

Dear friends,

in this Newsletter you will find important contributions coming from our group experiences in Budapest and Marsala and representing different points of view about our common transcultural theme.

Coming back to my own not answered question on what is transculturality and what is transculturality today, I give here some brief reflections in trying to bridge the two main rich papers of Huseman (who was the scientific supervisor of the two workshops) and Ruvolo and Profita who organized the Sicilian workshop. Both papers offer important lines for future discussions.

It begins to be clearer for me, that the large group is a main experience for Eatga, with the technical particularity of its multilingual setting.

Our open workshops inviting also non Eatga members, enlarge the possibility of this peculiar experience. After Marsala, I thought that the large group is a “diabolic” experience, a very questioning and frustrating one, but a way of exploring the group dynamics and its hidden “transcultural” unconscious in each one’s subjectivity.

In this sort of group experience it appears that we all fear undifferentiation, and we are all defensive about our “identity”: the sense of one’s own continuity and auto-containment of personal belongings.

The large group experience is not that of a mass, nor of a crowd, but curiously it has an impact on “anonymity”, although the other participants are not completely unknown for us!

The large group permits to explore the group symptoms, the sign of different basic fears, “fear of breakdown”, of losing differentiation, of alienation, and our defenses against those fears. At this point we find the different theoretical ways of explaining those fears and defenses (Huseman is more concerned by historical traumatic memories, and destructivity, Ruvolo and Profita by context dynamics and mythical symbolism, Sheked by aggressivity).

My feeling, as a participant, is that in large group situations, we stuck ourselves to some evident, visible, apparent aspects, those which seem more obvious for everybody (e.g. language differences, the places where we are seated, etc), to avoid other more compromising themes that could be socio-political or historical, transgenerational, existential, etc. What is clear in the large group experience is that some unconscious premises are played, which the leader (or leaders) intervention never satisfy: in fact interpretations are perceived as arbitrary and perhaps dangerous.

In my experience of large group I notice a paradox: that we defend from undifferentiation through conformity, which takes the form of some obvious definitory antinomies in a

somehow paranoid way (old-young, man-woman, english-french, etc) with its following consequences.

I find it is difficult for every conductor to find words to express the common uneasiness, or some existential truth; perhaps because there is a taboo about breaking group defenses?

With which “truth” could be touched the common fears which are covered, in these large group situations, by “no matter which” occasional belonging?

In the construction of each Eatga workshop, there is a creative effort to find an always more appropriate method to grasp this difficult matter of transculturality as an aspect of transsubjectivity (or viceversa?) and to confront the ethics of transculture in an actual socio-historical environment.

With all my best wishes

*Silvia Amati Sas*

**TO MALCOLM PINES**

**Dear Malcolm,**

**we wish you all the best for your 85th birthday.**

**We are proud of your friendship, and we all admire your productive scientific life.**

**All the friends of EATGA**