

## GROUP ANALYSIS IS ANARCHISM - GROUP ANALYST AS ANARCHIST

*Juha-Matti Toivola*

*Turku, Finland juha-matti.toivola@fimnet.fi*

Sigmund Freud refers to groups in his works Totem and Tabu (1913) and Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego (1921). To us group analysts noteworthy is Freud's speculation that group psychology indeed could be first and more natural for humans and individual psychology secondary and much more difficult to achieve and maintain. Freud takes up in these works the idea of original herd, in which the strong male has the power and control and the herd is structured around him. I think this kind of idea is in most psychotherapists mind when they think about the origin of our group mind. But after Freud there has been new information about the history of humans and other apes. What is our heritage? The ape bonobo may be our closest ape. Bonobo looks almost like a chimpanzee, but is considered as own species. In group behavior bonobo is completely different from chimpanzee. Information about bonobo and its group behavior is quite recent (de Waal and Lanting, 1997). Freud's original herd is similar to gorillas group. In chimpanzees the power is in the network of males. In bonobos the real power runs with females and male's power position depends on the power position of mother. In bonobo group social interaction is special in its non-aggressiveness. What is very evident is the use of sex in easing down anxiety and aggressiveness in social relations. If we are like bonobos originally, we could think our group psychology background anew. So, it could be, that the human history is much less hierarchical or aggressive or violent than we used to think. So it could be natural that we have in us a tendency to a democratic, peaceful and low hierarchical community. How has history really happened? One version we group analysts get by reading Norbert Elias' The Civilizing Process. In it the main focus is on how power relations and landowning developed in France during centuries up to the French Revolution. To me a memorable detail is about landowning. Charlemagne gave his fellow warlords pieces of land to govern. It is described how this land was transferred when time went by to a privately owned land to this family, which created huge fortunes to some families. As Elias describes, at the end it was the French king who got overhand in this landowning business. In practice at that time the economy of the French state and the economy of the king were the same thing, so: "L'état ce moi", is very accurate and not just a figure of speech. This kind of fortune robbing by taking happens of course at the very moment. Just like the warlord in the middle ages our own ceo's and investment bankers are transferring the money they are trusted to take care of to their personal possession. This wealth gives us all know huge power over all of us with less money. Transactions of absurd magnitude happened when the former Soviet Union collapsed and whole industries

went into the hands of a few men, the so called oligarchs. Problematic this is also because social power relations and interaction practices are directly connected to individual thinking processes like Elias described. This happens through systemic interconnectedness in all levels of interaction. So all the changes in society happen in the same time in our mind and thinking processes, alas we change when our society changes. This could be one reason to be involved in politics to influence our societies and future. Now we are getting nearer to our topic. I think that one of the main events concerning freedom and in that sense also in the development of anarchism the birth and liberation of the USA from the British rule. In the Declaration of Independence reads, as well known, that all men are created equal. Noteworthy in this North American concept of freedom is the tradition to avoid on any cause the influence and authority of the state and take special notice on the freedom of an individual citizen. In this respect this American thinking is truly anarchistic thinking. But the story has more sides in it. Emotionally maybe even more chattering episode took place as mentioned by Elias. In year 1789 started the French revolution. Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité. The king's absolutistic rule was abolished and nobility and clergy lost also their special privileges. The French Revolution has strongly influenced many intellectual traditions in Europe, among them the anarchistic movement. The French Revolution is in many ways an archetype on revolution. Revolution is a total destruction, which lifts the miserable, poor and laboring ordinary man in the center of action and power. Surprisingly fast and inevitable society recreates again hierarchies of power and inequality. This creation of hierarchies in its natural force tells to me at least about human beings difficulty to respect one another and about the difficulty to share the common environment equally. So without the French Revolution there would not be anarchism, so it's now time to move to a time, when the word anarchism starts to mean something. Property is theft The founder of anarchism, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865) came from humble peasant backgrounds. He was self-taught and didn't value formal education, because formal education seemed to unjustly guarantee self-evidently better positions in power hierarchies. Proudhon was well read in Christian literature and you can see this in his writings. Proudhon was the first to use the word "anarchism" to clarify his thinking and he described himself as the first anarchist. Proudhon had a negative attitude towards private property especially early in his career. Private property gives according to him the possibility to gain from fellow man's work without the property owner putting in any work or pains. According to Proudhon being on paid labor oppresses and diminishes ones freedom. Proudhon in his radical form was against private property. From him Marx got the idea and in Soviet Union it was tried in practice with well-known results. "Property is theft" is a slogan that is put into Proudhon's mouth (Proudhon, 1840). So but what it has to do with group analysis, in what way Proudhon remind us the founder of group analysis, S.H.Foulkes. My thinking goes as follows. If we take seriously Norbert Elias and his sociological thinking in group analysis, then we must think, that those power and interaction relations which are in work in society, so analogically similar forces and models are working also our human relations, in our mind and in our language. So what could the words "property is theft" mean in relation to group analysis? As I understand Proudhon, he meant that no-one has right to claim a possession as his own. It reminds me of American Indian thinking that no one can own the land, when faced with the settlers from

Europe. Proudhon thought that land and tolls can be used and benefited but not owned. Behind this is thinking that by freely distributing goods they will also be utilized without anybody preventing the distribution with claiming ownership to something. Analogically in group analysis no-one in groups is allowed to withhold his thoughts or ideas, one must express them as freely as possible. In such way thoughts and images are jointly shared and utilized, and so everybody gets richer and help each other get richer. Same analogy can be seen in individual psychoanalytical psychotherapy, where in free association it is special attention given to those thoughts that are kept away from the associative process. If we go back to Proudhon's anarchistic thinking, so in it private property in a few hands is neurotic illness in society. This thinking is familiar from present day debate about economic equality, which some people think is prerequisite to healthy society. These Proudhon's words can surely be interpreted in many ways. One way to see it is very anarchistic also namely seeing knowledge as property and seeing the power related to knowledge. Who owns group analytical or psychoanalytical or psychotherapeutic information? In USA they are very practical and they register a therapy technique and then they begin to sell it. In this way knowledge very literally is transformed to property. Then one can really start to think about stealing something. Who in group analysis own the knowledge? Is the knowledge in the head of conductor? Is therapy like transferring money from one account to another? If group analyst is withholding knowledge in his head, so isn't he like the thief Proudhon was after collecting a personal wealth? Maybe the conductor is trying to collect more wealth from the group members by promising to help them. So also private entrepreneur says by helping his paid workers he is giving them employment. In group analysis we want to benefit from every group members thinking in a common effort, in which there is no place for private enterprise. I think group analysis is truly proudhonian in its free floating discussion, its equal knowing and its joint effort to study. Marx was wrong Mikhail Bakunin (1841-1876) is known as one of the first anarchists. In groupanalytically point of view interesting was Bakunin's ideological work and in it his conflict with Karl Marx. Their conflict was on both ideological and organizational level. On organizational level Marx used tricky party tactics in First Workers International to keep anarchism and Bakunin out of management of the movement. This conflict analogically reflects just the very difference that separates these two theorists. Bakunin was against central government and centralization. Marx saw it necessary to have a centrally led leadership to co-ordinate the workers movement. Bakunin foresaw the problem that in revolution by taking the power from one group to another the basic structure stays intact. So in workers revolution the power is transferred to the working elite. Then comes out the very thing that George Orwell writes in his novel Animal Farm, a "red dictatorship" is formed, and worker is not freed, but stays instead under suppression and power structures as before. Bakunin predicted that the Marxist workers revolution will only lead to from one oppressive government to another, power is transferred from one group to another, but the structure stays untouched (Bakunin, 1870). This prophecy was given in the middle of 19th century and it was tragically tried out in many countries in the 20th century. Bakunin the group analyst would have been satisfied about the diversity of group analysis and its lack of central rule. In group analysis sometimes one can feel a little London centered, but the whole field of group analysis and the

field of psychoanalytic group therapy are clearly not under a central rule. This is the question, who owns group analysis? Bakunin would have answered that no-one. To start with the whole theoretical background in group analysis has so many roots, so the whole idea of controlling it is absurd. What does the idea of no central rule mean analogically in group analytic group situation? I think it means that the group conductor doesn't own the knowledge to heal or about life in general. Healing in group or creating new thoughts is done authentically in cooperation with all members in the group, just like Foulkes taught us. You can look at it from another angle. What is it for an individual group member to take part in groupanalytic process? He learns to see things and incidents equally; he learns to speak for himself and think for himself. In groupanalytic group one is subject to interaction which strengthens autonomy and puts ones former interaction in family and society in general under inspection. According to groupanalytic theory everyone in group has to take part in the whole process, you can't delegate it to anyone else. In the group much can happen in common, together and surely for others, but the basic idea is that the individual must be activated and strengthen his mind. Also Darwin was wrong Prince Pjotr Kropotkin (1842-1921) is a second generation anarchist, who developed further Proudhon's and Bakunin's thinking. Kropotkin presented an anarchistic society model. In it society consisted of union of small self-sufficient communities. It has been said, that Kropotkin's model looked very much like the Russian countryside villages at his time. Anyhow the basic idea is sweet and beautiful. Utopias have always been along these lines, so Kropotkin is in good company and maybe ahead of his time. But I want to concentrate on Kropotkin's work, *Mutual Aid: A Factor in Evolution* (1902), because its message has connection to groupanalytic theory. In *Mutual Aid* Kropotkin describes with zoological, ethnographical and historical examples how in evolution essential force behind development and survival is the support and help given to individual by group and community. This thinking was at its time very far from the then ruling socialdarwinistic view of survival of fittest and strongest. Survival of the strongest is usually considered to signify war between all, everyone being on his own. Kropotkin found instead that evolution is driven by the support individuals give to one another. This social support makes group and society stronger and resilient. It took a while before Kropotkin's findings could be fitted to general scientific thinking. But what does this mean to group analysis? It is easy to see the connection with Kropotkin's idea and with one of the curing factors in group therapy, social support. So if social support is firmly recognized as significant factor in group's development and individual health, so it is easily understandable that the same is true in whole society. Here I come back to anarchism's basic ideas about equality and equal right to common wealth. If we think about the individual group member, so Kropotkin's finding seems to suggest, that the more one can help the group to work, the better the same individual will benefit in the group. Anarchism>syndicalism Errico Malatesta (1853-1932) was a passionate man, a man of principle and an persistent anarchist all his life. During his lifetime as an anarchist he spent 38 years in exile from his home country, Italy and in prison he spent 10 years. He worked for anarchism in many countries like Romania, Egypt, Argentina, Switzerland and France. Malatesta was at his time a very popular speaker and he could attract huge crowds when speaking. Malatesta worked both with Bakunin and later with Kropotkin. The headline is referring to an argument in Amsterdam Anarchist

Congress held in year 1907. There Malatesta had a dispute with Pierre Monatte about anarchism and syndicalism. Syndicalism means that workers union or workers guild should take over the production and the means of production. When through revolution workers union takes over the production of goods, from that follows, that society will be freer. The former oppressing structures break up and more equal material and interactional practice will emerge. Coming together or belonging to an organization were not goals in themselves and Malatesta was strictly against such aspirations. Malatesta was for social revolution, which meant for him abolishing inequality, changing power and behavioral structures. That is why Malatesta was against syndicalist aim to accomplish change by change only in production structure (Malatesta, 1891). What has Malatesta to give to group analysis? Syndicalist view on group analysis would see group analysis as part of the medical system treating illnesses and so group analysis would be part of the very practical health care system with its economical and clinical set up. In health care every treatment modality is under a very heavy pressure to prove its effectiveness. Much hope has been put on the assumption, that group analysis would prove economical just because of its group form. With satisfaction group people have received the findings that group therapy is at least as effective as individual therapies. But Malatesta in me asks that do we achieve with clinical group analytical group psychotherapy in treating medical disorders all those goals and result that we could achieve in group analysis? If group analysis is limited to a clinical treatment modality in the service of the medical system, will it limit itself from more radical work in the service in liberating individuals and society? How about having as group analysis's goal social revolution the same as Malatesta had. I think we should. So the mission for group analysis is wider than a medical treatment modality. I often wonder, whether we in our everyday work really use this more comprehensive view and more importantly, what would work along this wider view be? I am reluctant to think that group analysis is just a technique to get people talk to each other in groups about their problems, without in the same time having in mind the whole social interaction and its signification in every individual's life. Another angle on syndicalism in group analysis is the question about group analysts as a profession. Is the mission of this profession of group analysts to have as big a share of the whole group therapy and group work and organization consulting business as possible? Maybe we group analysts want to have a significant power in making the decisions on who to treat with what therapy and how long and by whom? The mission would be to control the debate on groups and group psychology. Psychotherapeutic syndicalism would be that psychotherapists would define how to treat, how much money is needed and what the demand on treatment is. Groupanalytic anarchistic approach would be to change the whole concept of helping people. Maybe it will no more called helping, maybe it is something completely different. In Malatesta way the tradition to organize and segregate helpers and those that are helped in hierarchies and bureaucracies doesn't serve the cause of liberation. It may very well obstruct free communication, development and emancipation of energies. Radical group analyst? From group analytic point of view it is obvious that society can be seen as containing many kinds of oppressing relationships, which restrain the free flowing of energy and ideas. Analogically we have in our group's obstacles in communication between members and also analogically barriers in individual mind, also called neuroses. So as a matter of fact anarchism is studying

neuroses in society in the same way as group analysis studies these phenomena in groups and psychoanalytical psychotherapy studies in individual therapy the neuroses of individual mind. According to anarchism it would be essential for a group analyst to be free from oppressing power relations or at least to be very aware of them. Essential of course is that the interaction is reciprocal and degree of freedom is high enough, not the formal organization. This idea seems very similar to Erich Fromm's idea of revolutionary personality. Fromm's revolutionary personality is defined as a independent and free, not fanatical and not dependent on authorities. As a matter of fact Fromm means, that revolutionary personality is a mature, self-reliant human being, who can stand on his own feet if necessary be against the opinion of majority (Fromm, 1941). Revolutionary personality sounds very much the same as an anarchist. Malatesta gave us the idea, to get together to work to a common goal. And from Kropotkin gave us the idea of helping each other. With all the anarchistic ideas we have assembled together also the basic ideas for our group analytical work.

### ***References:***

- Dalal, Farhad (2000). Taking the Group Seriously. Towards a Post-Foulkesian Group Analytic Theory. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers
- Elias, Norbert (2006). The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations. Transl. Edmond Jephcott. Oxford: Blackwell (German orig. 1939)
- Stacey, Ralph D. (2003). Complexity and Group Processes: A Radically Social Understanding of Individuals. Hove: Brunner-Routledge (2003)
- Freud, Sigmund (1989). Toteemi ja Tabu : Eräitä yhtäläisyyksiä villien ja neuroottisten sielunelämässä. Jyväskylä: Love kirjat (1989)
- Freud, Sigmund (2010). Joukkopsykologia ja egoanalyysi . Juva: Moreeni (2010) De Waal, Frans ja Lanting, Frans (1997).
- Bonobo: The Forgotten Ape. Berkeley: University of California Press (1997)
- Proudhon, Pierre-Joseph (1840). What is Property? An Inquiry into the Principle of Right and of Government. Marston Gate: Forgotten Books (2008)
- Bakunin, Mikhail (1870). Marxism, Freedom And The State. La Vergne: Kessinger Publishing (2009)
- Kropotkin, Pjotr (1902). Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution. Mineola: Dover Publications (2006)
- Malatesta, Errico (1891). L'Anarchia. London: Bibliotheca dell'Associazione (1891)
- Fromm, Erich (1941). Pako vapaudesta. (Fear of Freedom). Helsinki: Kirjayhtymä (1976)