

RAZMIŠLJANJA O VELIKOJ GRUPI: O KONCEPTU VELIKE GRUPE

/ REFLECTIONS ON THE LARGE GROUP: EXAMINING THE CONCEPT OF THE LARGE GROUP

Sanja Janović

SAŽETAK / ABSTRACT

Tekst se bavi analizom doprinosa Patricka de Mare-a grupnoj analizi koji je ujedno i začetnik ideje terapije u velikoj grupi. Tehnika psihoterapije u velikoj grupi sa nepovjerenjem je dočekana od strane psihoanalize i psihoterapije u maloj grupi.

U trenutku kada shvatimo da je velika grupa primarno, politički fenomen, možemo početi prihvaćati i razumijevati politički značaj određenih doprinosa u grupi. Individua je na stanoviti način u "problemu" s društvom te uvijek zadržava dio koji nikada u pravom značenju riječi ne može biti socijaliziran te se nalazi se u stalnoj tenziji društvom i grupom a ujedno i na taj način postaje izvor kreativnosti. Transmisiju psihičke energije između pojedinca, grupe i društva omogućava dijalog. Ujedno je dijalog kulturalna forma, čak i umjetnička forma koju se treba **naučiti**. Ne samo da je pojedinci trebaju učiti, već i same grupe trebaju naučiti kako razvijati vlastiti dijalog.

To je vjerojatno središnji konflikt ljudske egzistencije i stanja u kojem se nalazimo kao vrsta. Ta vizija, potkrijepljena teorijskim konceptom Patricka de Mare postaje u velikim grupama sve jasnija i vidljivija. Moguće je to ponajbolja vizija koju smo do danas stekli, koja bi nam mogla pomoći u razvoju prema humanijem i demokratičnijem društvu, gdje svatko može imati i naći svoj glas, gdje možemo zajedno promišljati i gdje kreativnost može procvjetati na individualnoj i grupnoj razini.

*/ This text examines Patrick de Mare's contributions to group analysis, along with his pioneering role in the concept of large-group therapy. The technique of psychotherapy in large groups was initially met with suspicion both in psychoanalysis and in small-group psychotherapy. Once we understand that the large group is primarily a political phenomenon, we can begin to accept and comprehend the political significance of certain contributions within the group. The individual is, in a certain sense, always in "conflict" with the society, and always retains a part that can never be fully socialised. This part is in constant tension both with the society and the group, and thus also becomes a source of creativity. The transmission of psychic energy between the individual, the group, and the society is made possible through dialogue. At the same time, dialogue is a cultural form, even an artistic form, that has to be **learned**. Not only do individuals need to learn it, but groups themselves must learn how to develop their own dialogue.*

This may well be the central conflict of human existence and the condition in which we find ourselves as a species. That vision, supported by the theoretical framework of Patrick



de Mare, becomes increasingly clear and visible in large groups. It may even be the clearest vision we have yet developed, which could help guide us toward a more humane and democratic society, where everyone can have and find their voice, where we can think together, and where creativity can flourish at both the individual and group levels.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI / KEYWORDS:

velika grupa / *large group*, terapijska zajednica / *therapeutic community*, kontrakultura / *counterculture*

Sanja Janović, Dom zdravlja Primosko goranske županije, sanja.janovic@yahoo.com
/ Sanja Janović, Community Health Centre of the Primorje-Gorski Kotar County, sanja.janovic@yahoo.com

TO LINK TO THIS ARTICLE: <https://doi.org/10.24869/psihei.2025.7>

UVOD

Osnovna značajka velike grupe je da ona frustrira želju za intimizacijom, onu koju susrećemo u settingu male grupe ili pak grupne analize. Frustracija nadalje pospješuje mržnju. Mržnja pak, osigurava energiju i u izvjesnom smislu neophodna je za misaoni proces i dijalog. Kroz dijalog, mržnja se može transformirati u ono što Patrick de Mare(1) naziva *koinonia*, duh sljedbeništva nevezanog za osobu. U takvoj atmosferi *koinonie*, dijalog se može razvijati i dalje i izražavati široke raspone misli i osjećaja koji se mogu promatrati na više razina. Teorija velike grupe prema de Mare-u (2) se razvija od potreba biološkog organizma, preko intrapersonalne psihologije, interpersonalne psihologije, sistema, intersistema pa sve do kulture

INTRODUCTION

The basic characteristic of the large group is that it frustrates the desire for intimacy, the kind typically found in the setting of small groups or group analysis. This frustration, in turn, amplifies hatred. Hatred then provides energy and, in a certain sense, is necessary for the thinking process and the dialogue.

Through dialogue, hatred can be transformed into what Patrick de Mare (1) calls *koinonia*, the spirit of fellowship unbound to any person. In such an atmosphere of *koinonia*, dialogue can continue to develop and express a wide range of thoughts and emotions, which can be observed on multiple levels.

According to de Mare's theory of the large group (2), the process evolves from the needs of the biological organism, through

i politike. Progresija kroz navedene slojeve korelira s procesom civiliziranja koji se sprovodi putem jezika i dijaloga.

KONTEKST RAZVOJA GRUPNO ANALITIČKE MISLI

Koncepti vezani za veliku grupu razvili su se iz okvira grupno analitičke misli. Za razumijevanje razvoja grupno analitičke misli i same teorije grupne analize bitan je jedan kratak period u povijesti. U razdoblju 1920-1930. g. Institut za Psihoanalizu i Institut za društvena istraživanja nalazili su se u istoj zgradi u Frankfurtu. Sastanci su održavani u zajedničkim prostorijama, a eminentni analitičari poput Anne Freud, Paul Federna, Hans Sachsa i Siegfrieda Bernfelda održavali su predavanja koja su bila otvorena za javnost i sponzorirana od strane tzv. „kritičkih teoretičara“. Ova skupina teoretičara frankfurtske škole oslanjali su se na kritičke metode Karla Marxa i Sigmunda Freuda(3). Kritička teorija je osnovana kao škola mišljenja prvenstveno od strane filozofa tzv. Frankfurtske filozofske škole: Herberta Marcusea, Theodora Adorna, Maxa Horkheimera, Waltera Benjamina i Ericha Fromma. Vrlo pojednostavljeno kritička teorija tvrdi da je ideologija glavna prepreka ljudskom oslobađanju.

U takvom stimulativnom okruženju došlo je do razmjene ideja marksista i psihoanalitičara (4). Foulkes je u to

intrapersonal psychology, interpersonal psychology, systems, intersystems, and finally all the way to culture and politics. This progression through the aforementioned layers correlates with the civilizing process, which is carried out through language and dialogue.

THE CONTEXT OF GROUP-ANALYTIC THOUGHT DEVELOPMENT

The concepts related to the large group developed from the framework of group-analytic thought. In order to understand the development of group-analytic thought and the group analysis theory itself, one brief, yet important period in history must be considered. In the period between 1920 and 1930, the Psychoanalytic Institute and the Institute for Social Research were located in the same building in Frankfurt. Meetings were held in shared spaces, and prominent analysts such as Anna Freud, Paul Federn, Hans Sachs and Siegfried Bernfeld gave lectures that were open to the public and sponsored by the so-called "critical theorists". This group of Frankfurt School theorists drew on the critical methods of Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud (3). Critical theory was established as a school of thought primarily by the philosophers of the Frankfurt philosophical school: Herbert Marcuse, Theodor Adorno, Max Horkheimer, Walter Benjamin and Erich Fromm. In very simplified terms, critical theory argues that ideology is the main obstacle to human liberation.



doba boravio u Frankfurtu i odlazio na zajedničke seminare koje su održavali psihoanalitičari i sociolozi lijeve provenijencije. Nadalje, po jedan filozof i psihoanalitičar sjedio je u upravnim odborima obaju društava.(5) Tako je Max Horkheimer, direktor instituta za Društvena istraživanja, sjedio u upravnom odboru Instituta za psihoanalizu dok je Eric Fromm bio član oba instituta te je educirao i jedne i druge o principima psihoanalitičke teorije.

Često se impliciralo da su se filozofi kritičke teorije poslužili psihoanalizom kako bi upotpunili i razumjeli te pokušali objasniti deficite Marxove teorije, poglavito redukciju psihološke stvarnosti na socioekonomske čimbenike. Freudov građanski životni stil kao i estetski konzervativizam, te njegova vlastita kreativnost i psihoanaliza, predstavljaju značajan doprinos radikalnoj avangardi koja je doprinijela transformaciji svakog aspekta europske kulture. Tumačenje snova i Uliks izrezani su od istog materijala. Zajedno s Hegelom, Marxom i Weberom, Freudova teorija je postala kamen temeljac na kojem je izrastao interdisciplinarni program Kritičke teorije društva.

Koncepte u grupnoj analizi doista ne možemo razumjeti bez pomnijeg čitanja i razumijevanja teorijskih koncepta društva koje su razvijali Adorno, Marcuse, Fromm i Horkheim.

In such a stimulating environment, an exchange of ideas between Marxists and psychoanalysts took place (4). At the time, Foulkes was living in Frankfurt and attending joint seminars held by psychoanalysts and left-leaning sociologists. Moreover, a philosopher and a psychoanalyst each sat on the boards of both institutes (5). Therefore, Max Horkheimer, director of the Institute for Social Research, sat on the board of the Psychoanalytic Institute, while Erich Fromm was a member of both institutes and provided education on psychoanalytic theory principles to both sides. It was often implied that the philosophers of critical theory made use of psychoanalysis in order to complete, understand, and attempt to explain the shortcomings of Marx's theory, especially its reduction of psychological reality to socioeconomic factors. Freud's bourgeois lifestyle, aesthetic conservatism, and his personal creativity and psychoanalytic theory made a significant contribution to the radical avant-garde, which contributed to the transformation of nearly every aspect of European culture.

"The Interpretation of Dreams" and "Ulysses" were "cut from the same cloth". Alongside Hegel, Marx and Weber, Freud's theory became one of the cornerstones of the interdisciplinary project of Critical Theory of Society. The concepts in group analysis truly cannot be understood without elaborate reading and comprehension of the theoretical concepts of the society developed by Adorno, Marcuse, Fromm, and Horkheimer. Furthermore,

Nadalje, misao i teorijske koncepte su razvijali i na njih se naslanjali Foucault i Derida, a u politološkom diskursu ne smijemo zaboraviti doprinose Sartra i Chomskog (5).

Već 1932. Foulkes piše Freudu pismo, razočaran postupkom i kriterijima za članstvo u Psihoanalitičkom društvu: "iluzija znanja gora je od samog neznanja". (6)

U daljnjem tijeku vremena, jačanjem nacionalsocijalizma u Njemačkoj, Foulkes odlazi u Ujedinjeno Kraljevstvo 1933. i nastoji se uklopiti u tadašnju britansku psihoanalitičko-psihijatrijsku scenu. Ono što se tada očito događa je prilagodba dijalektike i oblačenje teorije grupne analize u „privlačniju odjeću“ od marksističke. Neki autori smatraju da upravo problemi u teoriji grupne analize nastaju s pokapanjem dijalektike i prezentacijom grupne analize kao udobne pozitivističke teorije koja uspješno procesira devijantnost, mentalne bolesti i slične probleme u grupama. Radikalna teorija društveno nesvjesnog, kao odviše apstraktna, preinačena je u nešto konkretniji oblik posredstvom ideje komunikacijskog matrixa.

Drugi svjetski rat pridonio je razvoju grupne analize i etablirao ju je kao psihoterapijsku tehniku, opet tijekom "povijesnog" trenutka uspostavljanjem Northfield eksperimenta. Već je tada

thinkers such as Foucault and Derrida expanded and built upon the thought and theoretical concepts, while the contributions of Sartre and Chomsky must also not be overlooked in terms of political discourse (5).

As early as 1932, Foulkes wrote to Freud, expressing his disappointment by the procedures and criteria for membership in the Psychoanalytic Society, stating the following: "the illusion of knowledge is worse than ignorance itself" (6).

Later on, as National Socialism strengthened in Germany, Foulkes moved to the United Kingdom in 1933, in an attempt to integrate into the British psychoanalytic-psychiatric scene of the time. What clearly occurred then was a dialectical adaptation and the repackaging of group analytic theory in more "appealing attire" than Marxist ideology. Some authors believe that the problems in group analytic theory began with the burial of dialectics and the presentation of group analysis as a comfortable positivist theory, adept at processing deviance, mental illness, and similar group-related issues. The radical theory of the social unconscious, considered too abstract, was transformed into a more concrete form through the concept of the communicational matrix.

World War II significantly contributed to the development of group analysis and helped establish it as a psychotherapeutic technique, again during a "historic moment" in the creation of the



zamijećeno da su procesi u grupama različiti ovisno o broju članova grupe i da se u malim, srednje velikim i velikim grupama ne mogu koristiti isti postupci, te sami procesi imaju drugačije značenje i sasvim druge ciljeve. (7,8,9)

Sljedeći poticajni trenutak u razvoju grupno analitičke misli bio je svibanj 1968. koji je uvelike promijenio svijet.

Istina, promjene su započele već s krajem mainstream komunizma i autoritarnosti Lenjinovog i Staljinovog tipa rukovođenja, kada počinje potraga za istinskom demokracijom s korijenima u anarhiji (anarhija je ipak bolja od politburo!).

Promjene su difuzijom prodrle u popularnu kulturu, rock 'n' roll je od romantičnih balada postao politički angažiran; došlo je do pomaka u odijevanju i modi kao i do široke upotrebe droga. Sve navedeno vodilo je u smjeru kreiranja kontrakulture i alternativnog društva.

Pomak je značajan i u psihijatriji, u formiranju antipsihijatrijskog pokreta pod vodstvom Lainga i Coopera.

Dolazi do formiranja različitih grupa: encounter groups, self help groups, consciousness raising groups te i na posljetku terapijske zajednice. Snažan je bio pritisak ka demokratizaciji terapijskog procesa, osnaživanja pacijena-

Northfield Experiment. It was already observed at the time that group processes vary depending on group size, and that small, medium, and large groups require different approaches, while the processes themselves carry different meanings and entirely different objectives (7, 8, 9).

The next pivotal moment in the development of group-analytic thought occurred May 1968, significantly changing the world.

In truth, the changes had already begun with the decline of mainstream communism and the authoritarian leadership styles of Lenin and Stalin, marking the start of a search for true democracy, with roots in anarchy (after all, anarchy is still better than the politburo!).

These changes diffused into popular culture, and rock 'n' roll evolved from romantic ballads into politically engaged music; there was a shift in clothing and fashion, and widespread use of drugs emerged. All of this pointed toward the formation of a counterculture and an alternative society.

A significant shift also occurred in psychiatry, with the emergence of the anti-psychiatry movement led by Laing and Cooper.

Various types of groups began to form: encounter groups, self-help groups, consciousness-raising groups, and eventually therapeutic communities. There was strong pressure to democratise the therapeutic process, to empower the patients,

ta uz demontažu i dekonstrukciju tradicionalnih struktura moći, autoriteta i dominacije.

Terapijske zajednice su u tom period nikle diljem USA i UK (4). Geslo: "Unhappy young people could get some help without having to have a diagnosis and enter psychiatric system" dobilo je na praktičnom značenju.

Tijekom procesa, uočeno je puno problema u kreiranju terapijskih zajednica. Moguće najveći problem bila je želja osoblja da radije radi terapiju nego da kreira zajedništvo s članovima, tako da su terapijske zajednice uglavnom u svom izvornom obliku i ideji eradicirane od strane onih koji odlučuju i u svakodnevnoj praksi su zaostale tek u naznakama i u posebnim područjima.

Uočeno je da bilo teško naći rukovoditelje sustava koji su posvećeni demokratizaciji te imaju toleranciju na kaos, što je osnova za procese u terapijskoj zajednici.

Izreći svoje mišljenje često znači otkriti da uopće imam mišljenje. Govoriti u velikim grupama nije loš način da se pozabavimo sa "vlastitim ludilom". No izreći svoje mišljenje, u dubljem kontekstu znači opredijeliti se za nešto tj. glasati. Između te dvije ideje postoji veza, pa se može izvesti zaključak da iz mentalnog zdravlja proizlazi političko opredjeljivanje te konačno i glasovanje.

and to dismantle and deconstruct the traditional structures of power, authority, and dominance.

Therapeutic communities emerged during this period across the USA and UK (4). The slogan "Unhappy young people could get some help without having to have a diagnosis and enter the psychiatric system" gained practical relevance.

Throughout the process, many issues were observed in the creation of therapeutic communities. Possibly the biggest problem was the tendency of the staff to prefer doing therapy rather than creating a shared community with the members. As a result, therapeutic communities, in their original form and spirit, were mostly eradicated by decision-makers, and in everyday practice remained only in fragments and specific contexts.

It became apparent that it was difficult to find system leaders who were genuinely committed to democratisation and capable of tolerating chaos, which is a foundational condition for processes taking place in a therapeutic community.

Voicing one's opinion often means discovering that one even has an opinion. Speaking in large groups is not a bad way to confront "one's own madness". However, on a deeper level, to express an opinion is to take a stand, i.e. to vote.

There is a connection between these two ideas, and one could conclude that mental health gives rise to political orientation, and eventually to voting itself.



Velika grupa, tako ima dvije opcije: liječenje i demokratizaciju kao dva istoznačna procesa.

Živeći u društvima zapadnog civilizacijskog kruga imamo počesto dojam o vlastitoj demokratičnosti i demokraciji kao nužnoj ideji. No, suočeni s 30 i više članova imamo jako malo ideja kako potaknuti i facilitirati dijalog u kojem je moguće izreći i čuti druge. U takvim prilikama odmah se kreće sa strukturiranjem i agendama, koje moguće daju više moći jednima u odnosu na druge te definiraju ono što se treba ili ne treba govoriti, ali zapravo su način limitiranja grupnog prostora. Debatni format prividno daje tu mogućnost kroz prijedlog za diskusiju i prostor u kojem članovi mogu govoriti u prilog, protiviti se ili govoriti uopćeno. No time se daje voditelju mogućnost upravljanja i kontrole uz ograničavanje prostora misli i govora, bez stvarne mogućnosti da se ljudi međusobno upoznaju. Sve ovo ukazuje da suštinski jako malo znamo i ne razumijemo demokraciju. (10)

Primjedba stoji da je dosta teorijskog narativa Patricka de Mare, posebno zaslužnog za istraživanja vezana za veliku grupu, proizašlo iz naslanjanja na izvornu antičku grčku tradiciju s debatama u amfiteatru, koncentričnim slojevima sjedala u kojima se svih moglo čuti i vidjeti. No nekad zaboravljamo da takva kultura u polisima nije

The large group, therefore, presents two intertwined options: healing and democratisation as two synonymous processes.

Living in the Western societies, we often have the impression that we are democratic and that democracy is a necessary idea. However, when confronted with 30 or more participants, we have very few ideas about how to encourage and facilitate a dialogue in which people can both speak and listen to others. In such situations, the immediate reaction is to impose structure and agendas, which possibly serve to concentrate power in the hands of some at the expense of others, and to define what should or should not be said, while in fact, these are ways of limiting the group space. The debate format seemingly provides this opportunity by offering a motion for discussion and a space where members may speak in favour of or against something, or about a topic in general. This, however, provides the conductor with a possibility to manage and control, all the while limiting the space for thought and speech, without allowing the participants to truly get to know one another. All of this implies that we essentially know and understand very little about democracy. (10)

A valid observation is that much of Patrick de Mare's theoretical narrative, particularly in regard to his contributions to the study of the large group, draws heavily on the original ancient Greek tradition of debates being held in amphitheatres, with concentric seating arrangements where everyone could be

uključivala veliki dio društva-robave i žene. Idealizacija tih debata naravno nije održiva, niti nužno znači da model nije primjenjiv. Sama bit antičkog modela grupe jest u tome da prepoznamo potencijal i da razumijemo da je on u osnovi politički. U trenutku shvaćanja da je velika grupa primarno, politički fenomen, možemo početi prihvaćati i razumijevati politički značaj određenih doprinosa u grupi (2).

U daljnjem istraživanju fenomenologije velike grupe, ističe se i ime Corneliusa Castoriadis, još jednog "proroka" koji je bio ispred svoga vremena (9). Naime, zajedno s Jacquesom Lacanom i de Mareom, stajališta je da je individualna na stanoviti način u "problemu" s društvom. Smatra da je esencija individualnoga, zvana *monada*, dio koji nikada u pravom značenju riječi ne može biti socijaliziran i nalazi se u stalnoj tenziji društvom i grupom te postaje izvor kreativnosti. Patrick de Mare je također inzistirao na navedenoj dijalektici između jednoga i mnogih, prepoznavajući autonomiju individue (subjekta) uz originalnost i kreativnost grupe (2). Takav pristup smješta se nasuprot postmodernističkim trendovima koji najavljuju "smrt subjekta", protiv sustavnih teorija o apsorpciji subjekta od strane društva, kao i nasuprot psihoanalitičkoj teoriji koja individu apstrahira od grupe. Ne postoji društvo u kojem nema tenzija između

seen and heard. However, we sometimes forget that such a culture in the polis excluded a large portion of the society – namely, the slaves and women. The idealisation of those debates is, of course, unsustainable, meanwhile it does not necessarily mean that the model itself is inapplicable. The very essence of the ancient group model lies in recognizing its potential and understanding that, at its core, it is a political construct. The moment we understand that the large group is primarily a political phenomenon, we can begin to accept and understand the political significance of certain contributions within the group (2).

In further exploration of the phenomenology of the large group, the name of Cornelius Castoriadis, yet another "prophet" who was ahead of his time, stands out (9). Together with Jacques Lacan and Patrick de Mare, he shared the view that the individual is, in a certain sense, inherently "in conflict" with the society. He believed that the essence of individuality, known as the *monad*, is a part of the self that can never truly be socialised, and is in a perpetual state of tension with both the society and the group, thereby becoming a source of creativity. Patrick de Mare also strongly emphasised this dialectic between the one and the many, recognizing both the autonomy of the individual (subject), and the originality and creativity of the group (2). This approach stands in contrast to post-modernist trends proclaiming the "death of the subject", to systemic theories sug-



individue i grupe. Da je tome tako, govori i izostanak postojanja društva bez kriminala i konflikta.

Može se reći da ljudi nisu esencijalno društveni, čak štoviše ljudi su esencijalno anti-socijalni. U konfliktu smo sa sobom i sa svim našim grupama.

To je vjerojatno središnji konflikt ljudske egzistencije i stanja u kojem se nalazimo kao vrsta. Ta vizija, potkrijepljena teorijskim konceptom Patricka de Marea postaje u velikim grupama sve jasnija i vidljivija. Moguće je to ponajbolja vizija koju smo do danas stekli, koja bi nam mogla pomoći u razvoju prema humanijem i demokratičnijem društvu, gdje svatko može imati i naći svoj glas, gdje možemo zajedno promišljati i gdje kreativnost može procvjetati na individualnoj i na grupnoj razini.

DOPRINOS PATRICK DE MARE

Teorija velike grupe Patrick de Marea (2) je značajno različita od ostalih pristupa u grupnoj analizi, uglavnom do sada poricana i o njoj kao da je donekadavno izbjegavano govoriti. Njegova vizija potencijala kojeg velika grupa ima je sasvim sigurno u vremenu kada je nastala bila jako napredna ideja, čak i daleko ispred vremena. Relativno mali broj ljudi uspijevao je biti njome ponesen, i iako je ideja bila pozdravljena na

gesting that the subject is absorbed by the society, and also to psychoanalytic theory that abstracts the individual from the group. There is no society without tension between the individual and the group. The very absence of a society free of crime and conflict bears witness to this fact. One might say that people are not essentially social, and that they are, in fact, essentially anti-social. We are in conflict with ourselves and with all our groups.

This may very well be the central conflict of human existence and the condition in which we find ourselves as a species. This vision, supported by the theoretical concepts of Patrick de Mare, becomes increasingly clear and visible in large group settings. It might be the clearest vision we have achieved so far, one that could help us move toward a more humane and democratic society, where each individual can have and find their voice, where we can reflect together, and where creativity can flourish both on the individual and group levels.

CONTRIBUTION OF PATRICK DE MARE

Patrick de Mare's theory of the large group (2) differs significantly from other approaches in group analysis. It had largely been denied until now and, until recently, it seemed as if it were something avoided in discussion. His vision of the potential held by the large group was,

različitim mjestima u svijetu, ostala je razmjerno nerazvijana i nedovoljno teoretizirana u grupno analitičkom diskursu, često tretirana sa skepsom i nerazumijevanjem. Inicijalna ideja settinga odnosila se na 20-100 ljudi, koji sjede u jednom ili pak dva kruga s učestalosti od pet sastanaka tjedno i trajanja od sat i pol do dva, tijekom dvije i više godina. Foulkes se prema ideji odnosio kao "psihotičnoj". No, način kako se de Mare (2) odnosio prema velikoj grupi bio je u cijelosti rigorozan i intenzivan kao što se odnosio prema individualnoj psihoanalitičkoj seansi ili kao prema grupno analitičkoj situaciji. Bio je svjestan da se velika grupa niti približno nije ozbiljno shvaćala kao što je to bio slučaj sa individualnom terapijom ili radom u malim grupama. U najboljem slučaju shvaćena je kao ekstenzija male grupe, slične dinamike, sa *enactmentom* (odigravanjem) na ipak nešto većoj skali. U najgorem, smatrana je kaotičnom i potencijalno opasnom situacijom koju je najbolje izbjegavati. Ponekad je velika grupa bila doživljena, a potom iskorištena samo kao velika arena za pokazivanje. Nasuprot uvriježenom, de Mare je smatrao da se velika grupa sastoji od značajno kompleksnijeg i isprepletenog matriksa, značajno više od osobnog ili matriksa male grupe. Mala grupa je doista mala arena kroz koju se mogu sagledati ponovna odigravanja i analiza

without a doubt, highly progressive at the time, even far ahead of its time. Only a relatively small number of people were able to truly embrace it, and although the idea was welcomed in various parts of the world, it remained relatively underdeveloped and insufficiently theorised within the group-analytic discourse, often treated with scepticism and misunderstanding. The initial idea of the setting referred to 20 - 100 people, sitting in one or even two circles, with a frequency of five sessions per week, each lasting 90 to 120 minutes, over a period of two or more years. Foulkes viewed the idea as "psychotic". However, the way de Mare (2) approached the large group was just as rigorous and intense as the way he approached individual psychoanalytic sessions or group-analytic settings. He was aware that the large group was not taken nearly as seriously as individual therapy or work in small groups. At best, it was seen as an extension of the small group, similar in dynamics, only scaled up slightly with some enactments at a broader level. At worst, it was considered chaotic and potentially dangerous, something best avoided altogether. Sometimes the large group was experienced and then exploited merely as a large performance arena. In contrast to the prevailing view, de Mare believed that the large group consists of a significantly more complex and intertwined matrix, far beyond the personal matrix or that of the small group. The small group, he argued, is truly a small arena through which re-enactments and analyses of family



dinamike obitelji. Velika grupa s druge strane, počinje biti arena za ponovna odigravanje i analizu kulture i politike. Primjenjivati razumijevanje i znanje iz male grupe na veliku grupu doista je besmislica, a de Mare je takvu primjenu, smatrao zlostavljanjem grupe i članova (2). Koristio je metaforu: igrati 'čovječe ne ljuti se' na šahovskoj ploči.

Kao što svatko može bacati kockice, brojiti do 6 i pomicati figure tako svatko može doći na malu grupu i sudjelovati u radu. Nasuprot tome dijalog u velikoj grupi uči se poput složene igre šaha. De Mare je nadalje razradio ideju do formulacije: mala grupa pomaže u socijalizaciji pojedinca, a velika grupa humanizira društvo, očovječuje ga (11).

Prva ideja je nešto što se u psihoanalitičkom miljeu kako tako i prihvaća, no za prihvaćanje ideje o humanizaciji društva ipak zahtjeva vizionarski rad. Mnogi grupni analitičari u srednje velikim i velikim grupama, naime, nastavljaju igrati čovječe ne ljuti se na šahovskoj ploči i opiru se spoznaji da postoji i igra šaha koju bi vrijedilo naučiti. Ideja je da prilikom promjene strukture (svi sudionici u jednoj razini, krugu) određene tenzije počinju biti izražavane na silovit način. Nova forma može se odnositi na veliku grupu koja nema agendu, osim mogućnosti za dijalog ili diskusiju i predstavlja iznimno visoki potencijal za direktnu verbalizaciju

dynamics can be observed. On the other hand, the large group becomes an arena for the re-enactment and analysis of culture and politics. Mainly, to apply the understandings and knowledge from small groups to large groups indeed is a nonsense, and de Mare considered such an approach to be an abuse of the group and its members (2). He used the following metaphor: like "playing Ludo on a chessboard".

Just as anyone can roll dice, count to six and move pieces, anyone can also join a small group and participate in its work.

In contrast, dialogue in the large group must be learned like the complex game of chess. De Mare went even further, formulating the following idea: the small group helps to socialise the individual, while the large group helps to humanise the society, civilize it (11).

The first idea is something that is more or less accepted in the psychoanalytic milieu, however, embracing the idea of humanizing the society requires a truly visionary effort. Many group analysts, particularly in median and large groups, continue to play Ludo on a chessboard, resisting the realisation that there is also a game of chess worth learning. The central idea is that when the structure changes (for instance, when all participants are placed on the same level, in a circle), certain tensions begin to be expressed with great intensity. This new form may refer to a large group that has no agenda, offering only the possibility of

tenzija koje su zadržane unutar hijerarhije. Ako pojednostavnimo da je instinkt krda ono što stvara masu ("tulju") nećemo se daleko pomaknuti u razumijevanju društvenih procesa.

Velika grupa, tako ima dvije opcije: liječenje i demokratizaciju kao dva istoznačna procesa.(12)

Živeći u društvima zapadnog civilizacijskog kruga imamo počesto dojam o vlastitoj demokratičnosti i demokraciji kao nužnoj ideji. No, suočeni s 30 i više članova imamo jako malo ideja kako potaknuti i facilitirati dijalog u kojem je moguće nešto izreći i čuti druge. Potreba za radom u velikim grupama danas postaje jasnija te se i bolje može kontekstualizirati Freudova rečenica iz *Nelagode u kulturi* (1930): „Netko će se, ipak jednoga dana upustiti u analizu patologije u kulturi zajednica“. Patrick de Mare pak piše: „Kultura grupe predstavlja grupni ekvivalent individualnoga uma“. Budući da kultura može biti i neadekvatna, čak i patološki destruktivna, može predstavljati ekvivalent neurotičnog poremećaja kod individue. Ukoliko ima i otpora, a uvijek ga ima, izvjesno je da dolazi iz naše vlastite zajednice. Kao primjer kulturnog deficita, upravo je nevjerojatno kako u područjima koje pokrivaju psihijatrija, psihanaliza, psihoterapija i grupna terapija svi izbjegavaju kritike kulturalnih konteksta u kojima se iste prakticiraju, do

dialogue or discussion, and representing an exceptionally high potential for the direct verbalisation of tensions that have remained suppressed within hierarchy. If we reduce herd instinct to the sole explanation for what forms a mass ("mob"), we will not get very far in understanding the social processes.

The large group, then, presents two options: healing and democratisation as two synonymous processes. (12)

Living in the Western societies, we often have the impression that we are democratic and that democracy is a necessary idea. However, when confronted with 30 or more participants, we have very few ideas about how to encourage and facilitate a dialogue in which people can both speak and listen to others. The need for working in large groups is becoming increasingly evident today, and Freud's statement from *Civilization and Its Discontents* (1930) can now be better contextualised: "one day someone will venture to embark upon a pathology of cultural communities." Patrick de Mare, for his part, posited that the culture of the group was the group equivalent of the individual mind. Since culture itself can be inadequate or even pathologically destructive, it may reflect the equivalent of a neurotic disorder in an individual. Wherever there is resistance, and there always is, it is likely to emerge from within our own community. As an example of cultural deficit, it is truly remarkable how fields like psychiatry, psychoanalysis, psychotherapy, and group therapy



te mjere da se pokušaji eksploracije konteksta tretiraju nerealističnima.

Paradoksalno, moglo bi se zaključiti da postoji iznimno velika potreba za razumijevanjem ritmova prošlih i sadašnjih kultura u grupama, naročito u njihovom međuočnosu sa ritmovima cijele planete Zemlje. No nastojanja su minimalna(13).

Svrha velike grupe je razvoj misli i dijaloga. Ona ne predstavlja psihoterapiju pojedinca već podrazumijeva razvoj građanskih vještina. Stoga, pokušaji interpretacije u velikim grupama kojih smo česti svjedoci, jest redukcionizam i hendikepira razvoj dijaloga na višoj razini. Uporne interpretacije bazičnih pretpostavki kao i fenomena primarnih procesa ponavljano vraćaju grupu unatrag i zaustavljaju rast i razvoj grupe. Takve intervencije ne dopuštaju razvoj elaborirane i sofisticiranije grupne kulture. To nužno ne znači da nisu dobre niti poželjne, već znači da trebaju naći svoje adekvatno mjesto u analizi politike i kulture u grupi. Iznimno je metodološki važno izbjegavati redukciju politike i kulture grupe na razinu psihoanalitičke psihologije.

Prve velike grupe koje je de Mare održavao uvijek su na neki način bile borba za dostatan broj članova. Počelo je s prvih 40 članova, s tim da je postupno broj padao na 30, potom na 20 članova. Iskustvo je pokazalo da što su grupe

all avoid critiquing the cultural contexts in which these practices are embedded, up to the point of treating the attempts to explore context as being unrealistic.

Paradoxically, one could conclude that there is an immense need to understand the rhythms of past and present cultures within groups, especially in their correlation with the rhythms of the entire planet Earth. However, efforts in that direction remain minimal (13).

The purpose of the large group is the development of thought and dialogue. It is not aimed at individual psychotherapy, but rather implies the cultivation of civic skills. Therefore, attempts at interpretation within large groups, which we often witness, constitute a form of reductionism and hinder the development of higher-level dialogue. Persistent interpretations of basic assumptions and primary process phenomena repeatedly pull the group backward, stalling its growth and development. Such interventions do not allow for the development of a more elaborate and sophisticated group culture. This does not necessarily mean that they are undesirable or invalid, but rather that they must find their appropriate place within the analysis of politics and culture in the group. It is methodologically crucial to avoid reducing the politics and culture of the group to the level of psychoanalytic psychology.

The first large groups that Patrick de Mare conducted were always, in some way, a struggle to gather a sufficient

više sličile na terapijske, proces opadanja članova bio je ubrzaniji. Ono što je inicijalno bilo zamišljeno kao velika grupa, završilo je kao sekcija za srednje veliku grupu pri Group Analytic Society. Kada je 1985. de Mare bio pozvan održati *Foulkes lecture* to je uradio u zgradi Confederation of British Industry, jer je tada to bila jedina zgrada u kojoj se moglo organizirati da članovi sjede u koncentričnim krugovima te gledaju i čuju jedni u druge.

Još je bitno spomenuti dva povijesno značajna trenutka: formiranje Black and White group (Eric Ferron) s pokušajem dijaloga o rasizmu, kao i rad Transkulturalne sekcije pri GAS (Dennis Brown, Jaak Le Roy).

Ono što čini rad Patricka deMare-a (5,6) posebnim i izuzetnim jest uvođenje nove paradigme u teoriju GA, a to je pozicioniranje psihoanalize u odnosu prema politici i kulturi. Velika grupa ne raste i ne razvija se posredstvom interpretacije, čak niti posredstvom analize u smislu da je ona shvaćena kroz prizmu individualnoga ili pak kroz prizmu male grupe. Razvija se posredstvom dijaloga. Pri tome je najvažnije to da je dijalog kulturalna forma, čak i umjetnička forma koju se treba **naučiti**. Ne samo da je pojedinci trebaju učiti, već i same grupe trebaju naučiti kako razvijati vlastiti dijalog.

Stajalište de Mare-a je bilo da ljudi trebaju naučiti raditi u srednjoj, median

number of members. It began with 40 members, gradually decreasing to 30, and then to 20 members. It was observed in practice that the more the groups resembled therapeutic settings, the faster the number of the participants declined. What was originally conceived as a large group eventually became a section for a median group within the Group Analytic Society. When de Mare was invited to deliver the Foulkes Lecture in 1985, he did so in the building of the Confederation of British Industry, as it was the only space available at the time that allowed the participants to sit in concentric circles, seeing and hearing one another. Two historically significant moments should also be mentioned: the formation of the Black and White Group (Eric Ferron) which attempted to open a dialogue on racism, and the work of the Transcultural Section within GAS (Dennis Brown, Jaak Le Roy).

What makes Patrick de Mare's work (5, 6) truly special and exceptional is the introduction of a new paradigm into group analytic theory, positioning psychoanalysis in relation to politics and culture. The large group does not grow or develop through interpretation or even through analysis in the sense that it is seen through the viewpoint of an individual or small group perspective. It develops through dialogue. What is most important is the idea that dialogue is a cultural form, even an art form, that must be **learned**. Not only must individuals learn it, but the groups themselves must learn how to develop their own dialogue.



grupi (15-40 sudionika) prije nego što budu u stanju koristiti veliku grupu sa smislom i razumijevanjem. (6)

Temeljno je pravilo sjedenje u krugu tj. komunikacija u jednoj razini, ostati i mrziti uz prorađivanje ka jedinstvenom cilju "impersonal fellowship" – neosobno drugarstvo (van intimnosti i osjećaja).

Uvodi i termin "koinonija", od grč. riječi zajednica (communion) što se najpribližnije može prevesti kao stanje dijaloga među članovima (najviše 30 sudionika).

Često je problem rada u velikom grupama pogrešan kontekst. Poglavito trebaju biti obeshrabreni svi oni voditelji koji vjeruju da su osjećaji najvažniji te da prevladavaju.

Sam kontekst *koinonije* je originalna ideja: u malim grupama članovi se brane od osjećaja mišljenjem i misaonim procesom.

U velikim grupama: preplavljenost različitim osjećajima nužno pokreće misaoni proces sa svrhom da se održi grupa.

Također mora doći i do promjene: od mržnje posredstvom dijaloga do kulture grupe, sa svrhom da grupa ne bude zarobljena u polarizacijama.

Velike grupe uvijek su napadnute: iznutra i izvana, ali rad u grupama

De Mare was of the opinion that people need to first learn to work in median groups (15–40 participants) before they can meaningfully and insightfully engage with a large group (6). The basic rule was sitting in a circle, that is, communicating at a single level, staying in the group and enduring frustration, moving toward a common goal of *impersonal fellowship* (a kind of companionship beyond intimacy and sentiment).

He also introduced the term *koinonia* from the Greek word for community (communion), which can be best translated as a state of dialogue among members (usually no more than 30). One of the common problems in working with large groups is the wrong context. In particular, it is essential to discourage conductors who believe that emotions are central and should dominate.

The very context of *koinonia* is an original idea: in small groups, the members defend themselves against feelings through the process of thinking and mental processing.

In large groups: being overwhelmed by emotions necessarily triggers thought processes with the aim of preserving the group.

A transformation must occur as well: from hatred, through dialogue, toward the development of a group culture, with the aim of preventing the group from becoming trapped in polarisations.

može promovirati otpor ka otuđenju i submisiji te ponuditi normalizaciju.

De Mare živio je i disao za veliku grupu. Paradoksalno, najveća ironija se odigrala na IAGP Conference u Londonu 1998. gdje je de Mare ponudio iskustvenu srednje veliku grupu kao dio programa. Javio se veliki broj zainteresiranih sudionika konferencije te su bili podijeljeni u dvije grupe, medijan veličine jer bi inače imao veliku grupu, koju je paradoksalno, oduvijek priželjkivao (!)

U međuvremenu, u istoj zgradi petstotinjak sudionika IAGP konferencije sudjelovalo je u radu velike grupe, koja je bila dio programa i u kojoj su članovi nastojali u iznimno kratkom vremenu trajanja same konferencije stvoriti dijalog o specifičnostima međusobnih kulturalnih naslijeđa i povijesti političkih opresija i sukoba.

UMJESTO ZAKLJUČKA

Dok psihoanaliza tretira dijelove osobnog uvida sa skromnim razumijevanjem političkih okolnosti, grupna analiza zadržava specijalnu povezanost sa hijerarhijom svih hijerarhija tj. obitelji. Za razliku od navedenoga, terapija u velikim grupama mogla bi imati mikropoliticko značenje u osiguravanju novih vrsta uvida, naročito društvenog uvida u čimbenike koji se nalaze van

Large groups are always under attack: internally and externally, but group work can promote resistance to alienation and submission, and offer a sense of normalisation.

De Mare lived and breathed for the large group. Paradoxically, the greatest irony took place at the IAGP Conference in London in 1998, where de Mare proposed an experiential median group as part of the program. A large number of participants signed up and they were divided into two median groups, which were median because otherwise, it would have been a large group, which, paradoxically, de Mare had always wished for (!).

Meanwhile, in the same building, around 500 conference participants took part in a large group session which was part of the conference program, and in which the members attempted, within the very limited time of the conference, to initiate a dialogue on the specificities of their cultural heritages and the histories of political oppression and conflict.

INSTEAD OF A CONCLUSION

While psychoanalysis deals with elements of personal insight with limited understanding of political circumstances, group analysis maintains a special connection with the hierarchy of all hierarchies, that is, the family. In contrast, therapy in large groups could hold micropolitical significance by enabling new kinds of insight, particularly so-



orbite psihoterapije . U suštini znanstveni diskursi u psihologiji su dizajnirani na način da ignoriraju društveno-ekonomski kontekst u kojem psihološki čimbenici odigravaju svoju ulogu. U nekim terapijskim kulturama očito je da analitičari iz političkih razloga zauzimaju poziciju analitičkog odmaka održavajući pritom striktnu neutralnu akademsku poziciju. Društveni uvid djeluje pritom poput dvostrukog zrcala ne odražavajući nužno ponašanje individue u društvu nego pak odražavajući situaciju oko nas.

Velika grupa u ranim fazama postojanja i promišljanja se doživljavala proganjajućim medijem, opresivnom za članove pojedinačno koji se ne osjećaju dovoljno slobodnima da „dišu“ niti dovoljno inspiriranima da spontano izražavaju svoje misli. Zagušujuća opresija velike grupe vodi neminovno u depresivno nemisleće stanje ili alternativno, u izbjegavanje ili pak euforiju. To je cijena pripadanja grupi u specifičnom trenutku.

Pregovori oko načina prevladavanja takvih intenzivnih polariteta uz progradu i prorastanje situacije sa nitima komunikacije predstavlja samu esenciju psihosocijalne terapije. Okvir velike grupe treba postaviti kroz vrijeme i regularnost (redovitost i ohrabrenje su jako potrebni). Tehnika psihoterapije u velikoj grupi sa nepovjerenjem je doče-

cial insight into factors that lie outside the orbit of psychotherapy. In essence, scientific discourses in psychology are designed in such a way that they ignore the socio-economic context in which psychological factors operate. In some therapeutic cultures, it is evident that analysts, for political reasons, adopt a position of analytical distance, all the while maintaining a strictly neutral academic stance. Social insight, in this regard, acts like a double mirror by not necessarily reflecting an individual's behaviour in the society, but instead reflecting the situation around us.

In its early stages of development and reflection, the large group was viewed as a persecutory medium, oppressive to individual members who did not feel free enough to “breathe” or inspired enough to spontaneously express their thoughts. This suffocating oppression of the large group inevitably leads either to a depressive, non-thinking state or, alternatively, to avoidance or euphoria. That is the price of belonging to a group in a specific moment in time.

Negotiations around ways of overcoming such intense polarities, along with working and growing through the situation by means of communication, represent the very essence of psychosocial therapy. The framework of the large group must be established through time and regularity (constancy and encouragement are highly necessary). The technique of psychotherapy in the large group was initially met with distrust by psycho-

kana od strane psihoanalize i psihoterapije u maloj grupi. Razlozi se nalaze u karakteristično snažnoj i nepredvidljivoj erupciji kaotičnih emocija koje su potaknute settingom te oslobađaju anksioznost psihotičnog tipa. U trenutku kada se kroz grupni rad ova energija kontejnira i organizira kroz misaoni proces može imati snažne političke posljedice. Utjecaj velike grupe na okoliš je veći i jasniji nego u psihoanalitičkoj situaciji ili u maloj grupi gdje se sve odvija iza zatvorenih vrata. O tome svjedoči i činjenica da su mnoge terapijske zajednice poput Hendersona i Dnevne bolnice Paddington zastrašivane pa čak i uništene pomoću administrativnih i političkih utjecaja.

Možemo reći da velike grupe nastavljaju u točki gdje su male grupe zastale na način da osiguravaju setting unutar kojega možemo istraživati društvene mitove (društveno nesvjesno) unutar kojih možemo premostiti pukotine između nas samih i vlastitog društveno-kulturnog okruženja koje se sasvim zapanjujuće, čini van našeg dosega. Kontekst postaje centralna točka za razumijevanje procesa te predstavlja okosnicu koja je nedostatno istražena. Ove godine na Foulks Lecture danima, Teresa von Sommaruga nam je prezentirala kako je uspjela ideje i djela Patricka de Mare održati, razraditi ih te ih prevesti u novo stoljeće. Time je otvoren put nove evolucije u grupnoj analizi.

analysis and small group psychotherapy. The reasons lie in the characteristically strong and unpredictably chaotic eruption of emotions triggered by the setting, which release psychotic-type anxiety. At the moment when this energy is contained and organised through a thinking process via group work, it can have powerful political consequences. The influence of the large group on its environment is greater and clearer than in psychoanalytic situations or small groups where everything happens behind closed doors. This is evidenced by the fact that many therapeutic communities, such as Henderson's and the Paddington Day Hospital, were intimidated and even destroyed by administrative and political pressures.

We could say that large groups continue where small groups have stalled, by providing a setting in which we can explore social myths (the social unconscious), within which we can bridge the gaps between ourselves and our own socio-cultural environment, which surprisingly often seems beyond our reach. Context becomes the central point for understanding processes and represents the backbone that remains insufficiently researched. This year, during the Foulkes Lecture Days, Teresa von Sommaruga presented how she succeeded in maintaining, developing, and translating Patrick de Mare's ideas and work into the new century, thus opening the way for a new evolution in group analysis.



LITERATURA/REFERENCES

1. de Mare, P., Piper, R.& Thompson, S., (1991) *Ko-inonia: From Hate, through Dialogue to Culture*. London: Karnac.
2. Hopper E (2009) The theory of the basic assumption of incohesion: aggregation/massification or (BA) I:A/M. *British Journal of Psychotherapy* 25(2): 214-229.
3. Lawrence GW, Bain A, Gould L (1996) The Fifth Basic Assumption. *Free Associations* 6 (1): 2855:1-20.
4. Sandler PC (2002) A sixth basic assumption? In: *Bion Conference*. Los Angeles: International Bion Conference.
5. de Mare, P., "The Politics of Large Groups", Kreeger, L., ed. (1975). *The Large group: Dynamics&Therapy*, London: Constable.
6. Bion WR (1961) *Experiences in Groups*. London: Tavistoc. Crossref.
7. Bion WR (1962) A theory of thinking. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 43:306-10. Pub Med.
8. Bion WR (1963) *Elements of Psychoanalysis*. London: Karnac Books.
9. Dalal, F., (1998). *Taking the Group Seriously. Towards a Post-Foulksian group Analytic Theory*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
10. Foulkes, S. H. (1948). *An Introduction to Group Analytic therapy*. London: Heinemann Medical. [Reprinted London: Karnac Books.]
11. Lenn, R.&Stefano, K. (2012) *Small Large and Median Groups: The work of Patrick de Mare*. London: Karnac
12. Sherwood M (1964) Bion's Experiences in Groups: A Critical Evaluation. *Human Relations* 17(2): 113-130. Crossref.ISI.