed the creation of free analytically-oriented clinics be established, so that, **“men who would otherwise give way to drink, women who have nearly succumbed to privations, and children for whom there is no choice but between running free and neurosis, may be made capable, through therapy, of resistance and of efficient work.”** (p. 167, *SE*, vol. 17)

At Freud's insistence, after the war, all psychoanalytic institutes were required to establish clinics to provide free treatment to the poor. All analysts were required to contribute time in these programs. These clinics were among the first things demolished by the Nazis as they began to move against psychoanalysis, Jews, and all others who lived outside their proscribed social norms.

Freud wrote extensively on the psychology of groups but never developed a methodology of group treatment. That was to be the work of others: Trigant Burrow, Wilfred Bion, S.H. Foulkes and Eric Berne, among others.

Between the wars, the American social psychiatrist, Trigant Burrow, wrote extensively about the social basis of human behavior, arguing, “an individual discord is but a symptom of a social discord.” (“Insanity a social problem” 1926, *American J. of Sociology*). Burrow is one of the cast-off radicals of psychoanalytic history. An American psychiatrist practicing in Baltimore, he heard lectures by Freud and Jung during their infamous tour of America. He was so impressed that he moved his family to Zurich to undertake an analysis with Jung. He began an active correspondence with Freud as well. Upon his return to Baltimore in 1911, he co-founded the American Psychoanalytic Association with Ernest Jones. He worked as a psychoanalyst, writing numerous papers during the following decade. Then, in 1921, he accepted the challenge of one of his patients to switch places. Through this reversal of roles, Burrow--now the patient—confronted his own resistances to the analytic process and began to recognize the social forces at play in the analytic relationship. He created an experiment in which the members of the study group included himself, his patients and students, colleagues and members of their families engaged in an ongoing mutual examination of the unconscious dynamics of participation in the group. Burrow named this process “group and social analysis.” He argued that in group-analytic work, the analyst could not hold a privileged position. He or she, like everyone else in the group, was an observer of their own processes and were observed by everyone else. I found it impossible to read about these groups without also wondering who was having sex with whom. That might, of course, just be my Reichian hangover, but attention to sexuality is nearly a vacuum in the group analytic literature (except Moris Nitsun).

These group analyses were held strictly in the here and now, discussing the social and group-level pressures on the meanings and behaviors created through membership in the group. Burrow moved away from the exploration of infantile and childhood experiences as the primary explanations for adult neurotic behavior. He gradually left his psychoanalytic orientation behind to develop a socially grounded theory of human development that had more in keeping with phenomenology and existentialism than classical or Jungian psychoanalysis. *Burrow argued that normality must be distinguished from health—that normality is a brand of the shared sickness of the social structure.*

It was all a bit too radical, as we might imagine. He lost his post at the university and was asked to resign from the American Psychoanalytic Association in 1933—the same year that Reich was expelled from the International. His work—like that of his fellow analytic outcasts, Ferenczi and Reich—nearly disappeared. But he had strong influences on Wilfred Bion and S.H. Foulkes, two pioneers in group analytic practices.

***But perhaps even more impactful than Burrow’s work upon Bion and Foulkes were the World Wars.***

*In World War I Bion served in the Royal Tank Corp, Foulkes, who was Jewish served in the German army & Rickman, who worked with Bion, had been an ambulance driver, serving as a conscientious objector with a Quaker unit in Russia.*

The First World War shaped Bion in profound ways. In the autobiography of his early life, he devoted 180 gruesome pages to the account of his service, when at 19 he became an officer in the Royal Tank Corp. Only he and 2 others in the entire regimen survived the war. By the time the Second World War rolled around, he was a psychiatrist again in military service. All of his early work with groups occurred in the context of his work with psychologically damaged soldiers in England and France.

In the Northfield “experiments” he undertook with John Rickman, Bion began a series of experimental groups with soldiers in psychiatric care. While the experiment lasted all of 5 weeks, Bion’s reflections in his now classic *Experiences in Groups* have been foundational for group analytic work. He was a military officer who was also a psychiatrist, a psychiatrist who worked in the midst of war. He described the psychiatric unit in this way:

**“Under one roof were gathered 300-400 men who in their units already had the benefit of such therapeutic value as lies in military discipline, good food, and regular care; clearly this had not been enough to stop them from finding their way into a psychiatric hospital.”**

He goes on:

**“An officer who aspires to be a psychiatrist in charge of a rehabilitation wing must know what it is to be in a responsible position at the time when responsibility means having to face issues of life and death. ...A psychiatrist who knows this will at least be spared the hideous blunder of thinking that patients are potential cannon fodder to be returned as such to their units. He will realize that it is his task to produce self-respecting men socially adjusted to the community and therefore willing to accept its responsibilities, whether in peace or war.”** *Experiences in Groups*, 1959, pp. 12-13

After the war, reflecting on the experiences in his war-related groups, Bion observes:

**“it was essential first to find out what was the ailment afflicting the community, as opposed to the individuals composing it, and next to give the community a common aim. In general, all psychiatric hospitals have the same ailment and the same common aim—to escape the batterings of neurotic disorder. Unfortunately, the attempt to get this relief is nearly always by futile means—retreat. Without realizing it doctors and patients alike are running away from the complaint.”**

This was the birth of what Bion considered social psychiatry.

He outlined basic principles:

- 1) The objective of the group/community is to study its own internal tensions
- 2) No problem is tackled until its nature and extent are made clear as part of the larger group
- 3) The remedy had to be shared and understood by the full group
- 4) The study of the group's tensions was a 24-hour project
- 5) It was our objective to send the men out with at least some understanding of the nature of intra-group tensions and, if possible, with some idea how to set about harmonizing them
- 6) It is a group job & it is the study of real life situations

A Jew who fought for Germany in the First World War, S. H. Foulkes fled Germany with his family in 1933, moving to England. Like Bion, he was to become a psychiatrist serving the British military in the Second World War. He came to the Northfield Military Hospital after Bion had left and initiated another round of experiments in group treatment. In an article entitled, “Group analysis in a military neurosis centre,” Foulkes argued:

**“The emphasis was laid still further on the group as a whole. The main aim was to prevent the conductor from hampering the spontaneous expression and activity of the group. Thus he has to learn to tolerate anxieties and tensions within himself, to resist the temptation to play the role of the authoritarian leader but rather to submit all problems to the group, facing them fairly and squarely with the group.”** (1945, p. 189)

This is an extraordinary statement that captures the paradox of group analytic leadership. The facilitator does have a job, responsibilities that are distinct from group membership. The conductor is group member who must at one and the same time join the group, observe the group, observe one's self with that reactivity that Mick commented upon in response to my rant, to make use of one's experience, bring it to the group without imposing it upon the group. Foulkes conveys an attitude and a skill that has taken me many years to begin to hold, however tentatively.

Foulkes was deeply influenced by Burrow's work. He described the group analyst as a "conductor, rather than leader," of the group process:

**"The conductor puts emphasis on the 'here and now' and promotes tolerance and appreciation of individual differences. The conductor represents and promotes reality, reason, tolerance, insight, catharsis, independence, frankness, and an open mind. ...It can be seen that the conductor thus activates both analytic and integrative processes."** (p. 57)

**"The group analyst accepts whatever position the group chooses to confer on him. ...he must accept this position as a leader in order to be able to liquidate it later on. He could not wean the group from something which had not been previously established. ..He does not step down, but lets the group, in steps and stages, bring him down to earth. The change which takes place is that from a leader *of* the group to a leader *in* the group. The group, in turn, replaces the leader's authority by that of the group."** (p. 61)

As with Berne's notion of human hungers, Bion saw all human beings possessed by certain compelling needs that drove people toward, and away, from one another. Bion's model, like Berne's, was a fundamentally social psychiatry. The needs he defined were different from Berne's. His were Love, Hate, and Knowledge. By Knowledge, Bion was not speaking of an intellectual capacity. He did not mean cognitive insight. He meant *emotional* knowing, knowledge of the kind that can only be derived from lived experience. In this way he saw work in groups as a fundamental means for the acquisition of emotional Knowledge. There is much at stake in our membership in groups and social structures. It was these fundamental hungers and compelling needs underlying life in groups that Bion sought to bring to the surface.

Foulkes shared with Bion a profound respect for the unconscious forces that form and deform our participation in groups of all kinds. Like Trigant Burrow, he did not view an analytic group as a representation of the family. Rather, he saw every group as unique, with its unconscious character formed by the diverse range of group experiences that each member brought to the life of the group.

He challenged what he saw as the overly interpretive style of group leadership advocated by Bion, arguing:

**“The therapist confines himself entirely to interpretations, in particular transference interpretations. These are given preferably in terms of the group. This emphasizes the therapist in relation to the group, which is perceived as though it was one patient.”** (p. 18)

So now we'll leave the Europe and come across the pond to the U.S. and turn our attention to Eric Berne. Eric Berne grew up in Montreal, a Jewish family in a Catholic neighborhood. Berne's father, a doctor, was rejected by his medical colleagues and died when Berne was just 10 from the very disease, tuberculosis, he had dedicated his life to treating. As a boy and adolescent Eric was a misfit. He repeatedly formed clubs with other boys to try to have a group where he belonged. His clubs always fell apart. He was rejected by his psychoanalytic peers. Eventually the San Francisco seminars and ultimately the ITAA became his longer lasting club of misfits. The marginality of social rejection rather than the respect that Gianpiero stood for.

We all know that during World War II Berne, too, worked for the military evaluating in-coming draftees for their fitness for military service. We know that it was during this time that Berne undertook his “thought experiments” with the soldiers he had to evaluate in very short periods of time. These thought experiments resulted in his series of papers on intuition.

But what was the impact of the war itself and the holocaust on Berne's thinking? He never wrote about this. We may never know. We do know that after the war Berne undertook an extensive exploration of the practices of psychiatry in countries and cultures all around the world. Traveling at his own expense and initiative, he studied psychiatric cultures and published several articles based on his travels. Then it stopped. We might never have known why had not his son, Terry, told of the FBI coming to Berne's house and office, seizing many his papers and foreign correspondence, and revoking his passport. This was post-war America, the early 1950's, and Berne found himself suspected of being a Communist because of his interest in other cultures. His political and social consciousness seems to have collapsed after this. Berne's notion of transactional analysis as he defined it as a social psychiatry was radically different than the social psychiatric perspectives of Burrow, Bion and Foulkes. Berne stripped his social psychiatry of any social and political critique.

Berne's first book, *The Mind in Action*, written immediately post-war while Berne was in psychoanalytic training, published in 1947, concluded with reflections on “man as a political animal” with sections discussing “how do evil men gain followers?” and “how does an evil leader hold his followers?”. In the 1968



edition, re-titled as *A Layman's Guide to Psychiatry and Psychoanalysis*, and revised to promote TA, this section is deleted.

Jerome Frank, an American psychiatrist and author of the classic book on psychotherapy, *Persuasion and Healing*, observed: **“Ever since World War II, mental hospitals have been undergoing a quiet but massive revolution from essentially custodial institutions to active treatment centres...including a redefinition of roles of patients and treatment staff within the hospital walls.”** (quoted by Foulkes, p. 216)

As a psychiatrist consulting in mental hospitals, Berne contributed to leveling of the therapeutic relationship both with his model of staff-patient-staff supervision groups and his emphasis on the mutuality of the contractual, working relationship. But this proved not to be so true in the structure of his TA treatment groups.

Bion and Foulkes approaches to group analysis were grounded in the psychoanalysis of Europe and England and were at their hearts experimental social environments within which one could experience and examine the unconscious forces of group process and social life. Berne's model, in contrast, was founded in his analytic training in the post-war ego psychology model of American psychoanalysis. The result was a model of group treatment that was radically different from those proposed by Bion and Foulkes. A closing chapter of Berne's *Structure and Dynamics of Organizations and Groups* makes it very clear that Berne was fully read and familiar with their work. But Berne's was a model of individual treatment in the group, an adjunct often to the ongoing individual psychotherapy. In Berne's model the leader was clearly defined: he was the doctor and although at the center of the group, at the same time he was constantly the outside observer of the individuals' dynamics. It was only in the context of an "ailing group" that Berne recommended a shift to a process orientation.

While Berne was developing and promoting transactional analysis, the United States was blowing apart. Externally there was the war in Vietnam. Internally there were the racial battles of the civil rights movement. John and Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King were assassinated. Violence and war was everywhere in the U.S.

During the World Wars, there was no escape from violence and death. Now, in the U.S., the images of Vietnam permeated television, newspapers, and magazines. Once again, the violence of war could not be ignored. Berne held transactional analysis apart from it all in a resolutely apolitical public/professional position.

As it was after the World Wars, there was a resurgence in the U.S. during the late 1960's and early 1970's in group and community exploration and experimentation.

Existentialism & phenomenology

The human potential movement

Norman O. Brown & Herbert Marcuse—a psychoanalysis informed and inflamed by left-wing political vitality

A resurgence in interest in Reich, especially his Sex-Pol writings (Steiner and radical psychiatry)

Esalen Institute

Carl Rogers and encounter groups

The community mental health movement

Northern communities mental health—where I started as a psychotherapist—groups of every conceivable kind *in* the community

Each of these wars precipitated a period of social/cultural reactions that attempted some sort of healing through the efforts at group and communal life. But none of this was to be sustained.

As I have thought about the meanings of this historical pattern of the resurgence and collapse of group and communal life, I am reminded of Murray Bowen's theories of societal regression—the retreat to emotional cutoffs and withdrawal as the mean to manage overwhelming anxiety and avoid conflict and social pain. I see the periodic resurgence of groups as a sign of societal health, while the collapse of groups as symptomatic of social regression. Andrew gave us a rant on the tyranny of governmental registration. Farhad's rant was on the tyranny of CBT. It's interesting to note that a few years ago a Bowenian systems therapist wrote an article for the *TAJ* issue on ethics, describing the pressure for governmental regulation of theory and counseling as symptomatic of societal regression.

So I want to look further at some of the factors I think that contribute to the difficulty in sustaining therapeutic groups.

Here I will be speaking primarily in the context of psychotherapy. It is important to keep in mind that in other arenas of TA practice, particularly counseling, organizational work and educational theory, groups remain important avenues for working and facilitating personal growth and development. We just this past week received the numbers from SAGE for the most downloaded articles for the *TAJ* for 2014. Among the top 10, 3 were articles on groups in counseling, so it's clear that interest in groups is not dead.

I was never satisfied with the classical TA model of therapy of the individual in the group, which I often came to find rather boring. So I worked for many years—overcoming intense anxiety and resistance—first studying and then co-leading with group analytic processes with Frances Bonds-White. Later on I learned radically different ways of doing supervision in groups through my work with Christopher Bollas and Maurice Apprey. Here were people not afraid of the darker, meaner, more destructive aspects of group life, able to engage with these dynamics that fostered rich depths of awareness and engagement.

Within the TA literature, Servaas van Beekum has consistently represented a voice for working directly with the less conscious, more conflictual and corrosive aspects of group processes. In “The Relational Consultant”, for example, he outlined three central qualities of attention and attitude in working with unconscious foundations and motivations of a group’s life:

- 1) accepting chaos and unpredictability, listening for the organizational myths, observing such phenomena as splitting and projective identification
- 2) accepting that unconscious phenomena reveal themselves slowly and indirectly, suggesting that there is likely much of great interest lurking beneath the stated, conscious contracts
- 3) and creating a transactional space in which the consultant and the organization together are able to reenact, bring to awareness, make sense of, and ultimately transform and integrate the organization’s and representatives’ destructive and unhelpful ways of relating to self and others. (pp. 325-326; *TAJ*, 2006, 36: 318-329)

Currently in the pages of the *TAJ*, N. Michel Landaiche is the most consistent author articulating the darker sides of working in groups. There is a powerful honesty in Landaiche’s writings on groups, in part because he switches back and forth from his experiences as a group member to those as group leader. Neither position is necessarily pretty. In “Learning and Hating in Groups,” he describes his experience:

**“...rather than talking generally about the hatefulness of groups, I will describe what I hate about them... ...what I also fear and detest...the boredom of the group’s resolute avoidance, the tensions, the threat of being killed or humiliated (social death), the passivity, the entrenchments, the slowness of deliberation (compared to the quickness and surety of my own mind), the magnification of meanness. ...Frustration, uncertainty, contagion, threat—at such times, groups seem hardly worth the effort.”** (p. 191; *TAJ* (2012), 42: pp. 186-198)

Having written this, he then notes that in a quick count of that week in his work at a university counseling center, he was participating in 19 groups of one kind or another. Love them or hate them, groups are hard to avoid.

There are deep echoes of Bion when Landaiche writes of his commitment to “Looking for Trouble in Groups: (*TAJ* (2013), 43: 296-310:

**“I see the areas of trouble as the areas of greatest potential growth. They are the impasses to be resolved, often the areas any of us would least like to look at. So I think of it as my job to venture into these forbidden zones— venturing as a form of inquiry, exploration, lying in wait for the trouble rustling in the nearby brush. My strong sense of going there is in strong conflict with detesting that aspect of my job. [here he refers to van Beekum’s article which I just quoted]**

In the end, Mick a offers a kind Foulkesian perspective on group leadership:

**“...I have come to see leadership as a secondary property or phenomenon, one that emerges from membership. The group member able to manage himself or herself has potential to become a natural leader who is also able to follow. ..I care less whether I do or not like [groups]. Rather, I passionately want what only they can give to my pursuit of a meaningful life in progress.”** (p. 195)

In her recent book, translated from Italian, *Psychodynamic Psychotherapy with Transactional Analysis*, Anne Emanuela Tangolo, places group treatment at the center of her work. She offers a striking contrast between the therapeutic dyad and the therapeutic group. She writes:

**Shifting from individual setting to group setting is particularly important for those who are stuck and cannot help looking back or keep reproducing, with the therapist, the drama of their primary dramatic experience. ...The group is a shock, it means being thrown into the world, or school, or children’s games, or adolescent’s games, or sexual dynamics connected with one’s growth. “I am no longer the only one, I’m not your only focus, I’m not so special for you.” It represents loss....** (p. 103)

**“[ In a group] There is the possibility to share food with the brothers and there are brothers to play with, to spend time with, explore together, sleep embracing each other.”** (p. xix)

Tangalo articulates the shift from the primarily “vertical” structure of individual, dyadic psychotherapy with its emphasis on parent/child relationships to the “lateral’ relationships of siblings and peers. Groups draw us out of the nest of parental relations—be they good, bad, ugly, or indifferent—into the world of the lateral the layers and meaning of belonging among others like ourselves. These are the relationships that accompany and permeate every developmental transition over the course of life. Returning again to van Beekum’s work with groups, like Tangalo, he addresses ways in which groups evoke our histories and

projections with regard to lateral relations. He reminds us that they are many and unavoidable:

**arguments between a brother and a sister, play of children, lovemaking, dancing with someone of a different race, fighting between men, men working together, women watching men, working with my sister, children learning together, speaking with a peer, ...being part of a generation, dangerous siblings all sitting in a room and being handed a stick, feeling curious or frustrated with another, being left out of the fun...**" (p. 134; *TAJ*, 2009, 39: 129-135) The list goes on. I'm sure each and everyone of us in the room can add to this list.

I suspect that the wounds, rejections, passions, and uncertainties of our lateral relations are a major factor in our enduring ambivalences toward group treatment. It was 3 years ago that I was in Sydney, for the remarkable conference, *Allies and Enemies*, which focused on sibling relationships, bringing the impact of sibling relations into the field for therapeutic attention. I'm sure many of you in the audience today remember the impact of that conference.

Although Foulkes did not write of sibling relations in groups, he, too, addressed the "lateral". He asked the question, as did Trigant Burrow, what if we are all, more or less, on the same playing field? The group facilitator never fully relinquishes her role—there is always work to do. But to work in a genuinely group-analytic style requires those in the leadership roles to relinquish such beloved, idealized, and narcissistically gratifying roles of the authoritative, all-knowing leader and/or the compassionate/empathic good parent. We move from the vertical to join and learn within the lateral.

The richness and depth of these experiences in groups can (sometimes) outweigh one's anxiety and avoidance. As Landaiche concludes his article on loving and hating in groups, **"...And if we are fortunate as a group, we come through this disorder and alarm; we move from nonlearning to learning, which is a relief, yes, but also a wonder, an occasion for another kind of gratitude."**

As we face the disorder and alarm of living in groups, we can discover places of extraordinary generativity. Over the years as I have come to manage my own anxiety and distrust in groups, I have come to relish the generative capacities of fighting, working, discovering, learning and living in groups. I have come finally to know my own relief and gratitude as I grow older and make my way into the life of groups in ways that were not possible for me when I was younger. It has taken courage. It has often taken the force of will to step into and then through the deeply painful and troubled relationships with my siblings; the repeated, awkward rejections by my peers that permeated my childhood and adolescence;

my gradual relinquishing of a life-long dread of my deepest desires so as— finally--to belong among others and to truly relish the vitality of life in groups.

Freud, *On Murder, Mourning and Melancholia*, Penguin, 2005, p. 173

Trigant Burrow, *The Social Basis of Consciousness*, 1927, New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co.)

Foulkes, *Therapeutic Group Analysis*, International Universities Press, 1965 (quotes are from chapters in this book)  
“Concerning leadership in group-analytic psychotherapy” pp. 54-65. (1951)

*Ring of Fire: Primitive affects and object relations in group psychotherapy* (1994), V.L. Schermer & M. Pines, Eds.) London: Routledge

See also, *Bion and Group Psychotherapy* (1992), M. Pines, Ed. London: Routledge

Dalal, F. (2020). *Race, Colour and the Processes of Racialization: New perspectives from group analysis, psychoanalysis and sociology*. Hove” Brunner-Routledge.

Dalal, F. (2012). *Thought Paralysis: The virtues of discrimination*. Karnac: London.

Samuels, A. (2015). *A New Therapy for Politics*. London: Routledge

