

Individuation or Community: Why Not Both?

Myrna Little, Ph.D.

October 22, 2009, St. Louis, Missouri

Introduction

Individuation is a process inherently embedded in a social context. For many of us it was Jungian training itself that provided a matrix for the individuation journey. To attend a graduation ceremony such as we did last April in Boulder, and listen to the gratitude expressed by one graduate to “the mothers and the fathers” of our community, was for many of us to feel again that special moment of achievement, that fulfillment of the self’s persistent and implicit whisper, “this is the path of growth: go for it; your only obstacles are your projections and transferences.” Most of us discovered, just like those soldiers in Bion’s (1961) very first psychiatric group at Northfield Military Hospital in 1940 – warriors who did not want to return to active duty – that their real enemy was not the Nazi’s, but their neurosis; ours was not our analytic parents or siblings but our own defensive splitting around our fears. Few of us, however, were enlightened in this whole process of individuation by participating in an experiential training group, or in education about such groups. Without this conscious practice of learning to be an individual within a group setting, it is all too easy to assume that, if one is an analyst, one automatically comprehends the universal dynamics of group process.

This assumption is a shadow that I believe we foster within the seminars, classes, case colloquia, evaluation interviews, examinations, and society meetings by neglecting to emphasize that all participants in groups spontaneously digress, project, dissociate, or

fragment. Correspondingly, we have not distinguished how a therapy group with its potentially transforming free communication differs from the interactive exchanges in training groups. Recently Gus Quick and I on a panel both compared training to inoculation into a petrie dish, where growth in the evocative culture of groups automatically cultivates either warm emotions and camaraderie, or the splitting defences - idealization, or its opposite – paranoid expectations. Here, in this crucible, conflicts come to fruition, if not into polite resignation, withdrawal, and loss of personal as well as collective creativity, then into the full-blown splits and schisms that plague our Jungian organizations.

Three Chief Editors of prominent journals have addressed this issue. Colene Covington, former Chief Editor of the *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, in the 50th celebration issue of that Journal (2005, p. 35) wrote:

In my role as editor of the *Journal*...and subsequently as chair of the British Confederation of Psychotherapists (BCP), I was reminded on a daily basis of the political and theoretical differences, splits, and conflicts that beleaguer not only analytical psychology but indeed the entire profession of depth psychology since its foundation to the present.

Similarly, the Chief Editor of the *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* for 20 years, David Tuckett (2008), recently wrote that “Misunderstandings between psychoanalysts from different schools or different countries are not uncommon – they are the norm” (p. 8). And the founding Editor of *Psychoanalytic Dialogues* in his very first Journal wrote:

There is a great irony at the heart of contemporary psychoanalysis. The *skilled psychoanalyst as clinician* is, perhaps, the most careful and systematic listener, the most precise and respectful speaker, the most highly trained and refined communicator, that Western culture has produced. A sustained and dedicated effort to discover and articulate the personal meanings, the inner logic of the patient’s communications, is the most fundamental dimension of the craft of psycho-

analysis in all its variations. Yet, psychoanalysts have enormous difficulty listening and speaking to one another (Stephen Mitchell, 1991, p.1; italics in original).

It is this enormous difficulty of listening and speaking meaningfully to each other, a process managed patiently and precisely in the promotion of someone else's individuation – but does not carry over into community – that I am particularly addressing in this paper. I want to do in three ways.

First, I want to take a quick look at the group context and power politics that got rid of Jung, and suggest they are as important as the theoretical reasons Jung and Freud split, as well as leaving us with some unfortunate assumptions about group. **Second**, in order for us to evaluate our own function as a group, I am going back to Max Weber's 1923 anthropological meta-analysis of what holds groups together, which concerns any group's knowledge, its basis of authority, its type of leadership, its transmission of knowledge, and the trickster in this list, how groups manage change. **Third**, I will do a once-over-lightly on Bion, and the background of his group experience. **Finally**, I will share with you three contemporary groups who – as a function of being a group – are contributing to knowledge that impacts our own Jung-knowledge base, and therefore confronts the Inter-Regional and the larger Jung Group with issues of authority, leadership, transmission of our knowledge, and above all, or what we do with change.

In this Third Section regarding contemporary groups who have something to offer us, first is a group of researchers who, in this year's publications, are writing that *imaging and doing use a shared neural substrate*. They address, not only how we

continually and non-consciously detect one another's intentions, but also provide an empirical basis for that which we call "the self." The second group, the Boston Change Process Study Group, uses these same researches and "functional images," to identify and clarify the processes of actual change that occur in our analytic work. They do so in a way that seems to me to be an enantiomorphism of our current notion of practice and technique, so what they offer is radical in theory, but intuitively sensible. And finally, I will briefly describe a European group that is actually "listening and speaking meaningfully to each other," that is, a group who are successfully processing.

I. Jung and the Politics of "Participation": The Secret Ring

I have thought for a long time that in our emphasis on the individuation concept we have given short shrift to group processes (Little, 1999) and to being oneself while in a group setting. Theoretically, this skew is based in the thinking of Jung's time. His belief in an "original state of identity" came from Levy Bruhl's *participation mystique*, an *a priori* oneness of subject and object (CW 6, ¶ 10; ¶ 781), a primitive psychology with no trace of an individual and only collective relationship (CW 6, ¶ 12), which he then used to define collective mentality (¶ 123), vitalism, children's early years (CW 17¶, 107) and even the transference (CW 6, ¶781). Whereas Levy Bruhl expunged the term from his late works (Jung, 1916, ¶ 507n), Jung regretted he had done so, and kept it as the state from which one must differentiate in order to individuate.

Importantly, this assumption of an original state of identity is integral also to Jung's social vision, which was largely adopted from the French social psychologist Gustav Le Bon's crowd concepts regarding unconscious, mass behavior (Shamdasani, 2003, p. 283-7). According to Shamdasani (ibid., p. 341) what Jung borrowed from Le Bon he then grafted onto Levy-Bruhl; in this way he conjoined internal and external experience: "the mass is swayed by *participation mystique* (CW 9.1 ¶ 226, quoted in Shamdasani, p. 341); and again, "Le Bon is the best way to understand my views on 'mental contagion,' where "...man in the mass is psychically abnormal (CW 10, ¶ 477). Thus, writes Shamdasani (2003, p. 341), French crowd psychology provided a key template for Jung's reading of the social and political developments in Europe from 1930 onwards, and in 1936 he wrote:

... psychic activity...runs like a chain reaction that stops only in catastrophe...Through Communism in Russia, ...National Socialism in Germany...Fascism in Italy, the State becomes all powerful and claimed its slaves body and soul. (CW 18, ¶ 1324, in Shamdasani, p. 341).

This is the context out of which he critiqued Western civilization, intuited the disasters of his lifetime, regarded us as an endangered species, and remained skeptical of organizations all his life. Jung does insist – more times than I can quote – that true individuation of necessity "...brings to birth a consciousness of human community precisely because it makes us aware of the unconscious, which unites us with all mankind" CW 16, ¶ 227),

So I am suggesting that the *participation mystique* out of which Jung theorized his own individuation was first of all an experience of his own – his participation within a group – that small group of intimates surrounding Freud, as well as a larger group, an

entire professional society he helped create. Remember, Jung was the person through whom that first generation of psychoanalysts had come to Freud almost exclusively: Karl Abraham, Ludwig Binswanger, Abraham Brill, Trigant Burrow, Max Eitington, Sandor Ferenczi, Otto Gross, Hermann Rorschach, Sabina Spielrein, and Ernest Jones, to name but a few (Falzeder, 1998, p. 130). [My point is, experience was first; explanation and abstraction into theory came later.](#)

The dynamics of Jung's group experience is recorded for us by Andrew Paskauskas, the historian who in 1993 edited the 819 page tome of the Freud-Jones letters, and afterward wrote a paper titled "Freud's Break with Jung: the Crucial Role of Ernest Jones" (1988). In this paper he reveals that Jones, in a letter to Freud in the summer of 1912, proposed the formation of a Secret Committee, with the intention of providing an inner circle of men around Freud

...(who) could be thoroughly analyzed by you, so that they could represent the pure theory unadulterated by personal complexes, and thus build an unofficial inner circle...and serve as centers where others (beginners) could come and learn the work. If that were possible it would be an ideal solution. (Paskauskas, 1993, p. 47)

The "solution" Jones proposed was to exclude Jung. His masterpiece of subtle character assassination and innuendos that pathologize Jung we today would define as "triangulating," the function of which is to eliminate a third person and ingratiate oneself into a privileged closeness. Jones never admitted that the timing of this letter and the formation of the Secret Committee preceded the break, or that the Secret Committee's first project was to deal with the "Jung crisis," while conveniently and covertly

promoting his own ambition of replacing Jung. Mentioned no less than six times in the *Freud-Jung Letters* as unreliable, even a liar, Jones by that summer of 1912 and before the January 1913 break, was well on his way to becoming the next president of the International Association of Psychoanalysts, and was prevented only by the outbreak of World War I in 1914.

Jung of course had his part in such alienation. Unilaterally he had changed an international conference date – can you imagine our president doing that? – and had done so to accommodate his speaking engagement in America. Further, and personally offensive, he had cut proofs Jones had sent for publication, but didn't explain why; he called a meeting in Munich for November 24, 1912, and sent Jones' invitation to the wrong address *and* gave the wrong date; Jones only learned of the meeting from his common law wife, who was in analysis with Freud (Paskauskas, 1988, p. 21). These either deliberate or dissociated behaviors were attributed by Jones to psychopathology and regularly reported to Freud. How aware Jung was of their collusion, or of his own provocation, I can only speculate, but only two weeks after that Munich November 1912 meeting (December 14th or 15th), Jung in a letter to Freud made a whopper of a slip, “Even Adler's cronies do not consider me one of *yours*” (instead of *theirs*). Freud confronted him on December 18th, and the dam burst in Jung's scathing return letter:

...I would point out that your technique of treating your pupils like your patients is a *blunder*.
...I am objective enough to see through your little trick. You go around sniffing out all the symptomatic actions in your vicinity, thus reducing everyone to the level of sons and daughters who blushing admit the existence of their faults. Meanwhile you remain on top as the father, sitting pretty... You see, my dear Professor, so long as you hand out this stiff I don't give a damn

for my symptomatic actions; they shrink to nothing in comparison with the formidable beam in my brother Freud's eye...If ever you should rid yourself entirely of your complexes and stop playing the father to your sons and instead of aiming continually at their weak spots took a good look at your own for a change, then I will mend my ways and at one stroke uproot the vice of being of two minds about you...I shall continue to stand by you publicly while maintaining my own views, but privately shall start telling you in my letters what I really think of you (McGuire, 1974, p. 534-535).

On January 3rd, 1913, and obviously deeply hurt, Freud terminated their relationship. Jung's letter clearly wells up from a reservoir of accumulated resentment, is a retaliatory attack, an enactment of his heretofore unacknowledged emotional truth. We have all heard it in our consulting rooms when someone finally gets fed up and blows up, and speaks truth in a way it cannot be heard by the other party, the provocateur. I submit this was when Jung learned, that if you individuate, you run the risk of remaining outside the group, the organization, the institution, in the time-honored isolation of the Leviticus scapegoat (16:21-22), nowadays called the *whistle-blower*. The purpose in sending the scapegoat away is not only that we might forget our sins, but that we might see them at a safe distance, in somebody else. The group – and desire to belong– remains the siren to whom one must either tie oneself to the mast, or make the time and effort to comprehend how groups work constructively (Alford, 2001).

Jung eventually learned of the Committee's paranoid expectation that he, Jung, intended a take-over of the Association. For me the saddest lines in all these letters are Jung's final comments to Jones after the break with Freud, in November, 1913, his pain implicit in the words:

I had to withdraw from the *Jahrbuch* because Prof. Freud told Dr. Maeder in a letter, that he

doubted my ‘*bona fides.*’ Of course this was too much. Prof. Bleuler has left too. The rumour was spread out that I made an attempt to take the *Jahrbuch* with me. Deuticke can proof (sic) that this is a lie. I expected that Freud would tell me such a thing directly...Ferenczi to whom I told my decision wrote me a letter...I got the impression of an arbitrary projection of prejudices and suppositions instead of actual knowledge of my arguments. *Nobody has made an attempt to ask for my reasons* (Paskauskas, 1988, p. 28; italics added).

II. The Social Construction of Knowledge and of Groups (Weber, 1923; Tuckett, 2000).

Social groups, including ours, ordinarily arise around the **knowledge** they share, more or less unconsciously, and beliefs about which most individuals have no direct experience, for example, the world is round, George Washington was a real person, etc. To survive, a group must have **authority and leadership** in order to establish that knowledge, as well as to then **transmit** that knowledge to initiates, and finally, to **legitimate the knowledge** in times of **crisis**.

According to Weber and Tuckett (ibid), there are three kinds of leadership: (1) **traditional leadership**, i.e., the way we have always done it is the right way; (2) **charismatic**, revered, or dictatorial leadership, where authority is maintained by associating with the leader, by quoting him/her, or by wearing special robes, (3) and finally, leadership by **processes of reason and regulation, which are formally independent of individual whim**, and *which requires knowledge to be at an experience-near level, sufficient to adjudicate problems, and reach an un-compelled consensus*. In other words, knowledge that is not just one leader’s meta-psychology, nor parroted a leader or a book, but arrives from experience that is then understood mindfully.

In 1912 the group had, like today, more than one way to define knowledge about the psyche; Jung had his own “knowledge” and is not rightfully considered a student of Freud (Devescovi, 2000). Additionally, both men were charismatic leaders. However, resolving the crisis of differences-of- knowledge, which today we call pluralism, was for them more about secret collusion than about dialogue and speaking meaningfully to each other. Stephen Mitchell’s 1991 observation about our difficulty speaking to one another has prevailed since the beginning.

Even in Jung’s time Jungian groups were divided along “symbolic,” and “clinical” lines (Kirsch, 2007. p. 161). Later, Andrew Samuels categorized us as social groups along classical (traditional), archetypal, and developmental lines. In contrast, Jean Knox (2007, p. 319) employs an epistemological set of organizing principles along three knowledge lines: structure, process, and content. Thus she finds Jung’s early model to be primarily **structural** regarding complexes; increasingly he identified **processes** of self-regulation, compensation, individuation, and the transcendent function; **content** he found in archetypal imagery (ibid).

These three categories – structure, content, and process – are components of the meta-model of knowledge which, Knox contends, Jung was attempting to construct. These are categories which eliminate the “personal equation (Jung, 1961, p. 109, 110), yet include Weber’s “experience-near” knowledge. Jung was limited by the science of his time, “a barrier that must be crossed,” he repeatedly wrote, and which Knox argues that now, by crossing the barrier of our science, the time has come for us to fulfill what

Jung attempted – a meta-model that integrates the confluence of knowledge from the interdisciplinary fields of developmental psychology, attachment theory, cognitive and affective neuroscience.

Now crises of knowledge are inevitable, wrote Weber, because changes in the collective are inevitable. These we struggle with today. Economic changes (should we skype?), technical advances (will neuroscience steal our soul?), and/or ideological changes (developmental-relational discoveries since the 50's; authority issues in the 60's; women's issues in the 70's). Inter-Regional, like every group, is confronted with our systems of authority and how to legitimate our knowledge. With time, more and more changes and more and more deviant ideas have to be confronted.

III. So, what have we learned from the Jung - 'Secret Ring' Split?

We know that Jung remained skeptical of groups all his life. He was skeptical: we are skeptical. Many of us were hurt in our training and sought personal affirmation in a variety of ways: triangulating, silence, splitting, etc. Negative groups are a fact of life, and we don't like to pay attention to them. Preparing for this address, I learned that the Nazi's "final solution" means they tried several other "solutions" first that were too slow, or too personal; machine-gunning at mass grave sites bothered the gunners too much. It took industrial society such as now exists to create ovens that were "economical" (Bauman, 1989). As the French resistance fighter, Jacques Lusseyran (1987/1963) wrote, the Nazi genius was that at Buchenwald they were never seen; fellow prisoners ran

the camp. The final solution was thus a final detachment from eye contact as well as from conscience or morality.

Jung's "mass man" is still amongst us; if you have ever been to a high school football game in Texas you know crowd dynamics exist. And we still have Whistleblowers who oppose the mass, and even though we have hundreds of laws to protect them, laws are no more effective than are ethics procedures in preventing ethical violations. The engineers who warned against the Space Shuttle *Challenger* take-off on one cold Florida morning eventually lost their jobs. C. Fred Alford, a sociologist at the University of Virginia, spent a year visiting Whistleblower groups and listening to them talk. For an account of that group experience I recommend his book, *Whistleblowers: Broken Lives and Organizational Power* (2001) in which he quotes George Orwell's *1984*: Winston Smith has sacrificed everything because he would no longer alter the historical record and make it appear there were no dissidents. Tortured, naked, missing teeth, he is placed before a three-way mirror, doesn't recognize himself for a moment. "Says O'Brien 'If you are a man, Winston, you are the last man. Your kind is extinct'" (p. 3). Alford's point is like Jung's, we can learn from the sacrificed individual not just about him, but about ourselves, the forces that confront him. It saddens me to read Jacques Lusseyran (1987/1963, p. 186), the blind French resistance fighter (whose story is published by Parabola), that under German occupation most Paris residents opposed the resistance, called the freedom fighters "terrorists" "They would gossip about us without reflecting...they would denounce us without giving it a second thought," fearful

of the Nazi boot on their lives, already suffering by the loss of 80 percent of their food and resources. What is right? And what is the legitimizing rule of our small but important organization in the transmission of our knowledge, does it include studying how we can we talk to each other?

IV. What We Learned From Bion

About Wilfred Bion, the charismatic military hero in the 1940 British crisis of national survival, Robert Hinshelwood – another former Editor, this time of *Therapeutic Communities* for 20 years, wrote:

Everyone who works in group psychotherapy, the therapeutic community, art therapy...or a number of other related fields knows where their origins were. Northfield Military Hospital in the early 1940's was populated by Olympian psychiatrists and psychotherapists. We can treasure this fabled past, and know that we are the descendents of gods (Hinshelwood, 2000, p. 7).

What the Northfield did was to shift thinking from individual psychiatric treatment of men traumatized by war to: 1) resumption of social contact, 2) response to command, 3) realization of responsibility, 4) return of self-confidence, and therefore, 5) return to work. These goals were outlined by John Rickman in 1939 on the heels of the Dunkirk evacuation and three days after the commencement of war (Harrison, 2002, p. 107). The main source of this radical experiment was Trigant Burrow, an analysand of Jung and a former pupil of Freud who had abandoned classical psychoanalysis because of its overemphasis on the individual, and instead attended to analysis of the group in the immediate moment as a daily test of actual living experience. By dismissing the

dichotomy of the “sick” patient and the “well” therapist, and not identifying problematic behavior as illness, he focused on continuous, dynamic processes (ibid., p. 59- 60). This is common group procedure now, but then was revolutionary and led to discovering the impact a person’s behavior has on others – the power of the group – with actual modification of relationships in real time. Bion later renamed Weber’s organizing, but implicit beliefs of a group as “basic assumptions,” as ways to collude around primitive defences of our fears and avoid the agreed-upon task – actually avoid any thinking altogether, and become either codependent or paranoid.

VI. Fast-Forward to the Twenty-First Century

I want now to describe three groups that could impact our Jungian vision of theory, practice, scholarship, training, and community. This represents what I think is needed to balance all that we hold dear in myth, fairy-tale, and religion, i.e., to balance the symbolic aspect of our unique and individual experience.

1. The discovery of mirror neurons

At the University of Parma an experimenter with a monkey wired for study reached for his coffee cup and happened to notice that simultaneously the monkey’s neurons in the ventral premotor cortex activated, although the monkey had not moved. First reported in 1988, neurons that fire, both when an animal acts and when the animal observes some action performed by another, were christened by a now well-known group of researchers as “mirror neurons” (Rizzolatti G; Di Pellegrino G; Fadiga L; Fogassi L;

Gallese V). Since that date many further experiments have confirmed that mirror properties also exist in other parts of the brain – the sensory motor cortex, and the subcortical emotional brain, or limbic system (Gallese, Eagle and Migone, 2007).

Thus it is that neural circuits activated by observing someone carrying out an action, such as talking, or experiencing a sensation such as touching or hurting, we are touched, we hurt, we flinch, we yawn. The process is automatic, unconscious, and non-cognitive. This fundamental biological basis for understanding another's mind is described by Vittorio Gallese as “rather simple...the observer is going to activate the same motor schema (gestalt) of what most likely the agent is going to do” (ibid., p. 137). Alan Schore (2003, p. 98), in a paper titled “A Developmental Neurobiological Model of Projective Identification” explains what that means in our clinical work. He states that your facial expression is detected and processed by your observer in **100 milliseconds**, then matched in his right somatosensory cortex even faster – within **300 to 400 milliseconds**. Your patient's right hemisphere thus recognizes your emotion, and then simulates how you feel in her/his own body, and does so at lightening speed.

In a paper published just last June (2009) on “Motor abstraction: a neuroscientific account of how action goals and intentions are mapped and understood,” Gallese comes closest to our understanding of the self by what sounds like an oxymoron, “motor abstraction.” Here he links this embodied simulation via mirror neurons with the detection of intention in the person we observe. He says that what is coded in the observer's mirror neuron is not simply a movement, but rather, the **relationship** between

the acting agent and the target of the actor's action (p. 487). This, he writes, is a very special kind of relationship, a relationship leading to a goal. Another way of saying it is, that a 3-D object is identified, not merely visually, but in relation to the **effect** of its use by the acting agent. This "dynamic organism-object relationship (p. 489) is the "aboutness" of the goal, which of course is about what is going to happen. Thus, "goal-relatedness" is a functional, organizing principle *because*, as you know, when you intend to move, you know the goal; when you detect someone else's goal, you likewise detect an intention. This is "motor abstraction;" we do not ascribe intentions, we detect them (p. 493). He proposes that embodied simulation is "**intercorporeity**," the mutual resonance of intentionally meaningful behavior, as the main source of knowledge we directly gather about others. He writes (p. 494):

We should abandon the Cartesian view of the primacy of the Ego, and adopt a perspective emphasizing the fact that the Other is co-originally given as the Self. Both Self and Other appear to be intertwined because of the intercorporeity linking them. Self-individuation is a process originating from the necessity in which it is originally and constitutively embedded.

These discoveries and the impact upon a Jungian model of the psyche and our world support the depth of Jung's amazing intuitions and I submit will not steal away all that we hold dear regarding the spiritual meaning of life. *The Journal of Analytical Psychology* in June of this year is dedicated to an integration of this and other disciplines. I especially owe thanks to Jean Knox for her paper, "Mirror Neurons and Embodied Simulation in the Development of Archetypes and Self-agency," because the exciting

research papers she references are available to everyone through Inter Library Loan services (and provide me with these sources).

Thus we are *implicitly* talking to each other all the time. The potential not only for our work as analysts but also for thesis material and of scholarly talking to and listening to each other, and of validating some of Jung's most important intuitions is, to use a metaphor, "within reach." Gallese and Lakoff (2005), explaining the link between the body simulation of a motor neuron, and the abstracting into a corollary thought, use the example of grasping. They say if you cannot "imagine" grasping (this mouse; this cup) then you cannot "grasp" the hypothesis they suggest.

2. The Boston Change Process Study Group

In 1985 in a paradigm-changing *Interpersonal World of the Infant*, Daniel Stern differentiated the clinical infant from the actual infant (like Jung in the "Archetype of the Child"), by refuting Margaret Mahler's notion of the "autistic" baby and thereby Mahler's (and Freud's) merger theory. Stern did this using (then) 35 years documentation of the amazing capacities of the human infant, from birth. Now publishing primarily as a member of the Boston Change Process Study Group, who first coalesced as friends around the question, "what in your analysis led to real change?" Stern with this group published in 2007 "The Foundational Level of Psychodynamic Meaning: Implicit Process in Relation to Conflict, Defences and the Dynamic Unconscious."

In this paper this Group, in agreement with mirror neuron discovery, argues that interactive processes are primary; how we think about them, or name them, as conflicts, or defences, is secondary, because they are abstractions. In other words, experience between persons is implicitly stored from early life, retrieved throughout the life span, and becomes the templates of all later experience and relationships. How we abstract these experiences becomes our explanations about them, in other words, become our theories. In this model the past is carried forward to the present by way of experience; and this relational action – read by mirror neurons – is the foundation for being able to grasp the psychodynamics enacted with you the therapist and responded to by you implicitly and interpretively. This implicit knowing and processing is not about cognitive function, nor about symbolization, but about physiological and then social and behavioral regulation of affect, those patterns which originated in the infant-caregiver experience. Implicit processing guides all moment-to-moment exchange; it includes all body, voice, silence and rhythms. It does not mean “non-verbal” because the implicit way of being ‘bleeds through’ in the very words and metaphors we nonconsciously select. Implicit relational knowing is not symbolic, but is the intuitive sense of how to be with another, thus is based on affect and action rather than word and symbol. It is unconscious but not repressed. It can be brought to consciousness, but fits language with difficulty. Implicit knowing makes up the majority of what we, as adults, know about social interaction, including transference and countertransference. This, therefore, is the realm to be analyzed rather than merely the content of our patient’s stories. Jungians George

Hogenson and Warren Colman have both recently referenced (2009) the Boston Group and saluted its contemporary “grasp” of Jung, which is a reversal of a classical method that has privileged latent content over the manifest.

3. David Tuckett and the European Psychoanalytic Federation

An example of implicit relational knowing actually used to enhance group process and functioning as a work group rather than a basic assumption group, comes through David Tuckett, Editor for 20 years of *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, and subsequently as president of the European Psychoanalytic Federation for another ten years. Since the 1990's he has been questioning what is the psychoanalytic process (1994, 2000), and if it is even possible to “devise a framework for assessment of training programs within a disciplined psychoanalytic pluralism...where there is more than one way to practice...and yet avoid ‘anything goes’” (2005, p. 31). Like Stern, his most recent publication, *Psychoanalysis Comparable and Incomparable* (2008) is the product of small and large groups' functioning. The book is written by ten authors, from six years of more than 500 experienced analysts, from more than 20 countries, discussing more than seventy cases over the course of sixty workshops, with theories as diverse as drive psychology, ego psychology, relational psychoanalysis, and intersubjectivism.

The defined task in each workshop was to understand and compare the different ways analysts work, i.e., to find a way to abstract the implicit models of analytic work actually used, taken from a seasoned analyst's case presentation.

Their first discovery is not surprising to anyone familiar with group process. They learned that they could not talk to each other without supervising the case and splitting into “basic assumptions”; presenters got humiliated, observers got very anxious, all the usual defences, such as refusal to return, triangulating, coming late, leaving early, acting out, oppositional, neglect of the task, rivalries, sympathies, antipathies and even chaos occurred.

Second, they learned, as Thomas Friedman, three-time Pulitzer prize winner and foreign correspondent for *New York Times* wrote about Afghanistan, you can’t build structure without order. So the leadership simplified the task to presentation of only one case, allowed 12 hours to work, and shifted from a focus on the patient to focus on the analyst – what he/she was doing, saying, feeling, and why. Third, they learned that they were all outrageously judgmental, but by valuing differences rather than “a truth” participants found they could transcend their own model, and grasp the presenter’s theory. They incidentally found a new way to supervise.

Generally, they learned that discussion is a confrontation of attitudes and values (p. 214). They were surprised to find an existing insecurity regarding many theoretical and technical matters, because most concepts – our meta-psychologies – are unclear and ambiguous. For example, “countertransference” does not have a unitary definition. Post-group opinions have included the importance of de-idealizing one’s own implicit model; the positive experience of being in a group; and personal gains about growth, self-observation, one’s own practice, teaching and supervision. A companion

text is forthcoming that will publish the results. What I like in this model of listening and talking, and have begun using in supervision, are the categories they named, because they are not metaphysically determined. They include such experience-near categories as (1) analyst comments that maintain the frame; (2) interpretations that add something to facilitate the process (the analyst replies, “walls?” or “Sounds like you’re angry”). (3) questions and clarifications aimed at making matters conscious , such as “What makes you so sure?” (4) here and now affect and/or phantasy with the therapist, such as “I must sound like your mother;” (5) elaborating meaning, such as when several ideas/dreams/memories all come together, and (6) sudden and unusual reactions, which usually are an enactment, but can also be Daniel Stern’s “moments of meeting” when change actually occurs.. All of these categories of analyst responses fit the Boston Group’s description of “implicit relational knowing, ” and are being used by analysts in their workshops to define how an analyst is working implicitly. They have learned to talk to each other without supervising.

Conclusion

In summary, I have tried to redress what I think has been an imbalance regarding one-person psychology, with its emphasis on cognitive, symbolic processes, which thereby disregards the ubiquitous necessity of functioning meaningfully within one’s group(s). I urge that we welcome this documented recognition of the primacy of implicit relational processes wherein lie our universal, human similarities. For any of our various work-groups to be able to function successfully as a group, while allowing pluralism and

differences of orientation, I believe our Society needs to incorporate the study of group processes into our Curriculum as well as into our practice. The heart of such an approach I believe to reside equally in the subjective experience of both speaker and listener, whether occurring in the privacy of individual treatment, or within interviews, examinations, business meetings, case colloquia, or any other group setting. The implications for clinical practice and training of this art are beyond the scope of this paper.

I close with one of my favorite quotes of Jung's, which I think in the wisdom of his eighties, was his and remains our enduring vision for humanity.

Self-knowledge is not an isolated process; it is possible only if the reality of the world around us is recognized at the same time. Nobody can know himself and differentiate himself from his neighbor if he has a distorted picture of him, just as no one can understand his neighbor if he has no relationship to himself. The one conditions the other and the two processes go hand in hand.

(Jung, 1954, ¶ 739)

References

- Alford, C. F. (2001). *Whistleblowers: Broken Lives and Organizational Power*. Ithaca: Cornell.
- Bauman, Z. (1989). *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Bion, W. R. (1961). *Experiences in Groups*. London: Tavistock/Routledge.
- Boston Change Process Study Group (BCPSG) (2007). The fundamental level of psychodynamic meaning: Implicit process in relation to conflict, defense, and the dynamic unconscious. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, **88**, 843-860.

- Colman, W. (2009). Reply to Astor's "Are Urban and Colman really in opposition over Fordham's model of the self?" *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, **54**, 405-408.
- Covington, C. (2005). Why we can't get along. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, **50**, 35-40.
- Devescovi, P. (2000). At the origins of Jungian thought: Culture and method. Elements of a separation. *Psychoanalysis and History*, **2**, 277-285.
- Falzeder, E. (1998). Family tree matters. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, **43**, 127-154.
- Gallese, V. (2009). Motor abstraction: A neuroscientific account of how action goals and intentions are mapped and understood. *Psychological Research*, **73**, 486-498.
- Gallese, V., Eagle, M., & Mizone, D. (2007). Intentional attunement: Mirror neurons and the neural underpinnings of interpersonal relations. *Journal of American Psychoanalytic Association*, **55**, 131-176.
- Gallese, V. & Lakoff, G. (2005). The brain's concepts: The role of the sensory-motor system in conceptual knowledge. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, **22**, 455-479.
- Grosskurth, P. (1991). *The Secret Ring*. NY: Addison-Wesley.
- Harrison, T. (2000). *Bion, Rickman, Foulkes and the Northfield Experiments*. Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley.
- Hinshelwood, R.D. (2000). Foreword. *Bion, Rickman, Foulkes and the Northfield Experiments*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Hogenson, G. (2009). Archetypes as action patterns. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, **54**, 325-337
- Jones, E. (1955). *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud, Vol. II*. New York: Basic Books.
- Jung, C. G. (1916). General aspects of dream psychology. *CW 8*.
- _____(1921). *Psychology Types*. *CW 6*.
- _____(1921). 'The problem of types in the history of classical and medieval thought.' *CW 6*.
- _____(1921). 'Definitions.' *CW 6*.
- _____(1921) 'Schiller's ideas on the type problem. *CW 6*.
- _____(1923). 'Child developments and education.' *CW 17*.
- _____(1936). 'Psychology and national problems.' *CW 18*.
- _____(1939). 'Concerning rebirth.' *CW 9.1*.
- _____(1946). 'Psychotherapy today. *CW 16*.
- _____(1946) 'Essays on Contemporary Events.' *CW 10*.

- _____ (1954). 'The conjunction.' *CW 14*.
- _____ (1961/1989). *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. New York: Vantage.
- Krirsch, T. (2007). The legacy of C.G.Jung. In Ann Casement (Ed). *Who Owns Jung?* London: Karnac Books.
- Knox, J. (2009). Mirror neurons and embodied simulation in the development of archetypes and self-agency. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, **54**, 307-323.
- _____ (2007). Who owns the unconscious? In Ann Casement (Ed.). *Who Owns Jung?* London: Karnac Books.
- Le Bon, G (1895). *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind*. Trans. anon. London: Fisher-Unwin, 1921.
- Little, M. (1999). Paradigm lost. (Review of the book *Up From Scapegoating*). *San Francisco Jung Library Journal*, **17**, 5-20.
- Lusseyran, J. (1987). *And There Was Light*. Ithaca: Cornell Books, Parabola.
- McGuire, W. (Ed). (1974). *The Freud-Jung Letters*. R. Mannheim and R.F.C. Hull (Trans). London: Routledge and the Hogarth Press.
- Mitchell, S.D. (1991). Editorial philosophy. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues*, **1**, 1-7.
- Orwell, G. (1949). *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. New York: Signet.
- Paskauskas, R.A. (Ed.). (1993). *The Complete Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Ernest Jones 1908-1939*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard.
- _____ (1988). Freud's break with Jung: The crucial role of Ernest Jones. *Free Associations: Psychoanalysis, Groups, Politics, Culture*, **11**, 7-34.
- Rizzolatti, G., Di Pellegrino, G., Fadiga, L., Fogassi, L., & Gallese, V. (1988). Retrieved from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mirror_Neuron."
- Samuels, A. (1985). *Jung and the Post-Jungians*. London: Routledge and Kegan-Paul.
- Schore, A.(2003). *Affect Regulation and the Repair of the Self*. New York: WW Norton.
- Shamdasani, S. (2003). *Jung and the Making of Modern Psychology: The Dream of a Science*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Stern, D. N. (1985). *The Interpersonal World of the Infant: A View from Psychoanalysis and Developmental Psychology*. New York: Basic Books.
- Tuckett, D. (2005). Does anything go? Towards a framework for the more transparent

- assessment of psychoanalytic competence. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, **86**, 31-49
- _____. (2000). Theoretical pluralism and the construction of psychoanalytic knowledge. In Joseph Sandler, Robert Michels, and Peter Fonagy, *Changing Ideas in a Changing World*. London: Karnac.
- _____. (1993). Some thoughts on the presentation and discussion of the clinical material in psychoanalysis. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, **74**, 1176-1189.
- _____. (2008). Tuckett, D., Basile, R., Birksted-Breen, D., Böhm, T., Denis, P., Ferro, A., Hinz, H., Jernstedt, A., Mariotti, P., & Schubert, J. *Psychoanalysis Comparable and Incomparable*. New York: Routledge.
- Weber, M. (1923). *Economy and Society*. Volume I: *Conceptual Exposition*. (Translated). New York: Bedminster Press.