

In my view, TM is perhaps the most promising educational innovation to emerge from America so far, and should be incorporated in the Rathbone Society's field work. Moreover, we should advocate its general application in Special Schools by suggesting, along with other proposals, that TM be carefully examined by the Department of Education and Science during the course of its Enquiry into Special Education.

References

The psychobiological and sociological effects of TM are currently being investigated at some 40 medical and academic institutions throughout the world. The findings cited above are conveniently listed in 'The Psychobiology of Transcendental Meditation: an annotated bibliography', Miu Press, Spring 1973 (available from SRM, 32 Cranbourn Street, London, WC2H 7EY, telephone 01-240 3103).

Dr. Bernard Glueck, Institute of Living, 400 Washington Street, Hartford, Conn. 06106, U.S.A.

'Transcendental Meditation and its Potential Uses in Schools', Al Rubottom, *Social Education*, December 1972.

'TM as a secondary School Subject', Francis Driscoll, *Phi Delta Kappan*, December 1972.

'Guardian Extra', John Windsor, *The Guardian*, January 19th, 1973.

The introduction of TM into a school, if properly planned, has been shown to be a painless affair, since both staff and pupils usually respond very favourably. If there are any heads or teachers who would like to explore this possibility, or who are meditators themselves, we would be very interested to hear from them.

Jacob Stattman talking

with Mona Lisa Boyesen, Clothilde and Vivian Milroy

(continued from last month)

So far you have almost entirely been talking about groups as therapy situations. Are you limiting your comments to the therapy side or are you including the growth potential groups?

When I say 'therapy' I really mean 'growth'. I'm not sure what the difference is.

But you were talking about people who have specific problems.

I would say that most of what goes on in groups, encounter or gestalt groups and so on, whether they call themselves personal growth groups or not, is fundamentally

therapy in the sense of problem solving or problem resolution, and that's not bad. I see that as an initial stage towards a process of growth, that one must first deal with these privately held facts until you are free from these fixed patterns of behaviour. I think it is simplistic to talk about growth in the more idealistic sense. To me, what growth means is that when I have fully comprehended and accepted my present behaviour, acknowledged and understood it, then growth can begin. For a very good reason: to the extent that I am still fulfilling certain patterns which have to do with childhood dependency . . .

Therapy may perhaps be defined as identifying the limits, growth implies something that is unlimited. Obviously all humanistic therapy involves growth.

There still seems to me to be a very clear demarcation, I know you don't like labels but there is a difference between people who are labelled neurotic, in difficulties, unable to cope with life, unhappy while others are reasonably happy, reasonably adequate and want to go on from there.

Growth is often associated with behaviour which could be misconstrued as neurotic but in fact it is contributing to something beyond the normal, something creative, something transpersonal.

I'm now resisting the temptation to be good and say 'Yes I understand what you mean, I see it' but really you seem to be dodging the issue which is: you have a group of ten people here. Are they people who work successfully and happily in life and want to go on to something transcendent or are they people who have great difficulties, are failures in a commercial sense, don't have happy lives, have bad relationships. I say one is therapy, one is growth, but you seem to be resisting this.

I'm going to answer this by looking at the whole growth movement in a slightly different way. I would say that one could look at participation in the growth movement as a series of phases. In the first phase it's very likely one will deal with therapy, personal problem solving, personal issues, issues related to one's history and childhood and parental relationships and so on. At a certain point one begins to emerge quite naturally into a different phase, where I think growth applies. This phase is usually accompanied by ability to focus on other than one's own psychic world, perhaps a growing interest in a non-therapeutic reality such as meditation. The person begins to move from a concern with his own personal life to a concern with transpersonal, transcendental or spiritual issues. Other than that I can't dignify the word 'growth' as being very different from therapy.

I'm saying that the people are different. Does what you are saying about people who are screwed up and neurotic also apply to people who are reasonably operating in the world and are looking for something new and growing?

I can't answer that in a 'yes' or 'no' because many times people come to groups with that second intent in mind, that they are successful in a worldly sense but they want something more, something different. And yet so often what happens affects their

own intra-psychoic experience and the nature of their own relationships with others. Many times what they said they came for in the sense of something different turns out to be an idealisation. The implications in that kind of change, a real growth experience, are too traumatic and the idealisation gets grounded in the actual facts of their own behaviour and potentiality. In other words, everyone wants to be different, everyone wants to have a more creative fruitful life, but few people achieve it, and I think in a group the reason for that becomes very explicit. It was a disguised idealisation to hide their insecurity about being different, because when you are talking about growth you are talking about a much bigger risk factor than therapy involves. To me, when you are talking about growth you are talking about changing your life-style, your friends, your relationships. This is implied in real growth. The realisation of that is experienced in the group. A person, let's say a successful business man, comes to a group and says his life is just not fulfilled enough and he wants real action, he wants something different. Through the group he comes to understand what that statement really means in terms of actual behaviour. He sees that perhaps he won't be able to support the norms that the business world demands of him, that his family demands of him. He won't be able to have both the past and the future that he thinks will fulfil him. And that's a good thing, because he will either see the desire for fulfilment as an idealisation that's ungrounded, or he will make a very real decision to change, and then he grounds the idealisation and gives it body. And that to me is one of the highest values in the group experience, to test what we will really be able to do. Many times it develops that we are not able or willing to offer to ourselves what is required for that kind of change. In other words we can offer ourselves therapy but not growth, and it's not bad to discover that. It's a grounding of one's aspirations, so one can see them clearly. Some individuals, having discovered that, will go on towards what I would call more authentic growth experience because that will have to exist outside the group. I guess I could make that the differentiation. Therapy can be limited to the process within the group and the relationship with the leader and the group. Growth involves a full change in every dimension of one's life. Often too, because the group norm still has a way of perceiving behaviour which sometimes disguises the self-actualised person - whatever that may be. An example is a girl who was in a five day workshop and never opened her mouth. In terms of the group norm she was totally introverted, escapist, unwilling to take risks or expose her feelings and so on. She was simply ignored after the second day, the group gave up on her. By coincidence I found out afterwards that she was a very successful artist - I saw her work and it was quite incredible. Now her life and her way of expressing her feelings to a large extent deals with expressing herself on canvas rather than through the medium of the group. That doesn't mean that she has no problems or she wouldn't have come to the group in the first place, but one can't say that this person is somehow inferior or less actualising than the people who can express their feelings more easily in the group. I don't say this because painting has some sort of special priority in terms of growth, I'm saying that her act of painting can be better for her, more therapeutic. Perhaps the group process is not for her. She doesn't have to function well in a group to be a good person. That's where the group process can be a subtle fascism.

I agree so highly with this and I can talk from my own experience of being in therapy off and on for the past seven years, and still I am not in a process of growth. I am in a

process still of undoing my neurotic patterns. It needs to be said specifically that growth indicates one is free from the conditioned neurotic structure and until that it is a therapeutic process, and beyond that is growth. For example when you get attached to a yogi and try to detach yourself, this is growth, and the problems are the same on the therapist's couch.

When Perls talks about responsibility, and he calls it 'response-ability', I would have to add, and I move from therapy to growth, that it's response-ability with choice! For example a person might learn to develop response-ability within a context, for example in a group, in relation to a therapist. Take an issue like anger. A person learns to express anger and can do it within a context. The implicit assumption is that I can choose whether to be angry, how to be angry, etc. I can't make that implicit assumption. I know that a person can learn to achieve a certain behaviour within a social behaviour. That's true whether it's a psychological centre or what-have-you. One learns in a sense to make appropriate responses because there is also a supporting environment.

That to me is not the same as the hierarchy of responsibility that comes from autonomous choice, regardless of the situation. That's an ultimate ideal that would correspond to what a mystic means by enlightenment and what an existentialist means when he talks about a fully authenticated person. There is a difference. Many times people can function very well in a group but not outside. Fully functioning behaviour in a group is not synonymous with completely autonomous behaviour outside. There is a difference between therapy in a group and a person who is able to achieve growth in a fuller dimension.

There are a couple of other things I want to say about this growth/therapy dualism. This business of splitting, probably the people who know most about it are the Reichian and Bio-energetic people. Many times a person will enter into what we call growth activity which may be creative or spiritual, and what has happened is that this is a splitting off from the anxiety that goes with normal behaviour. In other words it's a retreat or a refuge from responsibility that's demanded in normal behaviour. So you have really a pseudo-participation in a group, certainly with a good master or guru. I'm not offering this is a criticism but as a fairly common phenomenon that occurs in therapy when certain elements of the personality get more grandiose, and a person may hide their aggression in the passionate worship of their leader. It's the social equivalent of the behavioural form of smile, a smile that's used to hide internal aggression and ward off external aggression. So the question in this therapy/growth gradation is how effective the movement has been in self-development moving into self-growth. That's the area that I feel a group can be very helpful in. But if the leader has a vested interest in supporting that behaviour, if he has any sort of pseudo-understanding of genuine growth, he is not going to confront a person or enable a person to confront his own split with regard to this. At a low level it's like the mind/body split. The humanistic movement in simplistic terms has moved from the mind being in control of the body with the resultant denial of emotional expression; in other words it has moved from the rationalistic to the emotional/affective. But then you can also get a split there. Affective experience is identified with maturity and integration when in fact it is just the opposite pole. This is what the work is all about -

to perceive those switches, the defence patterns disguise themselves by moving from identifiably undesirable behaviour to desirable behaviour with respect to group norms. That's also in a sense the creative pressure that every group leader must learn.

It sounds a bit boring, because you are in a way talking like a middle-aged psychiatrist way talking about his work knowing that it takes at least seven years to go through Freudian analysis; and you are just saying that this experimental therapy, the human potential experimental therapy, the human potential movement, is dealing with such dynamic forces which have taken years and years to be integrated in the body although it is in a destructive way . . .

It's like in a Zen centre, people have an idea they are going to deal with certain issues and they get so upset when they find themselves constantly talking about their mother and their father, they are saying to themselves 'But this isn't Zen, this isn't what Zen is about, and they leave because that isn't what they came for, that's psychotherapy. And that's why I get hung up on these words. In Tibetan Buddhism you spend three years in a very structured way dealing with your parents. Now no-one here in the West wants to hear that. I used to give lectures and I'd talk about that and they'd get up and walk out.

Three days alright, but three years!

They are looking for short cuts and there's no such thing. There are short cuts to behave a little bit more in contact, there's another short cut to behave even a little bit more and then again in about three months you will behave a little better and in about six months you will be able to express yourself in an even more genuine way. Then in another six months maybe you acknowledge what you feel, and in another year one is really able to identify the feeling. And each method touches on certain parts of the self. Like the Synanon therapy, for addicts it's right in the sense that the addict is dealing with a very specific way in which his personality is channelled, a certain kind of dependence. And what happens in a Synanon group, it's all what they call 'putting the game on you', where you are attacked and off attacked and attacked, and you have to out-toughen the rest of the group and pass the game on to someone else; and this is considered good behaviour if you can do it. And the whole purpose of it psychologically is to toughen up the ego so that you are not dependent. I think that's very good within a certain context, but the trouble is that what's left out in the Synanon or confrontation method is that you never deal with the vulnerability, what you get is a person who had a pseudo-toughness now developing a real toughness where they have just built the armour up, in Reichian terms, and the vulnerability that I think is necessary for the fully integrated personality is never developed. So when one of those people comes to my groups, often the first thing that happens is that I get in touch with the terror and the fear behind that facade of toughness, and they can't stand it, they really freak out. And they get so confused because it seems as if I've turned their therapy down, because they are angry, they are the one type of people in the group who can express anger, but the minute they get into any sense of vulnerability or fear they are finished, they collapse. Now that's not an integrated person. An integrated person can deal with fear. So that's what I mean when I say you

get distorted personalities that are labelled integrated. I'm probably terribly critical about this but that's because I'm tired of seeing people from the groups, running into them three or four years later and they say 'I'm not going to groups any more', and they may be people I've worked with and perhaps had big breakthroughs with and nothing's really changed. I think the process has to face the responsibility for that. If there had been less emphasis on the breakthrough, less emphasis on the things I've talked about, this person could have made some changes that were significant. And I've also run into people since I've changed my style who have said 'I'm glad you didn't push me, I'm glad I didn't have a breakthrough. At the time I regretted it but I've really been able to change now'. And so my ideas and attitudes come from what people tell me, they are not just old theoretical assumptions.

Maybe this would be a good time for you to tell us what is this change in your style.

OK, but in a way this is going to come up in what I am going to say about pushing a person, whether it's the leader pushing the person to express himself, to get in touch with his feelings, to get away from his rationalisations and so on, or whether the group is pushing the person, whatever the source of the pressure, whether it's positive or negative in results, they can be positive if the person can associate with it, can understand what the push is about, can agree to it, then it's not manipulation. Whatever comes out of there, they'll be able to associate with it, regardless of how traumatic it is. But if the push is experienced by the individual as incomprehensible, or an attack, or manipulation, a part of themselves will respond just because there is literal pressure - maybe literal to the point that someone is actually holding them down or locking them up or the therapist is doing something with their body, and they will think perhaps at an abstract level *'This must be good for me'* but it will still be experienced as an attack that is somewhat incomprehensible. To me the negative factor in that will be that they will experience a sense of disassociation - 'it happened to me' and a certain amount of their responses to the experience will be as a result of their problem in the first place, their inability to express themselves or what have you, and the resistances then emerge. But they are also going to have natural spontaneous healthy responses to the treatment, what is called in medicine is called iatrogenic illness - an illness caused by the therapy or the drug; in other words you have treatment for a particular illness, but the treatment makes you ill. I'm saying that there is an iatrogenic factor in the group process and that is that certain behaviour is elicited by virtue of this pushing pressure which is perfectly normal and healthy but identified as bad, as resistance to the process. For example, someone is being pushed to a certain point. He says *'No, I don't want any more, I can't stand it, I've changed my mind'*. I think the person should always have the right to do that, because even if it is what the leader identifies as a resistance or an unwillingness to take the risk or irresponsibility then that's the area that ought to be dealt with, that's the spontaneous here and now behaviour of the person, rather than continuing to push the person into some behaviour which is going to be assessed as acceptable. You can push anybody into anything, and there are times in a group when it's hard to identify between what we normally call torture and what we call therapy. And I think the difference revolves round this notion of choice, the notion of the individual's ability to associate with the experience, and certainly their freedom and right to say 'Stop'. And it is also

incumbent on the therapist to know the times when a person can't say 'Stop', that that's what their neurosis is about - they will let themselves be tortured. So the question then is, is the group and the leader in the service of growth or have they been seduced into the service of the neurosis itself, which I think sometimes happens. A group can become sadistic. I believe that it is possible for the group or the leader to come to the position where unconsciously they are fulfilling the neurotic aspect of the personality rather than its helpful side. That is not growth, but because something is happening, because there is some reaction, some emotional experience, it is identified as growth. And the recipient feels the approval of this and stifles their own confusions, and that's not good.

Could I give you one example of that that actually happened? We had some people who were doing groups and Gerda was doing private therapy with one member. In this particular case it was with addicts, so it was in a way how Jay explained, the id has taken over so it was an amoebic type of indulgence. The techniques used for the addicts were appropriate. Then it was a person who was in therapy with Gerda who had a very strong super ego so her problem was to reverse. In the group, when she finally came to the place where she was vulnerable she went into her id and they used the same technique; they were putting her down in the same way as the addicts, in a way that was suitable for the id but not for the super ego, so in that sense if a group leader can distinguish, because the tendency has been 'Express as much as you can'. What happened was that her neurotic structure, her armour, increased from that group because now she couldn't go into the id part of her because it was blocked.

In other words you might say that her problem is that she is over-defended. In that situation where they were trying to strengthen defences, for them to apply the same techniques and methods and confrontation is not going to help her. What she needed to deal with was her ability to cope with herself without such a rigid defence structure. What happened in that situation was that she was punished, because they couldn't comprehend that in her case the valid approach was to deal with the softer surrendering feelings, not the highly defended ones. That was their problem - they were under-defended, she was over-defended. So they turned their technique into a rule which forces everyone to fit the same model.

In real life terms what happened to her? Your theories are all very well, but did she become neurotic or stop therapy?

She continued with therapy but it took a long time until it came to the stage where she was before that particular group.

Here's a concrete example of a real life follow through. Suppose that there's a couple in a relationship, and let's say as it is common that the wife accuses the husband of being unable to express his soft feelings, he's not vulnerable enough, he seems unapproachable. So he goes to a group and the group essentially supports the wife's diagnosis and works with him on this and he finally achieves in the group a vulnerability. He shows his soft side in the group, he's now reachable, approachable. Now that in itself is good, but if there is in any way a punitive factor that enters in while he is in a vulnerable state, he is going to be very confused because while he is

vulnerable he cannot be responsible for himself. This business of letting go implies trusting the other. So he experiences that it was a wrong thing to be vulnerable when he perhaps felt all alone. He finally dropped his guard because everyone said it was a good thing, and then they punished him by demanding things that in that state of being he could not supply. So then he says 'I was wrong ever to do that'. So he shuts off more than ever and goes home to his wife and tries to forget the whole thing, but goes out and tries to find someone who will accept him as he is, unreachable and unapproachable. One of the basic things in encounter groups is the support, to do with the armour. One of the norms in encounter groups is it's good to be approachable, it's good to reach out and touch others; we are all too contracted, so we are afraid of our softer, more vulnerable sides because perhaps in childhood vulnerability was associated with pain and hurt. When we were vulnerable we felt the pain of the loss of a loved one, we felt the pain of not having mother there when we needed her, and so on. In adult life perhaps if we were vulnerable when a relationship broke down, we felt the pain. We identify the pain as bad so we close up. Then we are in a group and we are asked to open up, to decontract, and the problem for the individual is 'how can I be vulnerable with security?' It really is masochistic to open myself up if I'm not in a safe situation. The person has got to learn to be vulnerable and has at the same time got to develop a security with respect to that, so that if they need to close up (that's what I meant by responsible choice) they can do so. It's almost an assessment of the maturity of the group or leader or the process, whether the whole spectrum of choice is acknowledged. If only the vulnerability is rewarded it won't be sufficient for the person to carry the group process out in his life because the vulnerability that is rewarded in the group is actually inappropriate in many real life situations. You just don't get that trust and support. Then the person will have to look for special people who will understand that, growth-oriented people, but I think that the group process can also provide a way for people to develop their internal security so they can be vulnerable with a secure choice, rather than otherwise. On the one side you have the problem of being able to identify and express your emotion. The other side of the coin is the fear, which is associated with madness, of losing control of the emotion, of becoming a victim of the very thing you want to achieve which is a more free capacity to feel. One of the things that the group and the leader must be aware of, for example in an exercise which is designed to elicit strong emotion, is to see the point at which a person moves from inability to express themselves to the point where they can express their emotions, and then again the cross over point where they lose control not in the good sense of giving up certain rationalisations, but in the sense where they experience themselves as victims of their emotions.