



A HISTORY OF
GROUP STUDY

AND

PSYCHODYNAMIC
ORGANIZATIONS

AMY L. FRAHER

© Amy L. Fraher. All rights reserved.

Second published in 2021 by author.

First Published in 2004 by

Free Association Books

57 Warren Street

London W1T 5NR

www.fabooks.com

The right of Amy L. Fraher to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted by her in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patent Act 1988.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 1 85343 704 2

Table of Contents

Preface.....	4
1: Searching for Group Relations	6
2: The Parallel History of Psychoanalysis	10
3: Influences Behind the Innovation.....	21
4: Group Relations Theory.....	31
5: Influence of War	44
6: Tavistock Institute: The Foundational Years.....	60
7: Organizational Fragmentation	70
8: The Rice Years (1962-1969).....	81
9: The Miller Years (1970-1996).....	100
10: NTL & Groups in America: The Cultural Context.....	109
11: AKRI as an idea organization.....	121
12: AKRI's Organizational Fragmentation.....	137
Coda	147
Index	149
Endnotes.....	158

Preface

The history of writing *A History of Group Study and Psychodynamic Organizations* started in 2001 when, as a doctoral student at the University of San Diego, Professor Theresa Monroe suggested that I examine the history of group relations as the topic of my looming dissertation. Under the guidance of Robert Donmoyer as chair, I crafted *The Development of the Tavistock and Tavistock-Inspired Group Relations Movement in Great Britain and the United States: A Comparative and Historical Perspective*, providing data for this book. A hearty thank you to my Committee: Robert Donmoyer, Theresa Monroe, and Michael Gonzalez.

Yet, it was a conversation with John Kelleher which proved inspirational. During my first week at the Tavistock Institute, John invited me to lunch and we chatted about this and that, including my hope of signing a book contract for my now completed dissertation. What remains memorable was John's suggestion, "Why not write a history of group relations and the Tavistock Institute, 'warts and all'? Sort of like Douglas Kirsner's *Unfree Associations*." A short time later I read Kirsner's book, realizing then what John had meant and, through the assistance of Sally Halper, Tavistock Institute librarian, I landed a book contract.

Like Kirsner, I often let informants – the ones who were really there – tell the history of group study and life within psychodynamic organizations. Although my methodology has included analysis of primary historical sources, such as personal correspondence, unpublished autobiographies, original conference brochures, corporate reports, newspaper clippings, obituaries, corporate annual statements, minutes of meetings, and videos, and a review of secondary sources, such as scholarly books, journal articles, unpublished papers, theses, and dissertations, in some instances I had to rely more on informants' recollections than archival resources. Yet, informants' memories sometimes contradicted each other, challenging me to represent each and let the reader decide. At times, I used myself as an instrument to analyze how one's own personal experience can serve as a data source. My analysis is not without bias, but has supported eye-witness accounts with archival data.

As with any book, this work has not been the result of only one person's effort. I owe a special thanks to all Tavistock Institute researchers and staff. Open with friendship and generous with time, they provided an institutional home-base for my work during a period of institutional limbo in my life. I am particularly indebted to the generations of maintainers of the Tavistock Institute archives, Grubb Institute archives, and A. K. Rice Institute archives. Thanks also to the British Library, Tavistock Clinic Library, Wellcome Library, Copley Library, Melanie Klein Trust and Wellcome Trust Medical Photographic Library.

Thanks, in particular, to the following people:

Frances Abraham	Laurence Gould	W. Gordon Lawrence	Mannie Sher
David Armstrong	Sally Halper	Isabel Menzies Lyth	Pernille Solvik
Robert Baxter	Charla Hayden	Eric J. Miller	Debbie Sorkin
John Bazalgette	Frank Heller	Theresa Monroe	Elliott Stern
Francesca Bion	Dione Hills	Hugh Murray	Nancy Stevens
Earl T. Braxton	Laurence Gould	Adrian Nelson	Alan Trist
Caroline Carpenter	Paul Hoggett	Anton Obholzer	Beulah Trist
A. Wesley Carr	Evangelina Holvino	Abi Onatade	Marian Urquilla
Arthur Coleman	Jean Hutton-Reed	Diane Porter	Kathleen Pogue White
Lowell Cooper	Karen Izod	Linda Powell	Penny Youll
Joe Cullen	John Kelleher	Mary Rafferty	
Tim Dartington	Olya Khaleelee	Daphne Saunders	
Angela Eden	Anne-Marie Kirkpatrick	Ann Scott	
Faith Gabelnick	Edward Klein	Edward Shapiro	
Vivian Gold	Lisl Klein		

A special thanks to my manuscript readers Clare Doherty, Kathleen B. Jones, Ann Scott, and Mannie Sher, to my publisher Trevor Brown, and to Ari Bulmash, Ana Estrada, Karen Izod, and John McCloskey.

A final thank you to my other friends and family – you know who you are.

Amy L. Fraher
San Diego, CA
2004

1: Searching for Group Relations

When I took up my post as a *visiting social scientist* at the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations in August 2003, I found myself in an organization that seemed both depressed and anxious about its past, and yet transitioning and hopeful, in search of its future. The organization felt depressed, because it seemed as if Institute staff knew their days of innovation in applied psychodynamic thinking in organizations were largely over, and anxious, because they were worried that the mythology of the Institute would be shattered when the world found out. The halo surrounding the Institute's founding and interdisciplinary innovation in group study which was the product of the work of such scions as Wilfred R. Bion, Harold Bridger, Elliot Jaques, Isabel Menzies Lyth, John D. "Jock" Sutherland, Eric L. Trist and A. T. M. "Tommy" Wilson and later A. Kenneth Rice, Pierre M. Turquet and Eric J. Miller, appeared to have faded. At the same time, the Institute had launched a process, which led, before my departure in June 2004, to a proposed restructuring of its design and revision of its corporate plan.

As I reflected on these forces pushing and pulling in competing directions, I wondered whether a shift away from the quest for what Eric J. Miller called "an ultimate unifying theory of human behavior"¹ had occurred at the Tavistock Institute, and whether other organizations similar to it, such as National Training Laboratories and A. K. Rice Institute, had experienced similar things. Were there any common processes explaining the dynamics of change in organizations originally founded to study group behavior and enhance the democracy of society and organizational life? What factors interfered with their quest to improve people's quality of life? In particular, what dynamics limited change-oriented organizations' ability to sustain innovation?

Tapping Secrets

The Tavistock Institute I encountered in London in 2003 had few researchers on staff interested in exploring the psychodynamics of organizational life or expanding group relations theories and methods. In fact only one full-time Institute employee, Group Relations Programme Director Mannie Sher, had any significant experience in the field of group relations.² It felt to me as if the organization held a secret—that the Tavistock group relations tradition of applying psychodynamic thinking to groups and organizations was no longer actively being evolved at the Institute—and it seemed that the burden of keeping this secret created a constant, yet unacknowledged, undertow in the psyche of the organization. And as with all secrets, the challenge to keep the information hidden overshadowed any curiosity about its demise.

Although, like me, many current Institute staff members were not alive at the height of the Institute's innovative post-World War II years, they remained aware of the powerful historical legacy and brand-name recognition the Institute still carried in the

area of group study. Yet many appeared conflicted about investigating Tavistock's group relations theories and methods further. The idea that becoming familiar with a variety of perspectives, including psychodynamic principles and a deeper understanding of group behavior, in order to select the most appropriate methods for organizational research and consultancy did not seem to resonate as a viable option. Instead, the prevailing organizational culture seemed to require that people choose a social science approach and dogmatically adhere to it. Given the few staff left who confessed to support it, group relations was obviously the riskiest choice.

Younger Institute staff members were quite vocal about their lack of interest in group relations. Indeed, few current staff had ever attended the Institute's own group relations events. When I asked if they were curious about the Institute's annual conference at the University of Leicester, colloquially known as the *Leicester Conference*³ or simply *Leicester*, many staff smiled and replied "it's not for me," they were "thinking about doing it sometime," or "I might do a shorter one," even though the Institute provided time off for staff to attend, free of charge. One staff member sheepishly asked me over a cup of tea in the staff room one afternoon, "You seem pretty normal. Why do you like that stuff?"

In November 2003, I rode the train from London to Oxford to conduct my second interview with Isabel Menzies Lyth in her home in the village of Iffly. Born in 1917, Menzies Lyth was active in the War Office Selection Board and Civil Resettlement Units during and after World War II, the same units from which many of the founders of the Tavistock Institute hailed. After the war, she joined the others who launched the Institute in 1947 and began Kleinian psychoanalytic training because "*everyone* was doing it at the time." Menzies Lyth fondly recalled her work with many of the great Kleinian analysts of the time, including her second analysis, "the one for myself" she called it, with Bion, and supervision of her first child case by Melanie Klein.⁴

Menzies Lyth's seminal research on nurses and the identification of social systems as a defense against anxiety built on Elliot Jaques previous study at Glacier Metal and remains one of the most cited studies in social science literature. Having worked at the Institute for nearly thirty years, between 1946 and 1975, Menzies Lyth had witnessed its evolution over a critical period of its history. I was eager to continue the conversation we had started during my dissertation research in January 2002.

To my American eyes, Menzies Lyth's house seemed the picture of English country living. As I entered her immaculately tended garden through a heavy wooden gate and knocked on the front door a light mist imperceptively dampened the day. An intellectually spry and witty woman of eighty-five years, Menzies Lyth greeted me cheerfully and we soon fell into easy conversation on a range of topics. Although she has physical difficulty walking long distances, Menzies Lyth's mental capacity remains amazingly lucid, especially about the details of events that occurred decades ago. It was a wonderful treat for a social historian like me to have access to such a wealth of firsthand information. Our conversation moved easily from one topic to the next and I exchanged the role of interviewer for that of informant at those times Menzies Lyth became eager for current information from the field.

During one particularly interesting role exchange, Menzies Lyth described her sense of having been "so lucky" to work at the Institute because it was "constantly exciting," a "terrific place" full of "near geniuses" who, through the luxury of large

grants in the early years, spent much of their time in lively conversation about the future of society in the post-war period and their Institute's emerging role within in it. She called her time there "hugely exciting" and I listened in rapt, if not envious, attention to her spirited descriptions of a by-gone era, so unlike what I had encountered in 2003-2004. At a natural pause in our discussion Menzies-Lyth, who knew of my appointment, inquired "So how are *you* getting on at the Institute?" I felt the interviewee role slip off her shoulders and onto mine as I pondered how best to answer this question. In the end, I did what all informants in an awkward situation do: I evaded. I described how kind and helpful everyone at the Institute had been, how I had an office and was settling right in. Undeterred, Menzies Lyth persisted with even more curiosity, "But, how are you *getting on*—what are you *doing*?"

Why was I reluctant to speak my mind? Who was I trying to protect—Menzies Lyth from disappointment, the Tavistock Institute from embarrassment, the field of group relations from ridicule or myself from becoming the Cassandra⁵ of group relations? All these concerns were alive in that moment.

I realized that when I made my pilgrimage from Southern California to London, I had come with a phantasy, a Tavistock-Institute-in-the-mind that did not in reality exist. My phantasy was that I would write a book about the exciting things happening in the group relations field, the innovative application of psychodynamic thinking to workplace issues, and the evolution of new theoretical social science perspectives that I imagined continued to occur at the Tavistock Institute. Unfortunately, I did not find much data to support this perspective. Instead, I found a field, and an organization, in transition.

By the look on Menzies-Lyth's face, I think she was more disappointed than shocked when I described my experiences. She asked whether there was not any talk about group relations or the psychodynamics of organizations going on at the Institute any more. Sadly, I reported, there were few conversations like that happening regularly at the Institute, certainly nothing like the exciting things she had described.⁶

"But where has it gone?" she exclaimed.

"That is what I want to know!" I replied.

The Perennial Dilemma

In November 2003 a group relations event, co-sponsored by the Tavistock Institute and OFEK, an Israeli group relations organization, was held in Italy. Its purpose was to explore the theory, design, roles and application of group relations conferences. Reflecting on the meeting, its organizers, Avi Nutkevitch and Mannie Sher, noted one significant theme which emerged throughout was "whether the Tavistock-Leicester model was actually out of date or whether it contained the basic elements from which adaptations and new learning events could be built."⁷ The "perennial dilemma," Nutkevitch and Sher suggested, was whether the Tavistock-Leicester model was "dead or dying...or...alive and well."⁸ And, if in fact, the Tavistock Institute was no longer evolving the group relations tradition, "which countries and group relations organizations now held the mantle of leadership and innovation?"⁹ Could individuals from different backgrounds and perspectives successfully work together and be judged equally competent to carry the tradition?

These questions resonated with my own concern to investigate the history of the field of group study and the organizations associated with it, not only to explore the changes that had occurred, but to try to explain what dynamics undergirded them. Without this analysis, it would be impossible to address the question of whether the Tavistock model remained alive and relevant or had reached its expiration point.

The answers I have discovered in writing this book indicate that it is time to push past such dualistic, either/or thinking about change and recognize that institutes of group study—what I call *idea organizations*—experience periods of vitality *and* morbidity, of growth, decline *and* stasis, as part of their natural life cycle. The history of the field of group study is a history of both expansion and contraction; contained within it are both “the seeds of its own destruction”¹⁰ and renewal. As this history demonstrates, each of the organizations studied has experienced conflicts so intense that the survival of the organization has been imperiled. Yet, in each case these same conflicts have created opportunities for organizational renewal, which has led to new discoveries and experiments whenever members have been able to set aside their personal predilections and think about the group-as-a-whole.

2: The Parallel History of Psychoanalysis

In the following chapters I apply the construct of *idea organizations*—organizations designed to generate intellectual concepts and support learning, rather than to produce goods or services—in order to examine the psychodynamic workings of such institutes as the National Training Laboratories, Tavistock and A. K. Rice Institutes as well as early psychoanalytic *Societies*. I demonstrate how the innovation characterizing *idea organizations* ironically becomes the focus of attacks and inter-group rivalries, creating a cycle that puts the organization itself at risk.

Why do *idea organizations* designed to promote innovation and support collaboration and learning heighten inter-group tensions, driving the organization away from its center? Part of the reason, I argue, results from the fact that although innovation and collaboration are regular features in such systems, within these organizations people become personally attached to and invested in their ideas. In fact, individuals can feel so closely identified with “their” ideas that it becomes difficult to separate their ideas from themselves: *my idea is me, I am my idea*. Strong emotional bonds connecting people with their ideas intensify conflicts that inevitably develop between groups advocating one approach or another to an organization’s work. Consequently, if an idea is rejected—or we might say when an idea is rejected, because *idea organizations* must constantly innovate—this rejection is experienced as a personal attack. *You reject my idea; you reject me*.

One way we can observe these dynamics at work is by considering how organizational restructuring often can be played out as if it were an inter-generational family drama. The older, founding generation often experiences their once popular theories and methods coming under attack, even being deemed obsolete. This group experiences the necessary reorganization as a personal attack, as if not only their ideas but they themselves are being discarded. Conversely, the younger generation may feel personally slighted, that without periodic restructuring their innovations cannot flourish, their full capacities remain unrecognized and they can never “grow-up” and be accepted as full members of the organization. They feel as if they have inherited the family business, but have been asked simply to maintain what the older generation originated.

As a result of these conflicts about change, organizational tensions can alienate members, in this case the “young” from the “old,” both of whom feel unappreciated, causing feuds and splits to develop and making once productive participants feel estranged and unable to work. Disenfranchised workers often can be heard to say things like “we tried that eight years ago and it didn’t work then,” “so and so tried that, see where it got him,” and other statements reflecting each group’s struggle to keep pace with change in an *idea organization*. If allowed to develop in the extreme, such feuds and splits can lead to disastrous intra-organizational rivalries, where talented people, unable or unwilling to adjust to organizational change or uncomfortable with the tensions, drift

away at tremendous cost to the organization's productivity. In the end, people wonder whether they are living through an organizational transformation or witnessing a slow organizational death.

In order to mitigate destructive rivalries and conflicts, and maximize positive change, I contend that *idea organizations* must expect to evolve their theories and methodologies, and restructure their institutions at least once every ten years. Such *restructuring must be expected, if not demanded*, so that *idea organizations* can continue to thrive. Without periodic revision, *idea organizations* risk losing vitality and relevance, slipping into obscurity like last year's fashion. Ironically, however, the historical record demonstrates that failing to expect change or lacking procedures to adjudicate conflict about change has been a common vulnerability among *idea organizations*.

One of the earliest examples of the dynamics unique to intra-organizational struggles generated within an *idea organization* when it attempts to maintain relevance by evolving its theories and methods can be found in the history of psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic *Societies*. In addition to providing important data about trends within *idea organizations*, this history is also foundational to efforts to better understand the history of group study. Therefore, the following two chapters serve a dual purpose—to detail the parallel histories of psychoanalysis and its contributions to group study, and to illuminate important information about psychodynamics within *idea organizations*.

A review of the history of psychoanalysis begins, as one might expect, with a discussion of the father of psychoanalysis: Sigmund Freud. Although Freud is not known as a group theorist¹¹, per se, his psychoanalytic theories about individuals and speculations about group and organizational dynamics provided some theoretical foundation for group relations theory, which was elaborated upon by later theorists. In addition, Freud's development of psychoanalytic *Societies* provides an interesting parallel history to organizational developments in the field of group relations and, in particular, *idea organizations*.

Born on May 6, 1856 in the Moravian town of Freiberg, now known as Příbor in Czechoslovakia, Freud was the oldest of seven children of Amalie and Jacob Freud, a Jewish wool merchant. His family moved to Vienna when Freud was three and, although he often criticized the city, he continued to live and work there until 1938 when he was forced to flee for London with his family to avoid the Nazi takeover. He died in London the following year after a prolonged battle with cancer, due in part to his lifelong habit of smoking cigars.

After finishing medical school in 1881, Freud conducted zoological research at the Physiological Institute of Ernst Brücke where he met Josef Breuer, a well-known physician. Fourteen years Freud's senior, Breuer had a solid reputation as a man of science, treating the most famous families in Vienna. Freud was fascinated to hear the details of Breuer's treatment of patients through hypnosis¹² and the men became fast friends based on their mutual scientific interests. Notable is how this professional relationship quickly expanded into a personal connection that included sharing family gatherings and Freud even naming his eldest daughter after Breuer's wife.¹³

Freud was particularly intrigued by Breuer's patient *Anna O.*, whom Breuer treated from December 1880 until June 1882. An intelligent, beautiful and charming young woman, Anna O. was diagnosed with hysteria¹⁴ after gradually experiencing paralysis of three limbs, loss of sight, speech disorders and a distressing cough all of

which occurred while she was nursing her dying father. Treatment for Anna O.'s ailments had already been attempted with medication as well as shock-therapy, hot and cold baths and hypnosis, all to no avail. Yet in an amazing discovery, Anna O. instigated a change in her treatment by asking: "Dr. Breuer, if you would only let me talk to you and tell you how my symptoms started, I think it would help."¹⁵

Breuer, who was uncommonly sympathetic to his attractive patient's condition, agreed to this new method of treatment, investing much personal time in these conversations. As Anna O. spoke, Breuer noticed that she began gradually to lose her symptoms. It was revolutionary. No one to date had ever cured a patient of hysterical symptoms through the use of these methods.¹⁶ Anna O. reportedly enjoyed the new treatments, calling them "chimney sweeping" and touting it as the "talking cure."¹⁷

Freud was fascinated and, in October 1885, he traveled to Paris to work with the famous neurologist and hypnotist Jean Marie Charcot at the Salpêtrière Hospital. Thanks to Charcot's excellent reputation, the study of hysteria, previously considered a "peculiar disorder of the womb," began to be recognized as a serious nervous system disease.¹⁸ After just five months training, Freud returned to Vienna and, influenced by both Charcot and Breuer, opened his own medical practice in April 1886.¹⁹ Yet he quickly discovered that not everyone could be hypnotized and the results of hypnosis, even if positive, were often short lived, soon to be replaced by a new symptom. As a result, Freud became attracted to Breuer's *talking cure* as a more rational method of treatment than Charcot's hypnosis.²⁰

Based on these collaborations, Freud eventually developed his *free association method* which took the "apparently wandering thoughts" that patients produced when urged to revisit the cause of their symptom as psychic clues to the existence of unconscious motivations governing their behavior.²¹ Interestingly, Freud believed that it was the release of the repressed ideas that resulted in the beneficial therapeutic results, not the therapeutic process of talking itself.

On October 15, 1886 an ambitious young Freud attempted to expand the medical world's paradigm on hysteria by presenting a paper entitled "On Male Hysteria."²² Although he knew he was going against popular Viennese medical opinion, Freud persisted in offering an account of Charcot's work supporting that hysteria was not linked to genital organs but could manifest itself in men, as well as women. He attempted to provide case study support to his fellow physicians at their monthly meeting, but they disagreed with his diagnosis. Instead, they concluded the male patient Freud presented was experiencing mental shock, not hysteria. They challenged Freud to produce a case of male hysteria, exhibiting what Charcot would agree were typical symptoms²³ for them to study. Although Freud eventually did provide an acceptable example, he felt his reputation had been damaged and withdrew from the medical association, deeply hurt by the defensive reaction of his conservative medical colleagues and the sport they made of his innovation.

This experience tainted Freud's intellectual life, becoming somewhat of a recurring theme for him. Yet, as I will show, it is a common experience among innovators within *idea organizations*. *Idea organizations* thrive upon creative thinking. However, paradoxically, such organizations also often attempt to annihilate innovators. As a result, individuals within these organizations must not only think creatively but also understand group processes and possess enough personal resiliency to withstand the

inevitable attacks and setbacks. Freud, like many other innovators, struggled to manage this tension between creative genius and resilient theorist in a world awash with jealous colleagues, envious acolytes and pessimists from competing professions.

A Break with Breuer and Fleiss

Freud's first major publication, at the age of 39, was *Studies on Hysteria*²⁴ co-authored with Breuer in 1895. An important document in the history of psychoanalysis, and therefore influential to group study, this publication also marked the end of the Freud-Breuer friendship. In what would become a professional pattern for Freud and others within later *idea organizations*, Freud and Breuer could not find a way to resolve tensions between differing theoretical perspectives, emerging differences of opinion which should have been understood as a predictable feature of dynamic *idea organizations*.²⁵ As Freud began to define sexual conflict as the root of hysteria, Breuer gradually withdrew from their collaboration, perhaps, in part, out of embarrassment over the potential sexual implications of his intimate research with the attractive young Anna O.²⁶ Conversely, Freud's reluctance to accept criticism, combined with his tendency toward overgeneralization troubled Breuer and contributed to further their estrangement.²⁷

Freud's intense friendship with another physician, an ear and throat specialist in Berlin named Wilhelm Fleiss ended in a similarly abrupt and caustic manner. The two men had met around 1893 when Fleiss attended one of Freud's lectures in Vienna, and they began to correspond regularly after that. Freud had not yet grown into the confident, bold and forceful theorist he would later become, and, perhaps because of a desire to find a substitute for his fading friendship with Breuer, he fell into a mutually admiring relationship with Fleiss. Freud became fascinated by the wild and daring speculations Fleiss put forth about human behavior, especially about sexuality. One hypothesis of particular interest to Freud was Fleiss' idea that all human beings were bisexual, which Freud accepted for a time.²⁸

Interestingly, it was the topic of bisexuality which ultimately became the catalyst for their break. Fleiss began to withdraw from their friendship in 1900, in part because of Freud's habit of introducing collaborative ideas, which had roots in their previous conversations, solely as if they were his own.²⁹ Then in 1904 Fleiss discovered, to his astonishment, that his theory of bisexuality had been published by Otto Weininger,³⁰ who had heard of Fleiss' ideas through Freud's pupil H. Swoboda. In what grew into a public scandal, Freud defensively denied the allegation that Weininger and Swoboda had plagiarized Fleiss' ideas or that he had played any part in it. Yet the damage was done to the Fleiss-Freud friendship and the theme of bisexuality remained a tender subject for both men.³¹

What can we make of Freud's intense personal and professional relationships with Breuer and Fleiss and the bitter ending to both relationships? And how does this help U.S. to understand better the dynamics peculiar to *idea organizations* and therefore the history of group study?

It seems that Freud, like many innovators, showed a tendency to be both attracted to eccentric, original thinkers, yet also envious of their innovation and success. Ernest Jones, founder of the *British Psycho-Analytic Society* and Freud's biographer, observed

that Freud had an attraction for passionate relationships with men, yet men often below his intellectual abilities. Jones thought that this was one way Freud played out his love-hate relationship with his own father. Jones recalled Freud was widely known to replicate this intense love-hate engagement with other colleagues, demanding subservient loyalty from them without which they risked being banished from his group. Within such an environment, little innovation from this younger generation could flourish.³²

Wilhelm Stekel, another early colleague of Freud's, claimed that Freud confided to him that every new concept put forth by others initially made him feel "resistant and unreceptive" because he had not introduced the theory himself. Freud confessed that it sometimes took weeks for him to overcome these hostile feelings.³³ Not unrelated, Freud had the ability to forget conveniently the roots of innovation in conversations and, as a result, had a habit of claiming ownership for ideas that had emerged through collaboration, as Fleiss had contended. All of these factors continued to be present in Freud's later relationships, influencing developments in the field of psychoanalysis and providing important clues to the psychodynamics of *idea organizations*.

The Turn of the Century

By the end of the nineteenth century two major changes had occurred in the history of treatment in the mental health field. First, there was a growing acceptance that certain kinds of mental instabilities were the result of a disease, requiring medical treatment, and not the result of demonic occupation, a state of sin, willful insubordination or criminal intentions, as previously imagined.³⁴ Second, there was an increased understanding of the functioning of the "mind," as a distinct function from that of the brain, which had been largely brought to the attention of the medical profession by the work of Freud and his construct of the unconscious.

Prior to Freud's development of psychoanalysis, the body was believed to influence the mind, but not the mind the body. The mind was understood as just an emanation of the brain—another bodily function. As physicians started to understand hysteria, they realized that physical symptoms could be the manifestation of a troubled mind. Yet physicians still had little idea about methods of treatment, often suggesting only that the brain, like an overexerted muscle, should be rested. As a result, the patient was put to bed regardless of the fact that a tormented mind might suffer more in isolation.³⁵ Freud's theories offered alternative treatment methods, opening the door for other innovations, such as group treatment methods.

Signs of an Organizational Structure

Although establishment of the theoretical and methodological underpinnings of psychoanalysis can be traced back to Freud's self-analysis and the publication of *The Interpretation of Dreams*, it was not until 1902, when Freud began meeting in his home with colleagues in the *Wednesday Psychological Society*, that the first sign of an organizational structure emerged.³⁶ Freud invited four men relatively unknown at the time—Alfred Adler, Max Kahane, Rudolph Reitler and Wilhelm Stekel—to attend his group, and by 1908 it had grown to twenty-two members.³⁷ In addition to these colleagues others such as Carl G. Jung in Switzerland and Jones in Great Britain began

taking up Freud's free association method and in 1908 the first Psychoanalytic Congress was held in Salzburg.

Although we already have seen glimpses into the psychodynamics of *idea organizations*, the formalization of psychoanalytic *Societies* provides an abundance of data with which to extricate these dynamics more fully. For example, although most of Freud's publications had not been translated yet from German, his innovation was nonetheless becoming recognized in Great Britain and the United States, fueled in part by his strong personality and unwavering convictions.³⁸ Jones recalled that he and American psychiatrist Abraham Arden Brill visited Freud in 1902 when Brill confided his interest in translating Freud's publications to English. Freud agreed without hesitation, a decision Jones found somewhat impetuous because he did not believe that Brill had sufficient German language skills to undertake this project.³⁹ Yet Jones' observation seems representational both of the ever-present competition felt by acolytes to gain Freud's favor and Freud's own unimpeachable confidence in his intuitive, rather than explicitly rational, decision making.

Bolstered by these recently translated publications, Freud traveled with Jung and Sándor Ferenczi to Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts in 1909 to commemorate the university's twentieth anniversary. He delivered a short course on psychoanalysis and received an honorary doctoral degree celebrating his contributions to psychology. Jones, who was working in Canada and Brill, who lived in New York, joined them at Clark University and the five analysts traveled around the Northeastern states.⁴⁰

In the U.S. at the turn of the century a group of intellectuals, such as Clark University's unconventional President Granville Stanley Hall, was pushing at the boundaries of American culture, questioning the value of the popular Puritan work ethic and its suppression of joy and sexuality in American society. When Freud arrived at Clark, he found an eclectic group that included academics, psychological professionals, laymen and the media, all eager to hear about psychoanalysis. Using accessible Americanized English, Freud quickly endeared himself both to liberal optimists, the moral radicals interested in expanding notions of sexuality, and conservative reformers intent on civilizing humankind's instinctive sexual urges. Freud would fondly recall this time, his one and only visit to America, as the first official recognition of his psychoanalytic work.⁴¹

Yet Freud's visit left him with an unfavorable impression of the U.S. as a place where financial interests and commercial success took priority over intellectual achievements in scholarship, research and theorizing—areas to which Freud had devoted his life. This chasm between European intellectualism and American commercialism in psychoanalysis would widen significantly in later decades centering, in particular, on debates about competency and the work rights of lay analysts.

Perhaps not coincidentally, nearly forty years later, similar dynamics played out within American *idea organizations*, when, in an interesting parallel, differing perspectives on the study of groups emerged in the post-World War II period along regional divides. As we will see in the UK, the Tavistock Institute developed its small study groups and group relations conference with its focus on the group-as-a-whole, at the same time as, in the U.S., the National Training Laboratories developed its T-group approach and the human interaction laboratory with its focus at the individual level.

Pattern of Feuds and Splits

As psychoanalysis continued to evolve as an *idea organization* in its second decade of existence, a number of feuds and splits began to appear within Freud's inner circle. In 1911, Adler and Stekel, both members of Freud's original *Wednesday Psychological Society*, left Freud's circle and then in 1913 Jung, the heir apparent, drifted away.

Adler was a moody Viennese intellectual, ambitious and lively one minute, sulky, quarrelsome and morose the next. A talented speaker, he was ever ready for debate, yet his writing often lacked clarity. Although Freud initially was Adler's advocate, true to his pattern of love-hate relationships, Freud later recalled Adler had little talent "for judging unconscious material" and contended that his theories were empty and lacked meaning.⁴²

Adler's break with Freud occurred after a series of presentations at the *Wednesday Psychological Society* during which Adler criticized Freud's oedipal complex and the circular nature of some of his theories, while expounding his own theories of libido, aggression and masculinity. Many members were outraged that Adler had the audacity to critique Freud and promote himself. Others supported Adler, claiming that he was not contradicting Freudian theory, but expanding it. Although many agreed it was unscientific to believe that deviation constituted rebellion, Adler was attacked universally, resigning from the *Society* and his post as editor of the recently established journal *Zentralblatt*. Eventually, Adler started his own field called *individual psychology*,⁴³ which so infuriated Freud that he wrote to many potential members demanding that they choose either his or Adler's group. They could not attend both.⁴⁴

Stekel, troubled by the treatment of his old friend Adler, resigned from his post as *Society* vice-president in protest. Yet, he remained a follower in Freud's circle for at least another year. A dashing young physician and a talented musician and poet, Stekel was cheerful and well-liked. He was known to have a natural gift for psychoanalytic interpretation, especially dreams. In fact, Freud noted Stekel's contribution to his own expanded understanding of dream symbolism in his fourth edition of *The Interpretation of Dreams*.⁴⁵

Although Stekel's interpretations impressed even Freud, his research lacked scientific rigor and his writing had a journalistic quality, prone to exaggeration. He became over confident, even arrogant, believing his gift for insight had surpassed even Freud's. Not bothering to find evidence to support his theories, he caused great consternation among his colleagues, who called his ethics into question. The final break occurred after an ugly scene between Stekel and another *Society* member, Victor Tausk, about editorial provinces on the journal *Zentralblatt*. After Freud backed Tausk, and convinced nearly the entire subscription list to withdraw support, they founded a new journal called *International Zeitschrift für Ärztliche Psycho-Analyse (International Journal for Medical Psycho-Analysis)*. As a result, Stekel's journal soon folded and he left the *Society* in disgust.⁴⁶

Although Freud voiced relief to be rid of Adler and Stekel, and the problems they caused, he was deeply troubled by Jung's departure from his group. Freud had been grooming Jung for years to become his successor, appointing him President of the *International Psycho-Analytical Association* and editor of the journal *Jahrbuch für Psycho-Analytische und Psycho-Pathologische Forschungen (Yearbook for Psycho-*

Analytic and Psycho-pathological Researches.)⁴⁷ These appointments unleashed a wave of hostility amongst Freud's envious followers, who were jealous of Jung's special treatment and fast rise to power.⁴⁸

After receiving so much of Freud's coveted attention, Jung's departure exacerbated the group's hostility towards him. In addition, Jung was charismatic, talented and more grounded in psychoanalytic thinking than either Adler or Stekel, and more likely to develop a viable, alternative school of thought to Freudian psychoanalysis. And this worried Freud.

Jung's perspective, highly influenced by Pierre Janet of Paris, focused on the use of archetypes, with a reduced emphasis on Freudian sexual interpretation, as the crucial determinants of human behavior.⁴⁹ Through this less provocative approach, Jung believed psychoanalysis would now appeal to people who had previously rejected it. After years of struggle over interpretations of theories and methods, the Freud-Jung break came swiftly in 1913 when Jung was not reelected to his post as President of the *International Psycho-Analytical Association*. Then, much to Freud's relief, Jung resigned as editor of *Jahrbuch*, noting that there could be no future collaboration between the two emerging schools of thought. In the end Jung, perhaps one of the most gifted psychoanalysts of Freud's inner circle, successfully developed his own field called *analytical psychology*, yet was dismissed as a heretic and an unscientific mystic by many of his former colleagues.⁵⁰

Although this history is intriguing, what can it show us about the psychodynamics of *idea organizations*? The individual reason why each of these men no longer claimed membership in Freud's inner circle is not as important as the fact of their departure itself. In other words, these departures provide evidence that *idea organizations* both encourage and attack eccentric personalities, demonstrate an intolerance of opposing views, a propensity to scapegoat independent-minded thinkers and generate a climate of intense rivalry, which fosters envious attacks on anyone who differentiates themselves from the "in"-group.

As a result of the intensity of such disputes and resultant splits, psychoanalysis began to earn the reputation of being more of a religion or cult, demanding a dogmatic following, than the scientific field Freud originally had imagined.⁵¹ Some authors claimed this climate was the result of Freud's overbearing influence. Sándor Radó, a relative latecomer to Freud's group, recalled, "The first psychoanalysts were just as human as anybody else."⁵² As a sign of their loyalty to Freud and commitment to the psychoanalytic movement, "the most devout wanted to be rewarded by getting rid of unpleasant competition."⁵³ Rather than innovating in their own right, "intense jealousy" led the faithful followers to try to excel by finding and expelling the "traitors in their midst."⁵⁴ This becomes a common dynamic within *idea organizations*, when the toxicity of the environment rises to an overwhelming level and more energy gets expended policing members than innovating ideas or their application.

Perhaps in response to criticism, Freud revisited his group's dynamics later in his life, detailing the highlights of its evolution in *On the History of the Psycho-Analytic Movement*. Alluding to the infamous inter-group rivalries, Freud contended his group "was hardly inferior, in wealth and variety of talent, to the staff of any clinical teacher"⁵⁵ it is simply "that psycho-analysis brings out the worst in everyone."⁵⁶ Rather than attempt to maintain such strict control, he confessed, it might "have been better if I had given free

rein to my own passions and to those of others round me.”⁵⁷ In other words, Freud seemed to acknowledge the necessity to explore ways to create an environment which fostered innovation rather than intolerance amongst his group. In the final analysis, Freud confessed to remaining troubled by two points: First, that he did not succeed in fostering “the friendly relations” within his group that might have been possible “between men who are all engaged upon the same difficult work.”⁵⁸ Second, that he failed to “stifle the disputes about priority” that often arose “under these conditions of work in common.”⁵⁹

Margaret Rioch, the mother of group relations in America, might have said the same thing about her group of followers a few decades later. The history of group relations, especially in the U.S., provides examples of many of these same *idea organization* phenomena. The A. K. Rice Institute (AKRI), in particular, will be seen to have had difficulty accepting eccentric personalities and tolerating opposing views, demonstrating a propensity to scapegoat independent-minded thinkers, which created a climate of intense rivalry, fostering envious attacks of people who differentiated themselves from the dominant group. But AKRI is not the exception, but the rule. We will see how the Tavistock, NTL as well as A. K. Rice Institutes, endured a number of feuds and splits based largely on inter-group rivalries and an intolerance of opposing views.

Freud’s Secret Society

In response to growing dissension in Freud’s inner circle, a dedicated group of loyalists led by Jones in London and Sándor Ferenczi in Budapest established a *secret society* in the summer of 1912. Their goal was to organize a small group of men who, as Jones put it, had been “thoroughly analyzed by Freud”⁶⁰ himself and would act as intellectual bodyguards for the fledgling field of psychoanalysis. Their task was to monitor developments in the field to ensure that things proceeded in the right manner; in other words, a manner in which Freud would approve.⁶¹

Jones and Ferenczi invited Otto Rank, Karl Abraham and Hanns Sachs to join this group. Perhaps as a sign of the rivalry between them, Jones was not shy to report, “how Freud’s affections were distributed” amongst this group of his chosen analysands: “Ferenczi came easily first, then Abraham, myself, Rank and Sachs.”⁶² One has to wonder not only why a list of Freud’s favorites was important to publish, but how the order of preference could so easily be discernable.

Although the creation of this secret committee only may have exacerbated the rivalry within his circle of followers, it brought Freud a great sense of relief about the future of psychoanalysis. In recognition of his gratitude, Freud celebrated the committee’s establishment at their first meeting on May 25, 1913 by giving each of the five members a gold ring containing an antique Greek intaglio from his collection. Freud had worn a similar ring containing the head of Jupiter for years. In 1919, Max Eitington was invited to join the committee and received a similar seventh ring. Freud noted in a letter to Eitington when he announced his membership, “The secret of this committee is that it has taken from me my most burdensome care for the future, so that I can calmly follow my path to the end.”⁶³ This example provides another piece of data about life within *idea organizations*, the need for attention to succession can sometimes become an

overwhelming preoccupation, as founders search for someone “good enough” to carry on “their” legacy.

In 1953, author Vincent Brome interviewed Ernest Jones about the significance of the secret society’s rings:

Don’t be misled by the boyish business of the rings. They didn’t amount to anything, and at least two members of the Committee were embarrassed to wear them...The rituals involved in the Committee were the inevitable reaction towards greater discipline as a result of Jung’s defection. The combination of external hostility and internal dissension drove U.S. to somewhat picturesque methods—and—alas—even those in the long run didn’t save us.⁶⁴

Although the secret committee managed to balance the external hostility and internal dissension in order to appease Freud’s anxiety about the future of psychoanalysis, Jones recalled that there was a lack of warmth and friendship between the members. They merely had “a close understanding,”⁶⁵ bonded by a loyalty to Freud and a dedication to the psychoanalytic movement.

I contend that competition for Freud’s attention and approval, further exacerbated by power struggles over succession, squelched any meaningful means of interpersonal connection within this group, as an *idea organization*. In addition, the fact that personal innovation was attacked as heresy—unless it was wrapped in loyal endorsement of Freud’s own theories—resulted in the group feeling stunted and hostile, further exacerbating intra-organizational conflicts and intensifying inter-group tensions and rivalries. It is no surprise there was little warmth or friendship between them.

Lay Analyst

Although the secret society gave Freud some peace of mind, over time he became concerned that psychoanalysis was in danger of becoming a footnote in the treatment section of psychiatric textbooks rather than its own science under the umbrella of depth-psychology, as he had envisioned. As a result, Freud strongly supported the licensing of *lay analysts*: psychoanalysts who were highly trained specialists but not medical doctors.

Freud recognized that although an analyst could attempt to understand the stressors of different professions, psychoanalytically trained experts from within those fields could make the most valuable contributions. As a result, when approached about psychoanalytic training, Freud urged students to go right into analysis, not waste time obtaining medical qualifications. He envisioned lay people from all walks of life attending a new *college of psychoanalysis* with a curriculum that emphasized the study of evolution, the history of civilizations as well as anatomy, biology, sociology, psychology, literature classics, religion and mythology.

Freud felt so strongly, he produced a pamphlet entitled *The Question of Lay Analysis* in 1927 in order to make his unwavering support for this role known.⁶⁶ Yet there was clear opposition, most adamantly voiced by the *New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute*, the premiere international psychoanalytic organization in America at the time. Fueled in part by their own professional self-interest and fear of competition in the dwindling market of the Great Depression, *New York Society* psychiatrists felt they were being inundated with substandard lay analysts trained in Europe and transplanted to the

U.S. in the post-World War I period.⁶⁷ Therefore, they fostered the enactment of a state law in 1926 restricting the practice of psychoanalytic treatment to medical doctors.⁶⁸

But the debate only partially was about competition for clients; it also had ideological roots. Many of the European analysts who had immigrated to New York, such as Robert Bak, Kurt and Ruth Eissler, Heinz Hartmann, Otto Isakower, Edith Jacobson, Ernst and Marianne Kris, Rudolph Loewenstein, Margaret Mahler, Hermann Nunberg and Annie Reich, had close ties to Sigmund and Anna Freud. These lay analysts were not interested in what seemed like the petty insecurities and financial interests of New York psychiatrists. They were drawn to psychoanalysis as part of a larger intellectual social movement. They believed psychoanalysis could help change the world and as a result, the Europeans, similar to Freud, often looked down on the Americans and their preoccupation with commercial success. This European-American split becomes a common theme in other *idea organizations*, as well.

In London, where over forty percent of *British Society* fell in to the lay analyst category, they staunchly supported Freud's perspective, pragmatically solving their few concerns by agreeing that all patients should consult with a medical doctor before, and then on occasion during, their psychoanalytic treatment.

Later, a review of the history of group study and *idea organizations* in the U.S. will reveal similar dynamics. For example, Margaret Rioch, founder of the A. K. Rice Institute, developed a similar *secret society* in the early days of the group relations movement in America. Rioch's group of loyal young psychoanalysts, or *Princes* as they were commonly called, helped her establish the field of group relations in America. Motivated perhaps by the same loyalty to their charismatic leader and dedication to their burgeoning movement as Freud's circle, Rioch's ambitious group of young men helped spread group relations theories and methods across America.

Yet Rioch's support of a chosen group—especially one so obviously preferencing young, white male psychoanalysts—also fostered some of the same destructive patterns of jealous rivalry and envious attacks from within the group. In addition, when individuals outside the inner circle demanded entry, issues of competency became central in ways similar to the *lay analyst* debate within psychoanalysis. For now, we will continue the systemic analysis of psychoanalytic societies as *idea organizations*, investigating the history and influence of Melanie Klein and the World Wars.

3: Influences Behind the Innovation

World War I influenced the psychoanalytic world as it had every other sphere of European life. Although Freud, Jones and Sachs did not serve in the military, Ferenczi and Eitington became doctors in the Austrian-Hungarian Army, Rank went to Cracow to serve as editor-in-chief of the Polish army's newspaper *Krakauer Zeitung* and Abraham joined the German Army of East Prussia as a doctor.⁶⁹

In 1918, the *Fifth Psycho-Analytic Congress* was held in Hungary and nearly all participants came in military uniform. The meeting was an unusually festive affair, given the devastation occurring throughout Europe at the time, because recent successes treating war neurosis were being reported by Ferenczi, Abraham, Eitington and Ernest Simmel, among others.⁷⁰ As a sign of the growing support for psychoanalytic treatment methods, governmental representatives from Austria, Germany and Hungary were present, interested in establishing veterans' hospitals based on these new methods.

Melanie Klein, whose theories and influence figure prominently in the history of group study, in particular the Tavistock's model of group relations, was also in attendance, having started analysis a few years prior. In her unpublished autobiography,⁷¹ Klein recalled hearing Freud speak for the first time in Hungary and, being immensely impressed, vowed to devote herself to psychoanalysis.⁷²

I became aware of the existence of Klein's unpublished autobiography while reading Phyllis Grosskurth's detailed biography *Melanie Klein: Her world and her work*. Since Klein was known to be an intensely private person, Grosskurth noted, "It has generally been assumed that Melanie Klein left little documentation about her life." Yet in "actuality there is an abundance of material, largely in the keeping of the Melanie Klein Trust," which donated Klein's papers to the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine.

I spent a week at the Wellcome Library reading Klein's unfinished autobiography, touching papers Klein had touched, letters she had written and newspaper articles she had saved. One afternoon I reviewed her diaries and their cryptic entries: MJ at 4 pm, BS at 2 pm. I came across a single page, separate from the rest, Monday May 31, 1945 "Menzie's at 4:15?" The past and present collided inside me. Could this be Isabel Menzie's, I wondered?

I made a copy of this page, mailing it to Isabel Menzie's Lyth who, after three visits to her home in Oxford, had now become a close acquaintance. Menzie's was both thrilled and amused that this archive had been preserved, confirming that she had indeed been supervised by Klein during that time. I began to become aware of the role that I was playing by conducting this research, creating this book, uniting people with their pasts and synthesizing for others their intellectual roots. I was a piece of the puzzle that had been missing, the historian gathering together the parts that had been scattered and lost.

Melanie Klein

Klein's life story is unusual for a woman of her generation and her contributions to psychoanalysis, and by extension group relations, were extensive. Born in 1882, Melanie Reizes was the youngest of four children in a struggling, Jewish family in Vienna. Influenced by her father and older sibling's love for learning, Klein was pushed to read, study Greek and Latin, and complete mathematics at a young age. Although as a young girl, she showed much intellectual promise, aspiring to become a medical doctor and specialize in psychiatry, she was not able to achieve this dream. Instead, she agreed, at the age of twenty-one, to marry Arthur Klein an industrial chemist.⁷³

Klein gave birth to three children: Melitta in 1904, Hans in 1907 and Erich in 1914. Yet she was a reluctant mother and wife and soon tired of following her husband and his career from one small provincial European town to another. Missing the lively Viennese intellectual life, she often became depressed, taking refuge away from her family, leaving her mother to run the household in her absence. Although she would become a world-renowned child analyst, Klein readily conceded she was not a natural mother.⁷⁴

The year 1910 proved pivotal in Klein's life, and the history of psychoanalysis and group study, when she convinced Arthur to accept a transfer to a city, settling in Budapest, which was coincidentally emerging as a Mecca for psychoanalysis. After reading Freud's *Interpretations of Dreams*, Klein began analysis with Ferenczi in 1914 to help cope with her recurring depression and the death of her mother earlier that year. During her analysis, Ferenczi noted Klein's ambition and commitment to psychoanalysis, urging her to undertake a studied analysis of children.⁷⁵

Sándor Ferenczi

Sándor Ferenczi was born in 1873 and, like Freud, attended medical school in Vienna to study nervous disorders and the use of hypnosis to treat hysteria. Highly respected in the field, he was appointed psychiatric expert to the Royal Court of Justice in Budapest in 1905. He published over fifty articles based largely on his work with prostitutes and homosexuals, where his sympathetic views and calls for reform revealed a liberal, social activist side.⁷⁶ Like many members of Freud's group, Ferenczi made contact with Freud after reading *Interpretations of Dreams*. Jones recalled that Ferenczi quickly endeared himself to Freud, who began referring to him as "my dear son,"⁷⁷ even encouraging Ferenczi to marry his daughter eldest daughter Methilda, which he never did.⁷⁸

Their close friendship endured for over twenty-years during which Ferenczi often accompanied Freud on holidays where they would engage in endless theoretical discussions. Many of these conversations provided germs for Freud's later papers and Ferenczi reviewed these manuscripts before publication, seen as an enormous privilege within Freud's inner circle. In 1913 Freud even sent Ernest Jones, whose reputation had become somewhat tarnished in Britain after two child patients accused him of impropriety, to Ferenczi for the first *training analysis* in history.⁷⁹

Yet like many innovative personalities within *idea organizations*, Ferenczi had a mixed reputation amongst colleagues—people either adored him or resented him. Jones

remembered him as a gifted analyst whose vitality, enthusiasm and boyish lovability made him an inspiring lecturer and teacher. Others noted Ferenczi's unusual idiosyncrasies such as his frequent slips of the tongue. Known as the *King of Parapraxis*, he would often unabashedly analyze these self-revealing slips in public.

Many colleagues also noted that Ferenczi had more charm for men, than for women.⁸⁰ Sándor Radó, a well-read young Hungarian student of Ferenczi's, described him as having an attraction for younger men like himself, recalling that although Ferenczi was an intuitively gifted analyst often capable of brilliant, poetic insights, he could also be undisciplined and reckless.⁸¹

Regardless of Ferenczi's mixed reputation, after almost five years of analysis, Klein maintained close professional ties with him as she began her own psychoanalytic research with children. Political turmoil in 1920 forced Klein to leave Budapest and, after divorcing her husband, she settled in Berlin. Still an obscure young analyst, Klein was struggling to find her place in the field when she asked Ferenczi to introduce her to Karl Abraham, member of Freud's secret society and founder of another *idea organization* the *Berlin Psychoanalytic Society and Institute*. This relationship would prove pivotal to future events.

Karl Abraham

Karl Abraham was born in 1877 to an old established Jewish family in Hamburg, Germany. After completing medical school, he spent six years training intensively in mental hospitals, opening his own psychoanalytic clinic in 1920, one of the first of its kind.⁸² As a clinician, Abraham was cool, detached, stable and objective; quite unlike Ferenczi. As a man, Abraham was a skilled diplomat, yet could seem aloof. Jones described him as "the most normal" of the men within Freud's inner circle.⁸³

In these post-World War I years, much of Abraham's clinic's work was in the treatment of shell-shocked soldiers. A model for other clinics, it was one of the first to impart professional standards, for example, insisting that an analyst must be analyzed. Surprisingly, many analysts at the time—such as Ferenczi—disagreed, seeing no difference between a didactic training analysis and a therapeutic analysis to educate clinicians.⁸⁴

The establishment of Abraham's clinic helped propel Berlin forward as a rising center for psychoanalysis, similar to Budapest's position in the pre-World War I years. Many young scholars and talented psychoanalysts came to Berlin to study and enjoy the creative environment. Examples included Karen Horney, Ernst Simmel, Therese Benedek, and Helen Deutsch along with Hanns Sach and Theodor Reik from Vienna, Alix Strachey and James and Edward Glover from Great Britain, Sándor Radó and Franz Alexander From Budapest. In 1923, Klein was elected with full membership into the *Berlin Psychoanalytic Society*, yet she still felt stuck on the perimeter of psychoanalysis' inner circle. She desperately wanted to make a significant contribution to the field and her opportunity came when she somewhat inadvertently developed her *play technique*.

Searching for a way to analyze children too young to speak, the pragmatic Klein quite logically gave each their own drawer of ordinary looking toys to play with and simply observed as the child played out his or her unconscious phantasies. As she interpreted the child's play, she noticed their anxiety decreased and facial expressions

changed. One surprising discovery was that “in very small children there was often a capacity for greater insight than in adults” because, Klein hypothesized, “the connection between the conscious and the unconscious are much closer in children and that, at a preverbal stage, play can reveal even more than free association.”⁸⁵

This new technique won Klein some of the notoriety she craved, but aside from support from Abraham, her innovation was not widely embraced. There were still misgivings about delving too deeply into the minds of children and analyzing children not yet old enough to speak was seen as ludicrous; especially taboo was a mother analyzing her own children, as Klein was known to have done.⁸⁶

In fact, most child analysts, such as Anna Freud, worked from a more directive perspective with the aim of strengthening the child’s super-ego through education. Child psychoanalyst Betty Joseph observed that the way Klein worked with children “implied analyzing anxieties and fears, not reassuring the child. Trying to understand what prevented the child from learning and discovering about life, not educating him.”⁸⁷

Yet it seems, Joseph remarked, Klein “had no idea how new some of these ideas were.”⁸⁸ Like many innovations within *idea organizations*, new methods often spring from the intersection of available skills and the demands of necessity. In what might be referred to as a historical moment, psychoanalysis’ need for new methods of working with children intersected with Klein’s emerging theoretical perspective, resulting in development of a new technique. This technique, and the theories which followed, became pivotal to developments in the field of group relations. Yet as one familiar with *idea organizations* would suspect, Klein and her innovations also become the target of envious attack.

In 1923, Klein approached Abraham to request a personal analysis. Whether to help her think about her divorce, the death of her son Hans in a mountaineering accident, the growing tensions with her daughter Melitta, or to develop herself more as an analyst, the exact reason for her request is not clear. Although Abraham initially declined, citing a previous bad experience analyzing a colleague, he eventually relented and they started analysis in early 1924. Lasting about fifteen months, Klein’s analysis was terminated when Abraham fell ill, dying shortly thereafter at the age of 48.

Abraham provided Klein with the greatly needed encouragement for her underrated work. Klein recalled he strongly believed “that the future of psycho-analysis rested with child analysis” and this came as a great surprise “since I was really in those first years unaware of the importance of the contribution to psycho-analysis that I was making.”⁸⁹ Klein also seemed unaware of how her work already was diverging from Freud’s, starting with interpretations of the oedipal conflict and a shift in emphasis toward destructive tendencies. These reinterpretations of Freud’s theories were supported by Abraham, but his support was well hidden by his diplomacy and overt loyalty to Freud. Klein would not remain as diplomatic.

As one might expect, Klein was significantly influenced by both her analysts. Through Ferenczi, the lively nonconformist, and the small vibrant and innovative *idea organization* in Budapest before World War I, Klein became enamored with psychoanalysis. The pioneering spirit espoused there would later prove useful as Klein rallied the courage to develop both her own theories and a resiliency with which to recover from an attack. Through Abraham, the diplomat and the more serious and competitive *Berlin Psychoanalytic Society* after World War I, Klein learned the politics

of loyalty. The conservative diplomacy practiced there would later keep Klein and her work from becoming annihilated by envious rivalry and accusations of heresy. Klein would take aspects of the influence of both men with her to London in 1926.⁹⁰

Klein goes to London

After Abraham's death, Klein was attacked even more openly by *Berlin Society* colleagues, many of whom had always considered her an outsider from a lower social class; a non-academic, lay analyst who developed theories based on playing with children's toys. Regardless of her innovation, the theoretically conservative psychiatrists often found her presentations amusing, if not somewhat embarrassing. They claimed Klein's work lacked scientific rigor, questioning the validity of her findings and her apparent divergence from Freudian theory. Even other child analysts were hostile to Klein's theories and methods, Anna Freud in particular. With Abraham now dead, Klein had few allies and little reason to endure the ruthlessly competitive environment within the *idea organization* any longer.

Ernest Jones often gets credit for orchestrating Klein's move to London, yet the groundwork was first laid by two women members of the *British Psychoanalytic Society*: Alix Strachey, a fellow analyst of Abrahams, and Joan Riviere. Handwritten correspondence from Riviere to Klein dated April 27, 1926 reflected Riviere's concern that they secure Jones' early support, "It would be disastrous for you to offend him."⁹¹ Nicknamed "Napoleon,"⁹² Jones was known to be powerfully influential, yet moody and quick to anger. Riviere was clearly concerned that Jones remain appeased: "Of course, he might take it all right, but one never knows, and he might be very angry at your writing to me."⁹³ Yet she concluded her letter on an optimistic note "it will be delightful to have you here and I do hope you will find all you hope for."⁹⁴

A few months later Klein typed a letter to Jones in German, describing her previous conversations with Riviere and her aspirations to move to England. "I could make my contribution to the psychoanalytic movement, which I fervently desire, in London just as well as in Berlin."⁹⁵ Weighing the risks, she pledged her loyalty to Jones, asking for his support, "I have a lot of faith in my work and its success, and if I know that you will support me, I shall be confident enough to dare it...in my mind I am decided to make London my new home."⁹⁶ And Jones did support her, for a time.

Although Klein's previous contributions had attracted little interest, the invitation to move to London caused quite a stir within the psychoanalytic community. Even Freud inquired about the circumstances of Klein's relocation. Claiming to be "impartial," Freud wrote to Jones leaving no doubt about his concern that daughter Anna Freud continued to be viewed as the premier child analyst:

There is no need to stress too much the differences in the techniques and in the theoretical approach between Mrs. Klein and Anna. I, myself, of course, remain as far as possible impartial on the one hand, because Anna is my daughter and, on the other, because she has made her work completely independent of me, supported entirely on her own experience. This much however, I can divulge to you. The views of Mrs. Klein on the attitude of the ego ideal in children seem to me quite impossible and contradict all my assumptions.⁹⁷

In a lengthy response dated Sept 30, 1927, Jones refuted Freud's accusations that "a definite campaign" had been arranged "against Anna." Concerned he was in danger of losing Freud's support, Jones offered "a full account of the situation," observing the

“rather special interest taken in the problems of childhood in London.” Based, he noted, on the large number of women analysts conducting child-study and child analysis, such as “Miss Low, Miss Searl, Miss Chadwick, Miss Sharpe, Mrs. Isaacs, Miss Lewis, Miss Tern.” Seeing a natural connection, Jones noted, Klein was invited to London:

First to lecture then to work. There is general confidence in her method and results, which several of U.S. have been able to test at the closest quarters, and she makes the general impression of a sane, well-balanced, and thoroughly analysed person. We were somewhat astonished to learn with what little sympathy her work has been regarded on the Continent, but decided to give her work fair hearing and form our own judgment about it. This has been so favourable that we have come to regard her extension of psycho-analysis into this new field as not only a valuable addition to our powers, but as opening up the most promising avenue to direct investigation of the earliest and deepest problems.⁹⁸

Yet always cautious to attend to Freud, and his daughter’s, large yet fragile egos, Jones added:

Our general attitude about deep child analysis was formed without the slightest personal reference to either yourself or to Anna. Anna’s unexpected attack on [Mrs. Klein] could therefore only evoke a reaction of regret here... This history of a perfectly natural and spontaneous order of development will, I trust, convince you that the situation here is much more objective than thought and did not arise from any personal feelings about either Anna Freud or yourself. The mood here is one of entire devotion to your personality and fidelity to the principles of psycho-analysis.⁹⁹

After this slightly rough start, Klein seemed to settle right in to work and life in London. Jones sent both of his children and his wife to Klein for analysis, and under Jones’ active support, Klein began to build a thriving practice. By the end of 1926, Klein had eight children and two adult patients and on October 2, 1927 Klein was elected as a full-member of the *British Psychoanalytic Society*.

The decade between 1928 and 1938 was perhaps the most productive and enjoyable of Klein’s life as her psychoanalytic practice prospered, giving her ample data to continue her theoretical refinements. The peak of her success came in 1932 with the publication of *The Psycho-Analysis of Children*. Translated by Alix Strachey, this book was a milestone detailing the theoretical underpinnings of Klein’s most important findings such as splitting, introjection and projection of internal objects, and the paranoid-schizoid and depressive positions. These important contributions become the theoretical underpinning of the field of group relations.

Edward Glover, the second most powerful man in *British Society* next to Jones, wrote a review of Klein’s book for the *International Journal* calling it a “landmark in analytic literature worthy to rank with some of Freud’s own classical contributions.”¹⁰⁰ As a result, the *English School* was starting to become known as the *Kleinian School*. Yet not everyone was a supporter. As we have seen, the innovation *idea organizations* demand in order to survive is also attacked through envious, inter-group rivalries.

Although one could argue that the seeds of the growing conflict within *British Society* had been sown upon Klein’s arrival in London, the internal turmoil greatly intensified with the arrival of the Freuds approximately ten years later. The dispute centered on the question of whether Freud’s theories were up for interpretation, as Klein

had done, or strictly reinforced as doctrine as Anna Freud, among others, had been insisting. Given Freud's own resistance to accepting professional critique, a precedent already had been established to view criticism as a personal attack.

Freud's go to London

1938 was a pivotal year in *British Psychoanalytic Society* history. Prior to 1938 H. A. Thorner, an analyst and colleague of Klein's for thirty years, recalled *British Society* appeared to be "a team that was working together." The environment was "warm and friendly" and being involved in it "was an exhilarating experience." The level of camaraderie and scientific discussion was "high" and the spirit "friendly and cooperative."¹⁰¹ For example, once a year senior analysts gave a big party, inviting the entire *Society* plus "well-known figures of public life and the literary world." People attended in evening dress, enhancing the event's feeling of glamour and prestige. It was a golden era. Yet the clouds of war were fast approaching, setting in motion a cycle of inter-group rivalry that would last nearly a decade.

Once again Ernest Jones played a pivotal, yet complicated role. Although in 1933 Jones had written to Max Eitington saying he could not "recommend that anyone come here" because "there is not enough work for our own poor people,"¹⁰² by 1938 he had revised his position. Perhaps recognizing the escalating nature of the crisis situation, Jones urged *British Society* to embrace continental European psychoanalytic immigrants with immediate membership, assistance in establishing a private practice and even training analyst certification, if appropriate. Two of these immigrants were, of course, Sigmund Freud and his daughter Anna Freud.¹⁰³ Yet, not everyone was pleased with this arrangement.

Mrs. Clare Winnicott recalled in an interview in 1981 that Melanie Klein had lamented, "This is a disaster," adding that *British Society* "would never be the same again."¹⁰⁴ And in many ways she was right. After 1938, over one-third of *British Society* analysts were now immigrants from continental Europe, many passing through on their way to America. This group was not very invested in the future of *British Society* as an *idea organization* and naturally gravitated behind their colleague Anna Freud, who remained highly skeptical of the innovation Klein's work represented.

With the Freuds so near, Klein's supporter Jones retreated into the background delegating more responsibility to Edward Glover in an attempt to stay out of the growing disharmony within the *idea organization*. Always eager to appease the Freuds, Jones' support of Klein had already become increasingly ambivalent as she surpassed him in influence over *British Society*.¹⁰⁵ After Freud's death in 1939, the intensity of the discord within *British Society* continued to soar as a clear theoretical divide emerged. Anna Freud began meeting separately with her group of followers fortnightly in her home and the Kleinians soon followed suit, both groups agreeing there was little common ground on which their teachings could be amalgamated.

Interestingly, after his glowing review of Klein's work in 1933, Glover now joined Klein's daughter Melitta Schmeideberg, a psychiatrist in her own right now, in leading the attack on Klein and her theories. Others such as Marjorie Brierley, Barbara Low, Adrian and Karin Stephen, and Ella Sharpe joined in the hostility. Yet many of Klein's early supporters remained loyal throughout such as Riviere, Isaacs and Rickman

along with a younger generation of her analysands such as Paula Heimann, Hanna Segal, Herbert Rosenfeld and Wilfred Bion. As hostilities increased, others abstained from joining either camp, remaining *independents*. Theorists such as D. W. Winnicott and W. R. D. Fairbairn were accused of heresy by both groups for pointing out inconsistencies and contradictions in both Freud and Klein's theories, developing their own innovative, independent styles.

When Britain declared war on Germany on September 3, 1939 Jones considered temporarily disbanding *British Society* for the duration of the war as many analysts fled to the relative safety of the countryside. Yet, due to their resident alien status the continental analysts were forbidden to travel outside of London. Therefore, *Society* meetings continued, without Klein or Jones, under the direction of Glover.

Klein had escaped to Pitlochry, a beautiful Scottish mountain town. Although she enjoyed the rest and serenity of the countryside, seeing just two patients, she was eager to return to her work in London. She had reason to worry because Anna Freud and her Viennese supporters were launching a campaign against her, supported by Klein's daughter Melitta and Melitta's analyst Glover.

The conflict peaked on April 24, 1940 when Klein traveled to London for a *Society* training committee meeting during which she was attacked outright. The final confrontation came when Anna Freud claimed "Mrs. Klein's work was not psychoanalysis but a substitution for it" and should not be taught to psychoanalytic candidates during their training.¹⁰⁶ As a result, both sides became more and more extreme in their views and hostility, less and less inclined to attempt compromise.

Over the next few years, intense intra-organizational disputes continued to surface as three distinct groups emerged within *British Society*: Kleinians in the "A" group, Anna Freud and ego psychologists in the "B" group, and an Independent group, made up of analysts unwilling to identify with either orthodoxy. The Independent group constituted the majority of *Society* membership, and although they accepted many of the contributions from both the Kleinian and Freudian perspectives, they had their own body of ideas and concepts.

These three groups fought over everything: promising young students, patient referrals, theoretical perspectives, and scientific papers. They blocked each others' candidates for organizational office and launched unrestrained personal attacks whenever possible. It became a "war" within wartime.

Although many attempts were made to bring some rationality, little could be done. At one point it was suggested that an external arbitrator be employed to which Anna Freud responded "If we should be able to solve our own personal problems and those of our patients I cannot see why we should not be able to solve the *Society's* problems."¹⁰⁷

Yet with Jones in the English countryside, Glover had the chance to expand his authority unchallenged, while Klein watched from afar with great concern. She believed things would have been drastically different if Jones had exercised stronger leadership, checking the attacks on her when they began in May 1935 and dissuading the Freud's from even coming to London altogether. Fearing annihilation, Klein decided she needed to build a strong, loyal group of talented supporters, like Freud had done, and fight to reestablish her presence in *British Society*. Some recalled Klein's tactics were ruthless, eventually discarding followers such as Heimann, Rickman, Winnicott, Riviere,

Rosenfeld and Scott, when they did not wholeheartedly support her and her ideas in every way.

Finally, it was agreed that *British Society* would allow one meeting a month to be devoted to an investigation into emerging theories. In what became known as the *controversial discussions*, theorists such as Klein, Isaacs and Heimann were allowed time to describe in what respects their theories and methods amplified, or required a modification of, Freudian teaching. This attempt to bridge the theoretical gap in some ways exacerbated intra-organizational dissension, provoking concerns about interpretations of analytical competency, similar to debates around the use of lay analysts twenty years earlier. The debate highlighted the underlying question: Can individuals from different backgrounds and training programs within the same *idea organization* successfully work together and be judged equally competent? As we will see, this question resurfaces within the dynamics of other *idea organizations* as well.

In 1944, *British Society's* training committee met and after much discussion decided that differences in technique and theory could, in fact, exist within the field of psychoanalysis leading Anna Freud and loyalist Edward Glover to resign from the committee in anger. In 1946, the Society developed a training program similar to those in existence today where candidates wishing to pursue Kleinian training were assigned a Kleinian analyst, while those wishing to pursue Freudian training were assigned a Freudian analyst and independents an independent analyst.

Much has been written about the details of this infamous intra-organizational feud within *British Society*. Yet, similar to Freud's disagreements with Breuer, Fleiss, Adler, Stekel, and Jung, what remains important in this analysis is not the details as much as the fact that the intra-organizational rivalries and feuds occurred. Although on one level *British Society* disagreed about theories and methods, covertly they were actually fighting about power. Each group believed it represented the essence of what psychoanalysis was and should be. Yet neither group attempted to educate itself about the other group's work in an effort to find a common foundation in their commitment to doing this work, however differently. Instead, Freudians attempted to dismiss Kleinian contributions as unfounded and Kleinians responded with smugness, feeling certain that the antiquated Freudians were lagging behind. Yet by Melanie Klein remaining, in her mind, a faithful follower of Sigmund Freud, the schism never fully broke into an antagonistic split. Amazingly, *British Society* never split and, on a positive note, the level of debate in some ways sharpened the positions of both perspectives.

Who was Melanie Klein?

Who was this woman, Melanie Klein? In the midst of the organizational turmoil of *British Society*, Klein remained relatively quiet, resisting the pull to become the arrogant and combative personality the *idea organization* seemed to want her to be. She attended Psychoanalytic Congresses, but often said very little.¹⁰⁸

If the extensive collection of Melanie Klein archives held at the Wellcome Library is any indication, the reception of Klein's contributions either in person or writing continued to be phenomenal. Hundreds of book reviews and syntheses of her work were catalogued, available in many languages and Klein apparently read them all, often writing to the editor if she did not feel her work had been represented accurately.

An active mentor for young people, Klein remained devoted to psychoanalysis and advancements of the field. Not only pushing the boundaries of theoretical developments, but also readily giving seminars on the basics such as analytic technique and use of the whole therapeutic setting. For example, Thorner recalled “She spoke about how to arrange your consulting room, whether you shake hands with the patient or whether not, which was of course for a student extremely valuable.”¹⁰⁹ This idea of considering the entire therapeutic setting would influence Tavistock theoreticians such as Wilfred Bion and his subsequent work with groups as well as A. K. Rice and his group relations conference design.

Never concerned about charging high fees, Klein believed a lack of money should not be an obstacle to treatment, especially for junior colleagues. Later in her career, she retired from treatment of children, focusing predominantly on analysts and candidates in training. Although she would only accept committee work on *British Society’s* training committee, she attended nearly all scientific meetings, regardless of topic, and encouraged others to do the same.

Thorner recalled Klein as “a strict analyst in many ways” yet talkative. Compared to other analysts, some thought Klein could be too talkative. Thorner observed, she “did not conceal what she felt or thought about analysis and reality situations.”¹¹⁰ And although kind, “Klein’s interpretations could hurt, which I never experienced with Bion.”¹¹¹ Yet “There was never any doubt in my mind about Melanie Klein’s integrity which is the real basis of all analysis.”¹¹² Nor did Thorner ever impugn her intention to facilitate good work. Thorner also recalled one of Klein’s weaknesses, which was perhaps exacerbated by her *idea organization* experiences in *Berlin* and *British Society*, was that she “divided the world into two kinds of people, those who were for Melanie Klein and those who were against her.”¹¹³ She was not afraid to make her views about colleague competency known, based on their alignment with her own theories, and “not always very objectively.”

As a woman, Klein was known to be a meticulous dresser, often sporting a wide hat, as was the fashion of the day.¹¹⁴ When attending meetings, “she was always formally dressed” and “when younger members appeared rather informally she did not hesitate to make a remark.”¹¹⁵ Her behavior was always dignified, projecting a sense of regal, yet benevolent, strength. She was fastidious, insisting on high standards of work without compromise and would not hesitate to speak to an analyst she felt was out of line. As part of what Tavistock psychoanalyst Elliot Jaques noted as her “clinical attitude,” Klein was highly secretive and rarely talked about herself, leaving “nothing in her papers that could reveal anything of any significance about her personal life.”¹¹⁶

Yet she was always open to new experiences. Klein loved music and theatre, dinner parties and company, and was known to have a good sense of humor and enjoyed laughing heartily. Later in her life, as party invitations dwindled, she became somewhat lonely, complaining “people felt intimidated by her.”¹¹⁷ Klein continued being productive until her death in 1960, seeing patients and writing articles. After all her challenges within *British* and *Berlin Society* circles, when queried about her psychoanalytic affiliation she still responded, “My dear, don’t make any mistake. I’m a Freudian, but not an Anna Freudian.”¹¹⁸

4: Group Relations Theory

Despite tensions within *idea organizations* associated with the psychoanalytic movement, its theoretical innovations contributed to the mix of influences that led to establishment of the interdisciplinary field of *group relations*—a field that embraces psychodynamic principles and experiential learning perspectives in order to study the group as a holistic social system.¹¹⁹ For example, contributions made by sociologists such as Gustave Le Bon and William McDougall, psychoanalysts such as Sigmund Freud, Melanie Klein and Wilfred Bion, social scientists such as Mary Parker Follett, Elton Mayo and Kurt Lewin, and anthropologists such as A. Kenneth Rice and Eric J. Miller, along with a cadre of others, all critically shaped early theoretical developments within the field of group relations.

Although they were not all group relations theoreticians, each of these individuals made important contributions in their own disciplines, influencing thinking about the wider application of social sciences. To explore their contributions to theories of group study, we will momentarily abandon the parallel history developed in the previous two chapters and focus on the complex interactions among these varied theoretical influences.

For example, Le Bon and McDougall provided key observations about group behavior by studying the *group-as-a-whole* within its wider social system along with analyzing the individuals' relatedness to that system. This shift from focusing on the individual to an examination of the group as a holistic entity represented an important piece of group relations history, demonstrating its distinction was not simply as applied psychoanalysis, but as a related field, with its own concepts and praxis.

The history of group-as-a-whole thinking can be traced back to 1896 when Gustave Le Bon, a French sociologist, published his now classic book, *The Crowd*, in which he developed a theory about the behavior of large, unorganized groups. Le Bon argued that when joining a group, especially a large group, a person sacrifices a part of his or her individuality, becoming more easily influenced and susceptible to suggestion: "An individual in a crowd is a grain of sand amid other grains of sand, which the wind stirs up at will."¹²⁰ Yet a charismatic leader could sway a crowd, playing on the crowd's child-like credulity and untethered emotions in a manner that Freud observed was "actually hypnotic."¹²¹ This occurred, Le Bon theorized, because the group mind was illogical, intolerant, prejudiced, rigid, uninhibited and submissive to any dominant force that exerted authority.

Although Le Bon's work was cited frequently, especially within psychoanalytic circles, not everyone agreed with his theories. Freud, for example, spent fifteen of the seventy-five pages of *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* quoting and paraphrasing Le Bon's work, first lauding and then dismissing his contributions. With characteristic competitiveness, Freud contended "None of that author's statements bring forward anything new. Everything that he says to the detriment and depreciation of the manifestations of the group mind had already been said by others before him."¹²² Further, Freud interpreted Le Bon's appraisal of the group mind as a reflection of his contempt for the masses and fear of social upheaval, a common characteristic amongst the French bourgeoisie at the time.

Others joined Freud's dismissal of Le Bon's contributions. Tom Harrison, for example, observed that Le Bon's "frightening picture of mob activity reflected the bourgeois view of the upheavals occurring in France throughout the nineteenth century."¹²³ Kraskovic also criticized Le Bon's theories for being overly negative, arguing, "The group contained within itself the seeds of both success and failure."¹²⁴ Yet Le Bon's analysis of group-as-a-whole behavior and his conceptualization of the existence of a *group mind* remains an important contribution.

Despite these criticisms, William McDougall, a British-born American social theorist, expanded upon Le Bon's work in 1920, developing important insights about *organized* group behavior. Like Le Bon, McDougall believed that unorganized groups were emotional, impulsive, violent, and suggestible and, at times, acted almost like a wild beast. Yet when a group was organized and task-oriented, McDougall theorized, the intensification of emotion in each individual could be harnessed effectively for positive group achievement, a phenomenon especially evident in small groups, yet seldom attained under any other conditions. McDougall's clear differentiation between organized and unorganized group behavior has had important consequences for group theory, and was applied in areas such as *Leaderless Groups* and *Officer Selection* during World War II.¹²⁵

Although few would dispute Freud's significant contributions to psychoanalysis, there have perhaps been few more lively debates than those about the nature and scope of Freud's contribution to group theory. Freud's loyal follower and biographer Ernest Jones claimed Freud's dream analysis with fellow analysts while enroute to Clark University in 1909 represented the first example of group analysis.¹²⁶ Others cited Freud's publication of *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* as the first exploration of the psychology of groups.¹²⁷ Even Bion noted Freud's influence and use of psychoanalytic experiences to illuminate some of the obscurities not discussed by group theorists such as Le Bon and McDougall.¹²⁸

Yet others adamantly disagreed with Freud's significance in the area of group study. For instance, Boston physician Joseph Pratt often has been credited with the earliest and most direct historical connection to group psychotherapy when he began weekly meetings with twenty-five tuberculosis patients in 1905, fostering a spirit of camaraderie and hopefulness which hastened their recovery. Still others have observed that Freud developed psychoanalytic theories based on individual engagement with affluent patients and was uninterested in mixing with the masses in order to develop theories about mob behavior, like Le Bon's or McDougall's.¹²⁹

It remains possible that the intra-group tensions within Freud's own circle of followers discouraged him from expanding group theory. It also may have been the case that Freud did not, in his mind, differentiate as strongly between individual and group theories as we do today. Rather, he always considered the individual in relation to his or her family group as a driver of behavior. Bion supported this noting "there is ample evidence for Freud's idea that the family group provides the basic pattern for *all groups*."¹³⁰

A second contribution by Freud was to diagnose the cause of McDougall's organized/unorganized group phenomenon as *regression*, observing that joining a group causes "an unmistakable picture of a regression of mental activity to an earlier stage."¹³¹ Yet, Freud further hypothesized that "in organized and artificial groups it can to a large extent be checked"¹³² and redirected through appropriate leadership interventions. Many subsequent group theorists have disputed this claim, instead observing group regression to be an inevitable and permanent cyclic oscillation.

A third influence is how Freud's exploration of the influence of the leader on the psychological functioning of the organized group, such as in religious and army life, led him to conclude that leaders hold groups together, "not so much through their actions and decisions, as through the position which they occupy in the unconscious life of groups."¹³³ Yet, Bion disagreed observing "To me the leader is as much the creature of the basic assumption as any other member of the group."¹³⁴

Finally, Freud's refinements of our understanding about the nature of the unconscious and his recognition that it operates, in part, as a defense mechanism activated to repress threatening ideas, remains an essential concept in understanding group life. In subsequent developments, group relations theorists used the mobilization of free associations expressed by individuals within a group as a way to explore the defenses alive in the group-as-a-whole. Instead of examining recollections of emotional distress surrounding individual's neurotic symptoms, as Freud did, group relations theorists took the apparently wandering thoughts expressed about organizations by people in groups as their field of focus.¹³⁵

Although group scholars may dispute the extent of Freud's influence on group relations theory, few would discount Freud's contributions to psychoanalytic philosophies in general. Furthermore, in his writings, Freud raised significant questions such as: "What, then, is a group? How does it acquire the capacity for exercising such decisive influence over the mental life of the individual? And what is the nature of the mental change which it forces upon the individual?"¹³⁶ These questions remain at the heart of group relations theory and, even today, are open and debatable.

One of the first theorists to apply psychology to the workplace in an important milestone for group theory was Mary Parker Follett in 1925. Of course, Karl Marx and later others such as Henri Fayol, Frederick Winslow Taylor and Max Weber, also made important contributions to a deeper understanding of organizations and work. In her essay *The Giving of Orders*,¹³⁷ Follett described the advantages of a more cooperative work environment, arguing for a less hierarchical worker-management interface. Follett observed that the solution to workers' resistance to following orders was to "depersonalize the giving of orders,"¹³⁸ suggesting instead that workers and foremen work collaboratively, studying a situation together and developing a mutually beneficial

solution to which they were both committed, which was a revolutionary approach at the time.

Between 1927 and 1932, Elton Mayo conducted a now famous study at the Hawthorne Works of the Western Electric Company in Chicago. By studying women assembling telephone relays, Mayo explored the relationship between the worker and her environment and the link between human motivation and productivity. The Hawthorne experiments showed that worker performance and satisfaction was influenced by numerous interrelated variables, such as the amount of supervision, encouragement and feedback provided by management, as well as by workers' control over their own tasks and environment.¹³⁹

Although the contributions of Follett and Mayo may seem like obscure links to group relations theory, they represent clear examples of the ways in which social science theorists worldwide had begun to shift their thinking about groups, organizations and work between the world wars. Paving the way for new methods of group study such as group relations, these theorists recognized organizations as complex interactive systems, a unique perspective at the time, and highlighted the importance of considering what Mayo called "the human aspect of industry" and organizational life.¹⁴⁰

Another foundational contributor to the field of group study was social scientist Kurt Lewin. Living in Germany during World War I, Lewin had observed first-hand the potential that humanity had for both good and evil, and firmly believed that the social sciences could, and must, be used to maximize human good. His harrowing wartime experiences resulted in a life-long commitment to using science to integrate democratic values in society. After fleeing Nazi Germany for the United States in 1932, Lewin taught at Stanford and then Cornell before establishing permanent U.S. residency, accepting a teaching position in child psychology at Iowa State University.¹⁴¹

One of Lewin's many contributions was the notion of psycho-sociological influences over group behaviors. By providing the elusive conceptual framework to examine group behavior, Lewin's theories, known at the time as *applied psychology* or *field theory*, provided a way to study the tension between individual and group. Lewin's methods were grounded in his philosophy that "the group to which an individual belongs is the ground for his perceptions, his feelings, and his actions."¹⁴²

Field theory, originally used in physics, was made popular in the study of social fields by Lewin, among others, in the 1940s because of its focus on the characteristics of interdependence. Using a scientific metaphor, Lewin compared groups to a molecule's parts and their interrelatedness, thereby demystifying the nature of group life.

There is no more magic behind the fact that groups have properties of their own, which are different from the properties of their subgroups or their individual members, than behind the fact that molecules have properties, which are different from properties of the atoms or ions of which they are composed.¹⁴³

Lewin's philosophies exerted significant influence over members of the Tavistock Institute at the time. In fact, Eric Miller noted "the Tavistock group shared his conviction that conventional modes of scientific analysis would not uncover the 'Gestalt' properties of complex human systems."¹⁴⁴ Therefore, innovation of new methods was required.

One answer to this need, and a final important contribution provided by Lewin, was an almost accidental discovery during a 1946 *Connecticut Workshop in Human Relations*. Lewin and his colleagues were experimenting with his hypothesis that adults

learn more effectively through interactive experiences shared in experiential learning environments than in traditional lectures and seminars. The results of this first experiential workshop contributed to the development of *here-and-now* theories and the human interaction laboratory, directly influencing development of the group relations conference.¹⁴⁵

Although Le Bon, McDougall, Freud, Follett, Mayo and Lewin, among others, can be credited with historical influence, Melanie Klein unequivocally laid the theoretical foundation for the field of group relations through her object relations theory. Her theories both built upon and departed from the work of Freud, elaborating on the complex ways that early connection to childhood *objects* continue to affect people throughout their adult lives.

Klein postulated that early child development is comprised of two distinct yet inter-related developmental *positions*, called *paranoid-schizoid* and *depressive positions*. She called them positions, rather than phases, because she believed them to be flexible and fluid states. Using these positions, she described how people learn from an early age to cope with unpleasant emotions, and the resultant confusion and anxiety such emotions create, by using two predominant psychological defenses: *splitting* and *projective identification*.¹⁴⁶

For example, in the *paranoid-schizoid position*, Klein theorized that the infant reconciled conflicts between its perception of the nurturing and satisfying breast/mother and the frustrating and withholding breast/mother by *splitting* the breast/mother into two separate beings, or *objects*. The infant then perceived one object to be nurturing and good and the other object as frustrating and bad. Similarly, the infant learned to distance itself psychologically from its own negative and destructive emotions by disowning uncomfortable feelings and *projecting* them onto someone else.

As the infant grows older¹⁴⁷ it attempts to reconcile this inner-conflict during the *depressive position*, recognizing its mother, and others, as whole objects containing both good and bad parts. Klein stated that the infant becomes aware, and afraid of, the destructive impulses it has felt towards objects such as the “sadistic phantasies directed against the mother.”¹⁴⁸ The infant experiences feelings of guilt for the harm it thinks it has caused through its hostile thoughts, and experiences a need to make reparation, now that objects like mother are both loved and hated. Klein recognized the *depressive position*, with its guilt and desire for reparation, as “part of normal development.”¹⁴⁹ “The irrevocable fact that none of U.S. is ever entirely free from guilt has very valuable aspects because it implies the never fully exhausted wish to make reparation and to create in whatever way we can.”¹⁵⁰

Freud’s “intrapsychic model of drive and of impulse/defense analysis” had limitations “for understanding any but the most selective aspects of group behavior.”¹⁵¹ This intrapsychic model made it difficult to apply Freud’s theories to a broader understanding of group behavior without some sort of conceptual bridge. Klein’s object relations theory shifted the psychoanalytic lens from Freud’s world of instinctual and sexual tensions toward analysis of post-natal development and ways to relate to others. These theories proved to be the conceptual bridge Klein’s analysis and Wilfred Bion needed to link the *individual’s* unconscious experience with theories about *group* behavior.¹⁵²

Much has been written about Bion and his contributions to understanding peoples’ behaviors in groups. Although Bion left the field more than fifty years ago, his

theories continue to be applied, interpreted and evolved by others, having widespread impact in many different fields from social psychology and sociology to organizational development and leadership studies.¹⁵³

Developed in large part as a result of Bion's experiences in British army psychiatry during World War II helped shaped his group theories and methods, which he applied to his work at the Tavistock Clinic and then, albeit briefly, at the Tavistock Institute after the war. In 1961, he published a collection of essays called *Experiences in Groups*. An extremely popular book, Malcolm Pines noted "*Experiences in Groups* is probably the shortest and most influential text in psychoanalytic group psychotherapy. Whether you agree or disagree with Bion, ignore him you cannot for he looms up at you from the darkness of the deepest areas of human experience."¹⁵⁴

Klein's theories, Bion explored how group membership evoked some of the same contradictory feelings as those experienced by the infant. The genius of this new perspective was to recognize that group members at times behave in a collectively psychotic fashion. For instance, Through Bion's lens, Klein's *object relations theory* explained how experiences in groups can trigger primitive phantasies, the origins of which lie in the earliest years of life.¹⁵⁵ In other words, the group mentality can drive the process in a manner akin to temporary psychosis.¹⁵⁶

For example, one unconscious desire is for the individual to join with the group by becoming part of an undifferentiated entity, like the infant fusing with the breast. Although comforting, this desire to merge with the group also creates opposing fears, such as the fear of becoming overwhelmed or consumed by the undifferentiated mass or, conversely, the fear of being rejected or abandoned by the group.

Bion hypothesized that groups have two modes of operation. He called one mode the productive *sophisticated group*, more commonly called a *work group* or *W group*. The *W group* focuses intently on the group's task and maintains close contact with reality. Bion called the other more psychotic mode of group operation, *basic assumption* or *ba group*, which finds its roots in the *paranoid-schizoid position*. The *ba group*'s primary task is to ease group members' anxieties and avoid the pain or emotions that further work might bring. Bion identified three types of basic assumption modes: basic assumption of *dependence (baD)*, basic assumption of *pairing (baP)*, and basic assumption of *flight-flight (baF)*.

Bion noted that when a group is operating in *baD*:¹⁵⁷

One person is always felt to be in a position to supply the needs of the group, and the rest in a position to which their needs are supplied...having thrown all their cares on the leader, they sit back and wait for him to solve all their problems...the dependent group soon shows that an integral part of its structure is a belief in the omniscience and omnipotence of some one member of the group.¹⁵⁸

This group assumes their "leader," whether selected formally or informally, has clairvoyance of thought and supernatural powers which render the rest of the group powerless and dependent. When the leader fails to meet the group's unrealistic expectations, as he or she inevitably does, the group becomes quickly frustrated and disappointed, and "selects" another member for the daunting task. This leader, too, is doomed to fail.

Bion argued that in *baP* the group invests irrational hopefulness for the future in two group members. Regardless of gender, the group assumes that these two

individuals have paired either for a “sexual” experience, which would provide the birth of a new group, a religious experience, which would provide a messiah, or a reparative experience, which would produce world peace.

In *baF*¹⁵⁹ Bion observed:

The group seems to know only two techniques of self-preservation, fight or flight...the kind of leadership that is recognized as appropriate is the leadership of the man who mobilizes the group to attack somebody, or alternatively to lead it in flight...leaders who neither fight nor run away are not easily understood.¹⁶⁰

Interpretations of the subtleties of Bion’s thinking abound. One common elucidation is that groups either are in a sophisticated work mode or defensive basic assumption mode, quickly swinging from one mode to another. Yet, groups can evolve over time and a dynamic group metamorphosis can occur as advancements are made in group development. In fact, some theorists observed that Bion’s three basic assumptions can be seen to be resting along a continuum of increasing conscious involvement from primitive *dependency* and *fight/flight* to the hopeful *pairing* group.¹⁶¹

Other theorists have contended that there are only two observable basic assumptions—*baD* and *baF*—not three. When a group is in *baP*, it is actually in an intensified form of dependency since it now relies on the leadership pair, rather than an individual leader, to ensure the groups survival. In other words, *baP* is an intensified form of *baD*, the opposite of *baF*.¹⁶²

Rice contended that “pairing and dependence are, like fight-flight, opposite poles of the same assumption.” For example, the “dependent group has met to obtain security from an individual who can never satisfy the demands made on him” while the “pairing group” hopes to produce “the new magical leader, a hope that is always vain.”¹⁶³

Yet, one could argue that there is only one *ba*—the *ba* of *fight/flight*—and all other group modes are variations of it. In this interpretation, a group in a state of dependency, relying on a single leader to lead the group to safety, is actually in *flight* mode. When a group is in *baP*, it is actually in *fight* mode since one leader attempts to wrest control of the group from another.

Bion supported this notion that the group is not always what it may seem. He noted that even when it is possible to identify the group’s *ba* state with reasonable certainty, a quality is still present that

Suggests it may in some way be the dual, or reciprocal of one of the other two, or perhaps simply another view of what one had thought to be a different basic assumption...I reiterate these points to show that *the hypothesis of the basic assumptions that I have put forward cannot be regarded as a rigid formulation.* [emphasis added]¹⁶⁴ *bas* are not always debilitating to the group’s task, as some have misinterpreted, but can sometimes be engaged for productive purposes.¹⁶⁵ For example, Laurence Gould noted that *baF* can act as the basis for “action, commitment, and loyal followership in the service of task performance”¹⁶⁶ as well as provide defense measures from external threats. Pierre Turquet noted that one sign of the group’s swing away from *ba* mode towards *W* mode is when the group “seeks to mobilize the relevant *Ba* group in support of its work.”¹⁶⁷

In 1974 Pierre Turquet, introduced a fourth basic assumption, which he called the basic assumption of *oneness* (*baO*). An expert on large group behavior, Turquet was responsible for the addition of the *large group* event to the Tavistock Institute’s Leicester

Conference design in 1964.¹⁶⁸ During this event a group of fifty to eighty individuals “have the opportunity to experience, and to learn to deal with, situations in which ‘sides’ are taken spontaneously, existing sub-groups adhere and split, other factions are formed for apparently irrational reasons.” This phenomenon is exacerbated in large groups where individuals “can no longer remain face-to-face” and as a result “can feel suddenly bereft of support.”¹⁶⁹

Based on his extensive experience consulting to groups, Turquet hypothesized the existence of the *baO* group “whose members seek to join in a powerful union with an omnipotent force, unobtainably high, to surrender self for passive participation, and thereby to feel existence, well-being, and wholeness...lost in oceanic feelings of unity or, if the oneness is personified, to be part of a salvationist inclusion.”¹⁷⁰

It is no coincidence that Turquet chose the words “oneness” and “oceanic” to describe the feelings of unity he observed in *baO*, since Freud used both terms in *Civilization and its Discontents*. Freud observed that the human “sensation of ‘eternity,’ a feeling as of something limitless, unbounded—as it were, ‘oceanic’...is the source of the religious energy which is seized upon by the various Churches and religious systems.” Unable to locate this religiosity within himself, Freud, an avowed agnostic, pondered whether this oceanic feeling had been correctly interpreted. It “sounds so strange and fits in so badly with the fabric of our psychology that one is justified in attempting to discover a psycho-analytic—that is, a genetic—explanation of such a feeling.”¹⁷¹

In search of such an explanation, Freud traced the oceanic feeling “back to an early phase of ego-feeling” in childhood, when the infant’s helplessness generated the longing for the father’s protection.¹⁷² In other words, the sense of oneness with the world reflected in the “limitless narcissism” of the oceanic feeling has its mirror image in the total dependency and loss of ego which this “oneness with the universe” also represents: I am one with the world, yet I am nothing because undifferentiated. Thus, the oceanic feeling can be seen as a form of *baD*, “another way of disclaiming the danger which the ego recognizes as threatening it from the external world.”¹⁷³

Following Freud, Klein also frequently mentioned the term “one-ness” when describing the infant’s sense of fusing with the breast/mother in its early years of life. Klein noted “in the earliest stages, love and understanding are expressed through the mother’s handling of her baby, and lead to a certain unconscious oneness.”¹⁷⁴ Both Freud’s and Klein’s use of the term one-ness seems the root of Turquet’s explanation of *baO* when he described group members’ eagerness to join with an omnipotent force for passive participation in order to feel safe and whole.¹⁷⁵

W. Gordon Lawrence, Alistair Bain, and Laurence Gould explored a fifth basic assumption of *me-ness* (*baM*) and offered it as the direct opposite of Turquet’s *one-ness*, emphasizing the individual’s desire to remain separate from the group because he or she “hates the idea of ‘we’.”¹⁷⁶ These authors posit that, although it may be a temporary or transitional cultural phenomenon, *baM* emerged as western societies became more industrialized and were felt to become more persecutory and hostile to the individual. As a result, “one response is for individuals to make themselves more cut-off from the effects and to withdraw into the inner world of the self” in what appears to be a “*socially induced* schizoid withdrawal.”¹⁷⁷

For example, when members of a group are united in unconscious *baM* they become calm, polite, ordered, androgynous and withdrawn. They prefer to use informal

spaces between events, such as meals or tea breaks, to speak their thoughts and conduct their work. At group relations events, they essentially deprive the consultants of any significant material with which to work. “Consultants may be trapped into feeling that they have to fill the gap with more and more working hypotheses about flight (*baF*) which serve only to unite further the group in *baM* and passive aggression.”¹⁷⁸ In *baM*, all one can do is survive; psychic pain and emotions are minimized and there is no learning. It is also possible for directors and consultants to fall into *baM* when they desire to be the star performer or central object of concern or admiration, sacrificing the group’s work to their own narcissism.

Building upon these earlier innovations and her keen sense that there was “something else” going on in the groups that she consulted to, Diane Hatcher Cano introduced an interpretation which she called the basic assumption of *grouping* (*baG*). Cano observed that groups sometimes displayed “consistent, repetitive attacks on linking,” hypothesizing that group phantasies to achieve either *baO* or *baM* replaced all realistic goals of achieving interdependence. As a result, all attempts to link are obliterated by attack.¹⁷⁹

In many ways, the conceptualization that groups are in a perpetual swing between sophisticated, reality-based work mode and a number of different defensive positions based on unarticulated group phantasy is the essence of group relations theory. As such it is what defines group relations as an intelligible field of study. This perspective is distinct from other theories of group study because it is not based on prescribed developmental phases. Rather, group relations theory emphasizes the inevitable, perpetual oscillation of group life. Yet few theorists have hypothesized what causes the group’s oscillation. Even Klein and Bion provided only limited guidance in this matter.

Klein hypothesized that the infant’s first experience of anxiety is the birth process, when the infant experiences the pain and discomfort of birth, and the loss of intra-uterine safety and security, as an attack by hostile forces. As a result, a sense of “persecutory anxiety”¹⁸⁰ toward external objects develops very early in the infant’s life. She argued that the infant learns to cope with these unpleasant emotions, and the resultant confusion and anxiety, in the *paranoid-schizoid position* through splitting, introjection and projection.

In this position, the infant develops destructive phantasies about biting, devouring and annihilating the bad breast/mother and phantasizes that, in retaliation, the bad breast/mother will attack him or her in the same greedy, aggressive manner. Conversely, the infant phantasizes that the good breast/mother is always available, inexhaustible and completely gratifying. The more aggressive the infant’s phantasies, the greater its fear of the bad breast/mother for retaliation and its dependence on the good breast/mother for protection.

As the infant matures, it learns to bear frustration and persecution anxiety lessens enabling the ego to reconcile some of its split off feelings and attempt to reintegrate the whole object. This reintegration gives rise to feelings of mourning and guilt as both the loved and hated objects are synthesized into one, resulting in the more mature *depressive position*.¹⁸¹ Yet, despite these insights Klein does not provide much guidance about what enables the transition from *paranoid-schizoid* to *depressive position*, except to say that it occurs naturally over time as the infant matures. Bion observed that no one *ba* can allay all the fears and anxieties present in the group and so the group constantly shifts *bas*. He

pondered briefly about “what could precipitate the change from one basic assumption to another,” and offered the following:

No matter what basic assumption is active, investigation discloses that the elements in the emotional situation are so closely allied to group phantasies of the earlier anxieties that the group is compelled, whenever the pressure of anxiety becomes too great, to take defensive action.¹⁸²

In other words, the group swings from one *ba* to another when anxiety rooted in primitive part objects, or early childhood phantasies and mechanisms, associated with that *ba* becomes too much for the group to bear. For instance, the group will tolerate *baP* until anxiety associated with memories of the “primitive primal scene,” such as oedipal conflicts around their parents’ sexuality, become too much to bear. The group then shifts from *baP* to another *ba*, perhaps *baF*, in an effort to contain *baP* anxiety and the cycle starts again.

The more disturbed the group, the more easily discernable are these primitive phantasies and mechanisms; the more stable the group, the more it corresponds with Freud’s description of the group as a repetition of family group patterns and neurotic mechanisms.¹⁸³

Similarly, Rice contended “the more a group manages to maintain a sophisticated level of behaviour, the more it uses the emotions associated with one basic assumption to suppress and control the emotions associated with the other two.”¹⁸⁴ In other words, the group will mobilize the emotions of fight-flight to suppress and control the emotions surrounding pairing or dependence. When the group is unable to suppress the contradictory emotions, the basic assumption will change.

Although this explanation of the underlying causes of the group’s shift between *ba* groups—and even from *W* to *ba* group—makes perfect sense, neither Klein, Bion nor Rice provide many clues to understand what triggers the *ba* group to abandon its collective psychotic swings and shift to the sophisticated and focused *W* group mode. This area warrants further examination.

By extending Klein’s and Bion’s theories, I contend that the process of shifting from *ba* to *W* group is catalyzed by feelings of guilt and remorse for the group’s aggressive feelings and a need to make reparation. I argue that the group’s shift from *ba* group to *W* group is motivated by an *unconscious sense of guilt* (*U^{sog}Error! Bookmark not defined.*) following from the group’s recognition and acceptance of responsibility for its own aggressive, destructive tendencies.

In *Civilization and its Discontents*, Freud explored the tension between mankind’s instinctual desires and the restrictions civilization places on his or her thinking and actions. One common result of the unresolved tension between self and society is an “unconscious sense of guilt for primitive thoughts and feelings, which, although not acted upon, still plague the imperfect human. Freud noted “Any kind of frustration, any thwarted instinctual satisfaction, results, or may result, in a heightening of the sense of guilt.”¹⁸⁵ He also noted “A sense of guilt arising from remorse for an evil *deed* must always be conscious, whereas a sense of guilt arising from the perception of an evil *impulse* may remain unconscious.”¹⁸⁶ I hypothesize that this unconscious sense of guilt, *U^{sog}*, is the unarticulated force which propels the swing from *ba* to *W* group.

Bion commented that when a group forms, those who form it “hope to achieve some satisfaction from it.”¹⁸⁷ Yet the group itself frustrates these aspirations by its mere

existence as group. Thus, he concluded, “It may be argued that it is quite inevitable that a group must satisfy some desires and frustrate others,”¹⁸⁸ and added that “the most prominent feeling which the group experiences is a feeling of frustration—a very unpleasant surprise to the individual who comes seeking gratification.”¹⁸⁹

In the confusion and anxiety of the start of a group the *paranoid-schizoid* position emerges¹⁹⁰ as the group struggles to establish a tolerance level of “persecutory anxiety.” In this position the group develops destructive phantasies particularly about individuals in authority, but can also scapegoat sub-groups and individual group members who are deemed to be bad-objects. Like the infant, the group phantasizes that in retaliation these part objects will attack the group in the same aggressive manner that they have been attacked. The higher the frustration level within the group, the more aggressive the group’s phantasies, the clearer the distinction between the all-good and all-bad objects and the greater the group’s fear of retaliation. When hallucinations of persecution are at their peak, all good aspects of the object are felt to be completely destroyed.

In other words, when the group’s sense of persecution is high there is a correspondingly high level of denial, idealization, splitting and projective identification. Consultants and scapegoated individuals and sub-groups are phantasized by the group-as-a-whole to be either all-good—available and insatiably gratifying, or all-bad—dangerous, aggressive and potentially annihilating. As long as these two states are kept separate and distinct in the phantasy of the group-in-the-mind, they enable a temporary sense of security to emerge.

As anxieties rise about the group’s behavior and its sense of the world as either perfectly good or irredeemably bad, the group may begin to realize unconsciously its aggressive tendencies and start to develop *U^{so}g*, thus enabling the group to swing into *W* group mode. However, as Bion noted, this movement is not linear or a series of predetermined phases. Instead, it “links in a circular series.”

Isabel Menzies Lyth further expanded this idea, noting *bas* are always interacting within the group fueled by unconscious phantasies: It is “never one or the other.” There is “always a little *W* available, otherwise consultation wouldn’t work.” The group is “looking to achievement of task” to keep it oriented to *W*, “but when anxieties get too high, *bas* surface,” and the group once again swings away from work mode.¹⁹¹

In addition to a lack of investigation into causes of the group’s swing, David Armstrong, a principal consultant at the Tavistock Consultancy Service, similarly noted a void in theory about the *W* group. He observed, although much attention has been paid to Bion’s concept of *ba*, “that of the work group has in my view tended to be taken for granted, as if it were quite evident and unproblematic...I believe this neglect to be a mistake.”¹⁹²

Armstrong further noted that the *W* group “is an expression at the group level of a developmental push,” what Bion called a “compulsion to develop,” inherent in the human organism. Correspondingly, Bion’s *bas* represent “a regressive pull, equally built in, which seeks to evade development.” As a result, he concluded “the unconscious life of the group, as an organization, is always an expression or function of both push and pull.” Yet the task of a consultant or leader is not simply to examine the nature of *bas* as they surface in a group or organization, but rather to mine for the reciprocal influence and examine what may be shaping it,¹⁹³ seeking what Turquet called the “because” clause: The reason behind the group’s behavior.¹⁹⁴

Bion reminded us optimistically that “one of the striking things about a group is that, despite the influence of the basic assumptions, it is the W group that triumphs in the long run.”¹⁹⁵ Yet, Turquet noted “a pure work group is very rare” and is “constantly suffused with basic assumption elements.”¹⁹⁶ Turquet hypothesized that one can identify the sophisticated W group by observing the group’s use of leadership, the skills of its members, testable hypotheses and relevant basic assumptions in support of its work.¹⁹⁷

First, a W group will share the leadership role, allowing the most skilled member of the group to emerge as leader depending on the group’s shifting primary task. To facilitate this, the W group “seeks in a sophisticated way to protect the skills of its individual members.” For example, group members exercise a sense of personal responsibility, managing their own boundaries and anxieties rather than loading up the leader. If members are unable to tolerate their own anxiety, “efforts are often made to deskill the leader by various members of the group, who fill him up with their anxieties and fantasies” and the group will swing into a *ba* mode. Third, a W group will use testable hypotheses based on a predictive “because” clause to further their work rather than unreliable hunches. Finally, “the work group seeks to make a sophisticated use of the relevant Ba group for the implementation of its primary task.”¹⁹⁸

Although these theoretical contributions have been important underpinnings in the field, one question remains: Where are examples of innovation by group relations theorists in recent years? Tim Dartington, former Tavistock Institute member and Leicester Conference Director, observed that in terms of theoretical innovation, as evidenced above, “the new thinking is consciously linked to earlier concepts from Bion. For example, the exploration of fourth or fifth basic assumptions,” which were first outlined by Bion almost fifty years ago.¹⁹⁹

Aside from Gordon Lawrence’s development of *social dreaming* and the *praxis* event, as new group study methods, Dartington believed little theoretical innovation has yet to come forth. One reason for this dearth, Dartington proposed, is that the “dominance of Bion hasn’t left enough space for other learning. We are all still digesting” what Bion put forth. When asked for examples of group relations innovation, Dartington noted the addition of Turquet’s large study group to the conference design in 1964 is still the “largest innovation” in group relations in recent years.

How did this stagnation occur? Dartington hypothesized that over time, with the field’s reliance on Bion’s conceptual framework and little additional innovation, “things became precious” and “like psychoanalysis,” group relations became a “closed system with our own language, methodology and exclusivity.”²⁰⁰ This preciousness, further stunted the field’s innovation.

Edward Shapiro, director of the Austen-Riggs Center in Massachusetts and former director A. K. Rice Institute National Conference, further elaborated on Dartington’s point. In a field, “Built around group dynamics, the issue of differentiation and envy is powerful,” Shapiro noted. “Every time anybody differentiated themselves—every time, either through their capacities or their skills—it would invoke competitiveness and envy, and murder!” As we have seen in previous chapters, this type of behavior is inherent in *idea organizations* as the innovation they require to survive becomes the focus of attacks and inter-group rivalries, creating a cycle that puts the organization itself at risk. And as Shapiro noted, “Speaking as a target of some of that” hostility, it is a “painful” process.

Although the field of group study, in particular the field of group relations, encompasses many different institutions, I contend that similar destructive dynamics are present within each as an *idea organization*. In other words, organizational members attack the very innovation which their field of study, and their organization, needs to survive, fueled by envy, competition and a desire by some members to keep their field precious and closed.

Yet if the group relations field does not innovate, expanding its theory and arenas for application, the group relations conference, arguably a focal point of the field's work is in danger of becoming more about personal experience than social science research. And if one person's interpretation of an experience is just as valid as another's, then all engagement, learning and attempts to expand or apply theory can be dismissed as individual opinion. The result is a hollow shell of personal growth events—group therapy for normal people—not an intelligible field of study with broader application to organizational life.

Yet it was precisely this connection to application, the linking of social scientific studies of group behavior with social change, that characterized early stages of development of the field of group relations. The questions that early theorists had posed about groups and how to study them best had emerged in specific social contexts, which had made the search for answers feel particularly urgent.

5: Influence of War

It was a chilly afternoon in December when I left my flat in Islington, riding along Farringdon Road across River Thames and down Blackfriars Road with my face pressed against the foggy window of the Number 63 bus, a classic double-decker red. I always sat on the upper deck. Today, I used my finger to clear a neat little square in the moisture so I could peer out. I was traveling to London's *Imperial War Museum* where a special exhibit, *Women and War* had just opened. I perused the exhibit for a while and then wandered into other parts of the museum, eventually finding myself in a full mock-up of a World War One trench-line.

I entered the exhibit, along with a small crowd of men and women, while a grandmother and small grandson followed close behind. I ducked under a low hanging wood beam, which appeared to support the tunnel of sandbags on either side. The floor underfoot was packed mud and duckboards and I noticed a sharp drop in temperature as smoke drifted across the top of the trench near my head. I shivered slightly as grandma pushed against me, the child clutching her hand with both of his.

The first station to the right, a side tunnel off the main burrow, appeared to be the size of a grave. Six feet deep by three feet wide, it was formed out of a long hole in the ground shored-up on either side by sandbags. I peered in, adjusting my eyes to the dim light as the sound of shell-blasts echoed around me, and saw a soldier in full army garb, hunched over charts which littered the area around him, while he called out bombing coordinates over a crackling radio. Grandma and child pressed closer; I pretended to fuss with my jacket, encouraging them to pass, which they did, quickly leaving the exhibit as if the realism of what they had seen had been too much to take.

Around the next bend, I found myself alone under a cold starry sky, smoke continuing to drift by my head. It was uncanny. Another turn and I found a group of soldiers readying themselves to mount an attack over top of the trench. Their officer was describing the details of their assault as the men interrupted.

“Who will come get us if we are wounded?”

“How long will it take them?”

“The stretcher bearers will come just as soon as they’ve had their breakfast!” the officer answered, “Now get up there in position. Ready!”

More shells-exploded and I wondered, down here in this muddy hole, what it looked like up there—out there—in the battlefield ahead. Then I came across a primitive periscope-like box and mirror, stuck in the side of the trench. I looked in. Outside there was only a darkening void, a pitted muddy expanse of nothingness, punctuated by the

brilliance of intermittent explosions. Nothing more than a burnt-out tree stump and trampled clump of grass seemed left, ornately decorated with rusting barbed wire.

A final turn in the trench brought me face to face with a bloodied soldier, caked in mud, being helped by another down a side trench, heading toward a small sandbagged area behind me in which other soldiers were resting, talking and joking. It seemed amazing that while some soldiers were joking and eating breakfast, others prepared to mount an attack into no-man's land with little hope of survival. It all seemed absurd, as I pushed open the door at the end of the tunnel, stepping out into startlingly bright, white light. "This way to the rest of the war" the door sign read.

Any person knowledgeable about the history of group relations can readily trace the roots of the field to treatment methods employed with traumatized soldiers during the world wars. Yet few scholars have explored how—*exactly*—this innovation occurred, influencing methods of group study and spawning the creation of the Tavistock model of group relations in the post-World War II period. What social, political and cultural forces provided the opportunity for previously untapped skills and resources to be used, resulting in the emergence of new group theories and methods at that historical moment? And how did these innovations lead to the creation of a new field called group relations in London after the war? To understand this history, we turn first to key aspects of Great Britain's cultural ethos at the turn of the nineteenth century.

While Charcot and Janet in Paris, and Breuer and Freud in Vienna, were exploring the nature and treatment of *hysteria*, the British school remained largely indifferent. Instead, British doctors were attracted to the work of an American neurologist, Charles Beard, who was studying a form of nervous exhaustion he called *neurasthenia*. Brought on by overwork or overindulgence, Beard claimed that neurasthenia resulted from the tangled dynamics of civilization and stresses of modern life and reflected an innate human conflict between obligation and instinct.

In fact, many people at the time believed that an individual had a finite amount of energy and could, in fact, deplete it through over taxation, which required the source to be replenished. The cure recommended often was to eat and sleep oneself back to health for women, or to take fresh air and exercise in the country or onboard ship for men. Electric shock treatment also was thought to be helpful. As a result, health spas, hunting lodges and a variety of resorts became established, providing a range of services.

In response to these new diagnoses, numerous philosophies emerged about how best to avoid psychoneuroses such as neurasthenia. Some thought devout religious convictions, vigorous exercise and a strong work ethic were the best way to ward off illness.²⁰¹ In Britain, another popular way to *keep it all together* was rooted in the *stiff-upper lip* philosophy of emotional self-control.

Founded in an aristocratic public-school ethos, this philosophy was based on ideas about character, morals, honor and virility, that together were thought to create the essence of being an *English gentleman*. When not directly engaged in war or colonialist expansion efforts, these traits of masculinity were thought to be sustained over the generations through sport, hunting, exploration, dueling and other risky activities, and were translated down the social structure to working class boys through Christian character-building programs, such as the Boys' Brigade, Lads' Drill Association and Boy Scouts.²⁰²

Yet, when World War I broke out in 1914, manpower shortages exacerbated by significant early casualties did not allow time to screen soldiers for any of these qualities, even if there were a reliable method to do so. In fact, 20-30% of men enlisting did not even receive proper medical screening.²⁰³ Many of these hastily enlisted soldiers, especially from the working-class, responded to the government's massive recruitment efforts seeing an opportunity to make a wage and eat a hot meal as incentive enough to volunteer. Patriotism was running high and everyone believed the war would end in a quick and decisive victory for Great Britain. As a result, a good portion of those who enlisted were not fit for military service, let alone the rigorous years of trench warfare that lay ahead.

In 1914 the British Army, known as the *Old Army*, was full of career military men, whose character had been shaped by the public-school ethos, with its clear definitions of duty, honor, loyalty, patriotism and self-sacrifice, thought to epitomize their very identity as Englishmen. With such a strong sense of English character and its corresponding traits of masculinity, it came as quite a shock when, shortly after the war began, large numbers of soldiers from the British Expeditionary Force were evacuated home, apparently suffering from "nervous and mental shock."²⁰⁴

The army was ill prepared to deal with these afflictions of the mind, and did not even have a psychiatrist or neurologist on staff of the Royal Army Medical Corps (RAMC) at the start of the war. A Cambridge university psychologist, Charles Myers, was dispatched to the front line to assess the situation. By mid-1916 Myers had seen over 2,000 cases of what became known as *shell-shock*, a term initially adopted on the mistaken perception that the illness had organic origins.

Some medical experts, such as London County Council pathologist F. W. Mott, made strong arguments supporting the organic origin theory. Mott based his assessment on two erroneous assumptions: First, shell-shocked soldiers showed hereditary predisposition towards nervousness and second, all were near an exploding shell when the phenomenon was incited. Although Mott had never been to the front, he nevertheless hypothesized that shell-shock was the result of an exploding shell's reverberations and explosive gases which shocked soldiers' central nervous systems. He argued that those especially susceptible were nervous soldiers, who were weak in character.²⁰⁵

But Myers had different ideas, claiming instead that shell-shock was of psychological, not biological, origins. Supported by Harold Wiltshire, another experienced shell-shock physician, Myers found that shell-shocked soldiers were not always close to a blast. In fact, shell-shock often occurred in response to *unexploded* shells, leaving no physical sign of injury. It seemed that the experience of a *near miss* often proved just as psychologically debilitating as actual explosions.

As a result, Myers, Wiltshire and other supporters of the psychological origin paradigm concluded that shell-shock was closer to neurasthenia than to any organic ailment. In other words, shell-shock was the inevitable outcome of the tension between soldiers' sense of duty and will to survive; a conflict between obligation and instinct. They concluded that life in the ubiquitous mud of trench warfare and the stress of near constant bombardment created a perpetual state of apprehension, a powerless waiting for an impersonal death. And, because there were no term limits, soldiers often felt they were sentenced to duty at the front until killed, critically injured or driven crazy.

Myers and Wiltshire deduced that for many men, by the time shell-shock overcame them the inciting event was often so insignificant it could hardly be called *shock*. Rather it was the inevitable, compounded result of prolonged exposure to the horrific conditions of war. The relative insignificance of the inciting event, compared to all the soldier had already endured, often made facing his breakdown even more difficult. These new psychological insights produced new medical terms such as *war neurosis* and *functional nervous disorders*, as more accurate descriptions of the phenomenon.

Yet *Old Army* leaders were not interested in complex responses to what they believed were simply discipline problems. For many *Old Army* officers' mental instabilities were a sign of cowardice or malingering, punishable by death, even though subsequent research revealed that many soldiers shot for cowardice were clearly suffering from mental health problems.²⁰⁶

Undaunted by the British Army's cultural resistance, Myers first challenge was to convince *Old Army* Generals there was a lot of ambiguity surrounding distinctions between cowardice and madness, and that war neurosis warranted serious research not punishment. Next, he persuaded army leadership that treating soldiers close to the front drastically improved results in a shorter time, while evacuating them to hospital often forced them into insanity. The key was to keep soldiers connected to their unit, and their role within it, as a way to get them well.

As army policies slowly shifted, treatments began to evolve as well. Many doctors reported that not only was early, frontline treatment important but the treating physician's attitude was extremely influential as well. It was imperative that the doctor be upbeat, projecting utter confidence that the patient would recover completely in an expeditious manner. Treatment for about 70% of shell-shocked soldiers consisted of a bath, a few days rest, some limited medical attention and a pep-talk by an optimistic physician, before being returned to their units.²⁰⁷ The other 30% were sent back home.²⁰⁸

In 1916 alone, over 24,000 shell-shocked soldiers returned to Great Britain for treatment, forcing the army to develop new facilities. One example called Maghull Military Hospital, located in a small village north of Liverpool, was staffed with an interdisciplinary team of all-star doctors eager to experiment by applying the theories of Janet, Freud and Jung to the 600 resident patients. Although doctors were interested in helping patients get well, Maghull was a military hospital and manpower shortages dictated that the priority was to return soldiers to the front. Unsurprisingly, it was found that the farther the soldier moved away from the front, and his role within his unit there, the harder it was to convince him to return. As a result, in 1917 only 21% of the 731 patients discharged from Maghull returned to military service, 65% left the military, 12% went to another hospital and 1% to a civilian mental hospital.²⁰⁹

The eminent William Rivers, a central character in the novel *Regeneration* by Pat Barker, spent time at Maghull before transferring to Craiglockhart near Edinburgh. One of the most famous shell-shock doctors, Rivers treated renowned poet and political activist Siegfried Sassoon, convincing him to return to the front. By war's end there were twenty military hospitals specializing in the treatment of war neurosis in Britain, six for officers and fourteen for enlisted men.²¹⁰

World War I taught British Army psychiatry a lot about the peculiarities of war neurosis. In 1922 the *War Office Committee of Enquiry into 'Shell-Shock'* attempted to consolidate this information in order better to classify, prevent and rehabilitate soldiers in

future conflicts, should they occur. The committee interviewed fifty-nine witnesses, many of whom had been leading shell-shock doctors in the war. The findings were extensive.

First, the committee determined that a proper screening of new recruits' physical *and mental* fitness for duty was essential and cost effective in the long term. When warranted, treatment of war neurosis should be early, simple, close to the front and never allow the afflicted soldier to think he was seriously mental ill. Deep individual psychoanalysis was not believed to be cost or time efficient but limited use of psychotherapy as a method of "re-education" was recommended.

Although the laudable efforts of the *War Office Committee* helped encapsulate the wide array of lessons learned about war neurosis during World War I, *Old Army* leadership still believed it could discipline the psychological angst of war away. As a result, when World War II began less than twenty years later, few preparations had been put in place to prevent war neurosis.

A changed Great Britain went reluctantly to war in 1939. Memories of the recent and painful past remained all too clear. Absent was any of the youthful exuberance expressed by the thousands who had flocked to recruiting offices in the early weeks of the first war. A wide cultural shift away from Victorian era public-school notions of English character and masculinity toward more independent, individual-centered thinking had occurred. Christian values of morality and social obligation and *Old Army* rhetoric of duty and honor were no longer considered sufficient bulwarks against war's pain and loss. The general feeling was more one of dread than heroic opportunism.

New military policies required new institutional alliances and each branch of the British military sought relationships with those mental health organizations that best fit their philosophies. For example, the Royal Air Force teamed up with Guy's hospital, Royal Navy with St. George's, and, in a moment of historical foreshadowing, the British Army, the most psychologically challenged service, joined with the struggling yet innovative Tavistock Clinic.²¹¹

At the beginning of the war, army mental health expertise still was extremely limited. To begin to rectify this problem, two senior psychiatrists were appointed as *Consulting Psychiatrists*: Henry Yellowlees, a veteran from World War I, and Jack Rowlings "JR" Rees, director of the Tavistock Clinic. The appointment of Rees proved especially pivotal because many Tavistock Clinic employees joined him in the war effort: Two entered the navy, thirty-one the army and three the air force. As a result of this recruiting effort, 197 psychiatrists were in service by July 1943 and over 300 by war's end.²¹²

The presence of the Tavistock employees in the army remained formidable throughout the war. Colloquially referred to as the *Tavistock Group*, this contingent included Wilfred Bion, John Bowlby, Harold Bridger, Ronald Hargreaves, Thomas Main, Eric Trist, John Rickman, John Sutherland and A. T. M. Wilson. During the war these men collaborated with other individuals interested in psychodynamic thinking, forming a group known as the *invisible college*.

Unified under the influence of Brigadier Rees, the *invisible college* included Bion, Bowlby, Bridger, Hargreaves, Main, Trist, Rickman, Sutherland and Wilson along with John Kelnar, Ben S. Morris, Herbert Phillipson and T. Ferguson Rodger, among others. Although these men were not all clinicians, they were all interested in psychoanalysis and

kept in close communication during the war, sharing similar philosophies about working with groups. After the war many of these men went into psychoanalysis and were employed by the Tavistock Clinic, helping to establish its subsidiary the Tavistock Institute in 1947. Much of the Institute's post-war work had roots in the experimentation that this interdisciplinary group conducted during these war years.²¹³

Although a clear outcome of World War I was recognition of the need for careful screening of recruits, little had been done between the wars to develop a viable process. As a result, soldiers were given an initial physical examination, yet no other systematic screening process was in place for the first two years of the war. To address this problem, General Ronald Adam commissioned the development of an intelligence test by Tavistock researcher Ronald Hargreaves. Originally used to test for schizophrenia, Hargreaves' *Progressive Matrices* was quick, easy to administer and a reliable measure of intelligence and problem-solving skills.

But Adam, Rees and Hargreaves were not simply interested in weeding out nervous misfits and un-trainable dullards, deemed unable to handle the rigors of army life. They were interested in developing a *New Army*. Believing rational testing and careful screening to be the great equalizer of the British Army, they established a medical division of their own called *AMD 11*.

The *Old Army* had been characterized as bloated, out of date, class-ridden and incapable of fighting in modern warfare arenas. Many saw the *New Army* as a "quasi-revolutionary People's Army," where modern methods and weaponry were used by intelligent, motivated soldiers who knew the mission and their role within it. The *New Army* was a "thinking-persons army," an army that could acknowledge its fears, instead of repressing them, in order to harness its emotions as a motivating force.²¹⁴

Using reliable testing instruments, soldiers were now to be assigned jobs based on their intelligence and aptitude, instead of elitist old school ties. Yet updating the army's old class-ridden culture was no easy matter. Particularly challenging was the task of officer selection.

Officer Selection and the Leaderless Group

During World War I it was assumed that in order to create a skilled and loyal officer tier, men should be recruited who, in theory, already possessed the values of English gentlemen—the public schooled elites. This assumption proved at times fatal. Therefore, at the start of World War II, it was decided all soldiers would begin in the enlisted ranks where promising individuals would be selected to attend officer training based on proven performance and officer interviews.

Yet this system proved flawed as well when senior officers overwhelmingly preferred men from their own class, whether suitably skilled or not, passing over more qualified soldiers from lower-classes. As Eric Trist recalls it, "They were overlooking good candidates and sending forward too many poor ones."²¹⁵ Observing this prejudicial treatment, working-class soldiers were often reluctant to accept nomination when offered, preferring to stay within their own group. Yet with officer training failure rates as high as 60%, many the result of psychiatric breakdown, the army was fast approaching critical shortage. It became imperative that new officer selection processes be implemented.²¹⁶

Therefore, General Adam commissioned a group including Bion, Trist and Sutherland, to develop a more equitable and efficient selection process. Bion made the first of many instrumental contributions by devising the *Leaderless Group*, an egalitarian method of assessing an individual's character in a holistic manner, to be used in conjunction with other screening measures. During this event, candidates were given a task, such as building a bridge, and then observed to see to what extent they were able to maintain personal relationships under the strain. Would a candidate, for instance, disregard the interests of his colleagues in favor of satisfying his own needs as stress intensified?

Another important initiative developed by this group was the *Regimental Nomination* process. In an attempt to overcome class prejudice, actual or perceived, associated with *Old Army* leadership and the previous officer selection processes, Bion developed a nomination scheme whereby men voted via secret ballot for candidates to go forward for officer training.

These new selection procedures proved extremely successful. Not only did the number of officer candidates increase by 1,500%,²¹⁷ by selecting the best qualified soldiers, these new methods restored faith in officer selection as a process which could successfully create a less class-ridden, more skill based *New Army*. British Military historian Shelford Bidwell observed that Bion's *Leaderless Group* was "probably as important to the country's war effort as the 25-pounder gun and the Bailey bridge."²¹⁸ Yet, soldiers still were breaking down in battle.

Although senior army leaders preferred to ignore the psychological toll the war was exacting, the inevitable impact of war neurosis on manpower made it an issue that had to be recognized. Especially burdensome to senior officers was new research that revealed good leadership had tremendous influence over the number of shell-shock cases a unit suffered. For instance, units led by strong commanders often had fewer psychological casualties while other units, involved in the same battle led by different commanders, almost entirely broke down.

For most men it was not outdated notions of character that kept them fighting, as previously imagined, but rather it was loyalty to their group—their unit, hometown and families—that motivated them onwards, helping them contain the chaos of trench warfare. Any break in this support chain, such as a "Dear John" letter from home or the death of a unit leader, increased that chance of psychological breakdown. Further research determined that every soldier would inevitably breakdown sooner or later. As a result, American troops were limited to 210 days of fighting while the British adopted a policy of 400 days, rotating soldiers off the front line for 4 days rest every 12 duty days.

Yet even with all this evidence, many army leaders refused to believe that psychological incidents were a fated price of modern warfare. Although army psychiatrists continued to call for proactive medical planning, *Old Army* leaders refused to make provisions for the inevitable psychological casualties. Many Generals felt that the mere presence of a psychiatrist would promote a loss of discipline, causing rampant war neurosis among their troops.

In one infamous incident an unsympathetic American General George S. Patton confronted a seemingly uninjured U.S. soldier while touring hospitals in Italy. Patton inquired about the soldier's ailment. "Shell-shock, sir" the soldier replied, to which Patton slapped the man's face with his glove calling him "A goddamned coward." In a

similar incident later that month, Patton hit another shell-shocked soldier with the butt of his revolver. Although these incidents eventually cost Patton his command, such stories represent common opinions held by British and American Army leaders toward war neuroses.²¹⁹ Few were willing to recognize the profound influence one's environment can have on the state of mental health.

Northfield Military Hospital

Some of the most significant innovation in group theory and treatment methods advancing our understanding of group behavior and therapeutic communities can be credited to personnel assigned to Northfield Military Hospital in Birmingham, England during the war.²²⁰ Northfield was an antiquated, obtrusive red brick structure with an imposing, copper water tower visible for miles around. Formerly the Hollymoor Mental Hospital, the British Army took it over in April 1942 as a place to treat extreme psychological casualties, "medical misfits"²²¹ who had thus far not responded to treatment.

A large psychiatric hospital with 800 beds,²²² Northfield was divided into two departments: The Hospital Wing and the Military Training and Rehabilitation Wing or Training Wing. When a patient first arrived, he was escorted to the Hospital Wing where, one of about a hundred cases, he was given blue pajamas and personalized treatment, encouraged to relax and meet with his psychiatrist. Once sufficiently recovered, the patient was transferred to the Training Wing where he would be expected to don his uniform again and conform to army protocol and training. Unsurprisingly, men often tried to stay in the Hospital Wing, and their blue pajamas, as long as possible.

Yet, the story of Northfield's revolutionary advancements in the treatment of war neurosis really begins between the wars when a number of individuals were simultaneously wrestling with ideas about group treatment. The premise was that it was possible, if not essential, to employ the entire hospital environment as a therapeutically engaged social field in the treatment of patients.²²³

Working under the guidance of Rickman at the Wharnccliffe Hospital in Shetfield between 1938 and 1939, Bion had outlined a plan in a document known as the *Wharnccliffe Memorandum*. Trist recalled that the Wharnccliffe Memorandum detailed for the first time a prospectus for a planned *therapeutic community* in which a mental health facility would make systematic use of the daily events and relationships within the hospital for treatment.²²⁴ The events that transpired next had widespread impact on the field of psychiatry both during, and after, the war influencing development of a new field called group relations.

Although traditionalists both within army leadership and the medical communities were resistant to thinking of a military hospital as a *therapeutic community*, the demands of war necessitated innovative leadership in treatment, providing an opportunity to implement the ideas outlined in the Wharnccliffe Memorandum. In July 1942 Rickman, commissioned as a Major in the army's Psychiatric Division, took over as director of psychiatry at Northfield. Older than most of his fellow officers, Rickman was a large balding man with sparse gray hair, bushy mustache and round glasses, who was often seen puffing a pipe.

A Quaker, Rickman was a *conscientious objector* in World War I, yet still saw service as an ambulance driver in Russia.²²⁵ Between the wars, Rickman was a student of William Rivers at Cambridge and amassed an impressive resume of analysts including Sigmund Freud, Sandor Ferenczi and Melanie Klein. His comfort with Quaker rituals, which often involved sitting in silence for long periods, influenced his emerging group therapy approaches at Northfield.²²⁶

Bion, also commissioned as a Major, joined Rickman in late 1942, taking charge of Northfield's Training Wing in early 1943.²²⁷ Like Rickman, Bion served in World War I, enlisting prior to his eighteenth birthday in the Tank Corps. He served with distinction as a Tank Officer in France, earning numerous commendations. This front-line battle experience proved invaluable to him, and to army psychiatry, during the Second World War, when his contributions considerably influenced the shape of army psychiatry throughout the war.²²⁸

Although British, Bion was born in India in 1897 to a family who had served there for generations as missionaries, and in police and other governmental positions. His father was an irrigation engineer whose specialty was building dams. As was the custom at the time, Bion was sent to England for schooling at the age of eight and never returned to India.

After World War I, Bion read history at Queen's College, Oxford. A man of large athletic stature, he excelled in swimming, water polo and rugby while at school. After Oxford, Bion took a position as a schoolmaster for two years²²⁹ yet his wife Francesca recalled that "by 1924 it was clear to him where his interest lay—in psychoanalysis."²³⁰ Bion began medical training at University College Hospital, London then continued psychoanalytic training, first with Rickman then with Klein after the war.

Patrick B. de Mare, fellow Northfield staff member, recalled Bion "looked very much the officer of the 'old school' and indeed came from an upper-class Edwardian background with British Raj connections."²³¹ A good deal younger than Rickman, Bion was "a massive man, balding with a thick black moustache, high-coloured cheeks, thick-lensed gold-rimmed spectacles, smoking a large Sherlock-Holmes pipe." An imposing presence with his World War I combat medals, Bion was incongruently shy, often just sitting and smoking in profound silence. de Mare recalled, Bion "rarely spoke, and when he did so it would always be in the form of cryptic comments."²³²

Trist recalled Northfield "functioned as a clearing house" treating and then discharging soldiers according to each man's condition. Since the need for manpower was at its peak, virtually any method of treatment was welcome which might get soldiers, suffering from a range of ailments, back to battle or at least back to a productive role in some aspect of the war effort. Most previous efforts at treatment of the shell-shocked men at Northfield had yielded disappointing results. Therefore, one of the first tasks Rickman undertook was to experiment with group treatment.²³³

Seizing this desperate opportunity to put the ideas outlined in the Wharncliffe Memorandum into practice, Bion and Rickman operationalized the concept of the therapeutic community in what became known as the *First Northfield Experiment*, shifting the focus from individual treatment to that of group process, leadership concepts and social obligation. Paramount was the notion that the group analyzed its own dynamics in the here-and-now, rather than wait for direction from outside authority.²³⁴ Bion outlined his ideas about this First Northfield Experiment in a memo:

Throughout the whole experiment certain basic principles, believed to be absolutely essential, were observed. In order of their importance, they are set down here...

1. The objective of the wing was the study of its own internal tensions, in a real-life situation, with a view to laying bare the influence of neurotic behavior in producing frustration, waste of energy, and unhappiness in a group.
2. No problem was tackled until its nature and extent had become clear at least to the greater part of the group.
3. The remedy for any problem thus classified was only applied when the remedy itself had been scrutinized and understood by the group.
4. Study of the problem of intra-group tension never ceased—the day consisted of 24 hours.
5. It was more important that the method should be grasped, and its rationale, that some solution of a problem of the Wing should be achieved for all time. It was *not* our object to produce an ideal training wing. It *was* our object to send men out with at least some understanding of the nature of intra-group tensions and, if possible, with some idea of how to set about harmonizing them.
6. As in all group activities the study had to commend itself to the majority of the group as worthwhile and for this reason it had to be the study of a real-life situation.²³⁵

In an essay published in *The Lancet* November 27, 1943 Bion further detailed his “scheme for rehabilitation” at Northfield. Central was the notion that neurosis displayed in a group was “a problem of the group” *not* as the army had inferred, solely a problem of the individual. But how to make a group of hundreds of men recognize this fact was Bion’s biggest challenge. Bion recalled, “I became convinced that what was required was the sort of discipline achieved in theatre of war by an experienced officer in command of a rather scallywag battalion.”²³⁶ “But what sort of discipline is that?” he pondered.

Bion observed that it was the discipline required when confronted with two factors: “(1) the presence of the enemy, who provides a common danger and a common aim; and (2) the presence of an officer who, being experienced, knows some of his own failings, respects the integrity of his men, and is not afraid of either their goodwill or their hostility.” In the case of the Training Wing, Bion realized that the common danger and aim must be for the men to recognize “the existence of neurosis as a disability of the community.”²³⁷

To begin his experiment, Bion told the men the following regulations would now apply. Every man must complete one hour’s physical training daily (unless medically excused), participate in the 12:10 pm parade and become a member of at least one group. Any man could start his own new group. If an individual was unwilling to participate in the group for any reason, he must retire to a nurse-monitored restroom where he could read, rest or talk quietly with others there. Bion recalled that his goal in the endeavor was to “produce self-respecting men socially adjusted to the community and therefore willing to accept its responsibilities whether in peace or war.”²³⁸

Although little happened at first, Bion observed that it was evident that a “great deal of discussion, and thinking, was taking place.” Then groups began to form in earnest and multi-colored scheduling charts emerged dictating the time and location of meetings using sophisticated designs. After this initial phase of development, Bion noted, “With surprising rapidity the training wing became self-critical.” Men began wondering why,

for instance, only 20% of the patients were involved in activities. “The other 80% are just a lot of shirkers,” they complained, apparently not recognizing how this comment had been often leveled at them, as a group, by the army as a whole.

In less than a month, Bion’s scheme had resulted in a group of supposedly incurable, undisciplined “medical misfits” taking responsibility for the performance of their unit. Groups were operating well, cases of AWOL (absent-without-leave) were almost nonexistent and an unmistakable esprit-de-corps had taken over the Training Wing. Bion recalled “It was not unlike that seen in a unit of an army under the command of a general in whom they have confidence, even though they cannot know his plans.”²³⁹

Although Bion and Rickman experienced some therapeutic success in a short period of time, their progressive, experimental approach disturbed the rest of the organization. Their alternative philosophies and group treatments challenged traditional medical models and, as a result, created a great deal of animosity among the psychiatrists on staff. In addition, the Commanding Officer, Lieutenant Colonel J. D. W. Pearce, was known to be a rigid thinker and “a terribly conventional little man.”²⁴⁰ The opposition that Bion and Rickman had predicted might occur, when the *Wharncliffe Memorandum* was first created, came to ugly fruition only six weeks after the start of their First Northfield experiment.

What actually caused the demise of this First Northfield Experiment is not clear and the facts have been difficult to determine. Trist recalled that Bion, who was the Messing Officer in addition to his other duties, detected an inaccuracy within the officer’s mess account and concluded that a person of high rank should be implicated. Rather than chance a scandal that might reflect badly on army psychiatry, superiors unceremoniously ordered Bion and Rickman back to the War Office effectively terminating the First Northfield Experiment. Main believed that Bion’s “sacking” was the result of the Commanding Officer and his staff’s inability to tolerate the organizational chaos as Bion attempted to pass the day-to-day functional leadership responsibilities back to the men, who were attempting to make them someone else’s responsibility—namely Bion’s.²⁴¹ In addition, Jon Stokes, former Chairman of the Adult Department of the Tavistock Clinic, recalled it was Harold Bridger’s “view that the failure of Bion’s original experiments to continue beyond six weeks was due to his ignoring the setting in which he was. It is not only the intra-group tensions that need examination but also the influences across the boundary.”²⁴²

Others recalled a somewhat different story, claiming that it was Bion and Rickman’s irreverent attitude towards the rest of the hospital staff, the Commanding Officer in particular, which led to their removal.²⁴³ They thought the two psychiatrists displayed an insular and arrogant attitude toward their peers, and unwisely showed a contemptuous approach in dealing with the bureaucracy of the hospital system and military administration. As a result, it was a relief for many to see them leave.

Trist recalled Bion was livid about what had transpired at Northfield. Even though he was sent to a coveted post on the War Office Selection Board in Winchester, where he would serve with other senior officers, he knew from World War I, Bion felt betrayed. He had even given serious thought to making the incident at Northfield public and risk the consequences. But eventually he dropped the matter. Trist recalled Bion was frustrated because he had wanted to demonstrate at Northfield that the conventional concept of a military psychiatric center was obsolete and that there was a viable alternative: the

therapeutic community he had outlined in the Wharncliffe Memorandum. Fortunately, the work that was started by Bion and Rickman during those early years at Northfield did not go to waste.²⁴⁴

In 1944 Lieutenant Colonel Dennis Carroll became commanding officer heralding a new beginning at Northfield. Unlike his predecessors, Colonel Carroll embraced psychoanalytic treatments at the hospital, having been influenced by the work of Anna Freud. In response, attitudes toward group therapy began to shift as a wider range of staff psychiatrists embraced this new method of treatment.

It is important to note that not only new staff with more liberal attitudes toward treatment had changed. New army policy had directed that only men who had a realistic chance of recovery were to be treated at hospitals like Northfield. The difficult cases, such as those who participated in the First Northfield Experiment, were no longer taken up. As a result, many young soldiers who had earned respect in frontline fighting and D-Day landings in France but felt they had “done enough”²⁴⁵ for their country began arriving in place of the previous group, which had seemed to include chronic neurotics, malingerers and “medical misfits.” Other patients, called *Chindits*, arrived from fighting with General Orde Wingate behind Japanese lines in Burma, having endured horrendous treatment including extreme food and sleep deprivation and diseases. These patients and the treatment challenges they presented brought a new sense of purpose to Northfield, requiring staff evolve their methods to meet patient needs.²⁴⁶

Another key difference in the Second Northfield Experiment was that the directive came from above, not from within, the hospital. Brigadier Rees, impressed with group treatment methods he observed on an impromptu visit to Northfield, set about coordinating future experiments with the help of Hargreaves and support of General Adam, carefully garnering support within proper military circles. Although it may have seemed logical that Bion would have sought to return to Northfield to direct this second project, when asked, he insisted that his former unit, the Training Wing, be situated outside of direct medical control and be led by a regimental officer. Since Bion was a medical officer not a regimental officer, he bowed out in hopes that this new structure would foster greater success than had his First Northfield Experiment had. Therefore, Major Harold Bridger, who was not a psychiatrist, was selected to head the initiative and the Second Northfield Experiment began at the end of 1944.

Bridger had been head of mathematics at an English school before the war, then commanded an Anti-Aircraft Battery, training in the use of a new secret weapon called *radar*.²⁴⁷ Bridger noted that his attempts to reorganize his Battery to embrace the complex combination of socio-technical developments resulted in his next posting to the War Office Selection Board (WOSB).²⁴⁸ At the WOSB, Bridger came into contact with the Tavistock group and the *invisible college*. Working with Hargreaves and communicating with Bion, Bridger was selected to take over command of the Training Wing based on his work at the WOSB, his educational background and previous command experience. Bridger recalled, “In one sense, I welcomed the opportunity and challenge; in another sense I was quietly terrified, since I had no idea of what a mental hospital was like and felt, as in all such changes, as if I had been suddenly de-skilled.”²⁴⁹

With the help of Siegmund Heinrich Fuchs, otherwise known as Michael Foulkes, and then later Thomas Main, Bridger seized the opportunity to reinstitute many of the ideas unsuccessfully attempted by his predecessors. It was an exciting and innovative

time for the staff at Northfield and Bion, Bridger, Rickman and the *invisible college* all kept in regular contact.

Foulkes was a highly trained and charismatic psychoanalyst, part of the wave of German Jewish analysts to immigrate to Britain before the war. He had trained in Vienna with Helena Deutsch, joining Viennese Society before he returned to Frankfurt. He became influenced by neurologist Kurt Goldstein and the Frankfurt School of sociologists, joining the Berlin Society as well. At the invitation of Ernest Jones, Foulkes became a member of British Society in 1937. Although he was away from London for most of the war, Foulkes retained training analyst status within Anna Freud's "B" group, remaining a loyal supporter of the Viennese perspective.²⁵⁰

Intense and innovative, Foulkes experimented with various methods of group treatment before the war, making him well suited for his post at Northfield. He not only felt group treatment was a more efficient use of psychiatrist's time, but groups provided an opportunity to view patients in the quasi-social settings in which they were known to have difficulty operating.²⁵¹

Foulkes was a strong, charismatic personality, able to tolerate uncertainty and project a sense of calm, affecting positively the young psychiatrists on staff, most of them inexperienced in group methods. Many of these young analysts felt Foulkes to be an inspiration, "an original and creative thinker" with a "mind that far exceeded in depth anything we had come across before."²⁵² Where Bion, and his obtuse silences, was often experienced as enigmatic and challenging, Foulkes was felt to be "gentler" and his groups "more democratic." Foulkes' "therapy was like tennis—he let the opponent do most of the work."²⁵³ As a result, he soon developed a devoted circle of loyal followers.

Yet it is curious why Foulkes remains little more than a footnote in group relations history. One interpretation could be hostility toward his German heritage and strong German accent during the war against Hitler. Many patients reported he was "too clever" and they were afraid he might attack them. Foulkes' "groping habit of speech" and mental detours left many unsure about where his thought processes were leading, especially as he often tapered off in an unfinished sentence.²⁵⁴

Another interpretation could be that Foulkes was a loyal supporter of Anna Freud's "B" group back in London while nearly all of the *Tavistock group* were Kleinians. Perhaps some of the controversy being played out in *British Psychoanalytic Society* had seeped into British Army psychiatry and Northfield as well. For instance, fellow Northfield colleague Tom Main could hardly hide his disdain, describing Foulkes as "a funny little refugee whom no one could understand, a nobody."²⁵⁵ Another colleague, Martin James, recalled Foulkes' mannerisms and "piercing glance" was thought by soldiers "to exert a sinister influence" over his groups. As a result, when a tour of visiting Americans traveled to Northfield, Foulkes was asked not to attend the group sessions because it was believed he might leave a bad impression on the visitors.²⁵⁶

Yet Foulkes remained unflappable, continuing to develop his theories and mentor younger colleagues with an unshakable sense of inner confidence. Just as Bion had emphasized during the First Northfield Experiment, Foulkes believed the central goal for treatment was to get the shell-shocked soldier to start taking responsibility for himself again. And he remained dedicated to developing efficient ways to achieve this goal. After

the war Foulkes founded his own organization, based on principles developed at Northfield, called the *Institute of Group Analysis*.

Bridger made structural as well as treatment changes at Northfield, emphasizing to his staff that the entire organization was to be integrated, a “hospital-as-a-whole” approach.²⁵⁷ In a large open ward he established *The Hospital Club*, provided for use by the patients in any manner they saw fit. After some time of disuse, a group of soldiers confronted the staff in protest demanding to know why, in this time of war, public space was being squandered in this manner. While many staff feared mutiny, Bridger was ecstatic that his patients had so quickly returned to their roles as soldiers and concerned citizens.

Like Bion in the first experiment, Bridger and his staff fostered the creation of recreational and social groups. No longer were staff to direct tasks to be carried out, instead all decisions were left to the patients. Foulkes recalled that allowing the patients to run the hospital, and the resultant increased spontaneity in activities, enlivened the whole hospital atmosphere. This philosophy was the essence of Bion’s therapeutic community, outlined in the Wharnccliffe Memorandum, and attempted during the First Northfield Experiment and would become central in the post-war development of the Tavistock model of group relations.

Meanwhile, Bion was involved in another special project exploring uncharted areas of military psychiatry called *21 Army group*. Based on lessons learned in North Africa, where patients removed from their units deteriorated more quickly, the premise of the 21 Army group project was to bring psychiatric treatment directly to the battle front,²⁵⁸ a recommendation which had been made by Charles Myers during the First World War. Unfortunately, before Bion could really get the project going, the unexpected death of his wife forced his recall back to England and the 21 Army group project went on without him.

Bion was posted to a reclassification and rehabilitation board at Sanderstead in Surrey, allowing him to continue his group work with therapeutic communities yet in slightly different ways. Trist recalled that since most able-bodied men had already been recruited to the war effort, the rehabilitation, reclassification and redeployment of officers had now become a more important priority than their selection. Therefore, under Bion’s supervision the reclassification and rehabilitation board was turned into a special form of therapeutic community, providing a model for other boards. Another major success for Bion, and a clear example of his influence, was that these reclassification and rehabilitation units were not under medical control. Therefore, patients did not think of themselves as suffering from mental illness.²⁵⁹

After the war, key participants began to transfer out of Northfield back to civilian life. The new staff only stayed for short periods of time, even though patients, including prisoners of war, continued to arrive steadily for treatment. Consequently, the enthusiasm, energy and innovation of the earlier days at Northfield evaporated, and the old system restored itself. The army vacated the hospital in 1948, leaving it in a dirty and dilapidated condition.

Yet, wartime therapeutic experiences in general, and the Northfield experiments in particular, can be credited with exposing a generation of psychiatrists and laymen alike to a new treatment method called group therapy and the idea of a therapeutic community. On a more generous interpretation, Northfield could also be considered the beginning of a

whole new way of working experientially with groups experiential learning and the start of a new professional field called group relations.

Key figures at Northfield including members of the invisible college went on to make major contributions to numerous organizations after the war. Fields of influence included psychiatry and other areas of mental health, organizational consulting, business management, higher education and other social sciences. Although not as closely linked, lessons extrapolated from the Northfield experiments became key underpinnings of another field that emerged in the 1970s called organizational development. For example, Northfield proved that social innovations, which often have a start in a special part of an organization, are not likely to survive unless the whole system changes in the direction of the innovation as well.

Another innovation gleaned from Northfield was to situate treatment outside of the medical system as a means to accelerate recovery thereby avoiding the stigma of a patient being *sick*. Including non-medical personnel as group consultants was discovered to speed patients' recovery while saving money by cutting back on more expensive medical personnel. Trist recalled this strategy was especially prevalent during the development of the Civil Resettlement Units (CRUs) designed to help soldiers transition back to civilian life after the war. The CRUs used regimental officers trained to run groups, employing only two psychiatrists in the entire organization. Bion's notion that the psychiatrist's job was to create an environment where ordinary resources could be employed to regulate societal behavior once again proved successful.²⁶⁰

These lessons learned during wartime experimentation at Northfield elevated the importance, and broadened the application, of psychotherapy in general and group therapy in particular. In fact, the work done by British Army psychiatrists during World War II challenged traditional psychiatry, people's attitudes towards treatment, mental health and the entire structure of the medical system. This quest for a deeper understanding of groups and a wider application for group relations theories and practices, originated at Northfield, became the foundation of the Tavistock model of group relations.

Cultural changes By the end of the war, every element of British life had changed drastically: politics, industry, economics, labor, the status of women, issues of race, and the very definition of what constituted English qualities. Between 1945 and 1951, the Labour government established the basic outlines of Britain's social democratic system, which remained fundamentally unchanged until the election of Margaret Thatcher in 1979.

World War II, fought "to make the world safe for democracy," had sensitized the world to the evils of authoritarianism and the need to create more democratic organizations. Addressing these goals, Britain's new system supported a commitment to a mixed economy, the belief that the state should intervene in economic life for the maintenance of full employment, a nationalized health service and a social security system that guaranteed a minimum standard of living for all. Although few could argue, in principle, with the democratic values and egalitarian philosophies behind these ideals, making this new system operational became a lofty goal, with unforeseen repercussions. New perspectives about politics and the power and reach of the State, fresh attitudes towards industrial organization and the reevaluation of the social status of women and the underclass became increasing concerns.²⁶¹

For example, during the war nearly everything was rationed in the United Kingdom and continued to be well after the war was over. Rationing provided a stark awakening to the different privileges associated with class distinctions. Ironically, for many working-class British this highly rationed diet was a great improvement over what they had been subsisting on prior to the war. In addition, a shortage of labor blurred previous social taboos about what constituted women's and men's work. The evacuation of millions of children away from the dangerous manufacturing centers, and therefore their families, to safer locations in the English countryside, often resulted in prolonged family separations. By wars end, nearly every aspect of British life had been affected.

Although Britain's new more egalitarian social system improved the quality of life for many individuals, the construction of a welfare state and emergence of a consumption economy increased the size and scale of institutions individuals encountered on a daily basis. For some, the material gains did not outweigh the alienation, powerlessness and fragmentation that this increase in modern bureaucratization had wrought.²⁶²

As a result, the time was ripe for the development of a way to reconsider the influence of leadership, authority and organizations in an effort to rehumanize life within the ubiquitous institutions emerging in Great Britain's modern society. The Tavistock Clinic, through its Tavistock Institute, developed just such a model as one way to help people better cope with these new institutional anxieties. In what might be referred to as a historic moment, British culture's need for new methods intersected with the availability of appropriate theoretical perspectives, resulting in the development of a new field, the field of group relations.

6: Tavistock Institute: The Foundational Years

The Tavistock Clinic—originally known as *Tavistock Square Clinic for Functional Nervous Disorders*, then *Tavistock Institute of Medical Psychology* and now *The Tavistock and Portman NHS Trust*—was founded in London in 1920. In part the result of psychological studies conducted during World War I, the Clinic’s establishment represented a growing shift in societal thinking about mental health between the world wars. Similar to Karl Abraham’s clinic in Berlin detailed previously, the Tavistock Clinic was established as one of the first non-residential mental health clinics in Great Britain to provide psychoanalytic psychotherapy on an affordable, outpatient basis. Later, the Clinic became an important center for training mental health professionals and consultants. Founded on the vision and energy of psychiatrist Hugh Crichton-Miller, it was hoped the Clinic would become a model for others to follow. Unfortunately, this goal was not soon realized as other psychoanalytically-based clinics were slow to be established.

In addition to Crichton-Miller, the original Tavistock Clinic staff consisted of nine doctors: J .R. Rees, who would replace Crichton-Miller as director in 1926, J. A. Hadfield, Mary Hemingway, Neill Hobhouse, E. A. Hamilton Pearson, W. A. Potts, Evelyn Saywell and Leslie Tucker.²⁶³ Joined by professionals from a range of backgrounds including anthropology, psychology and other social sciences, this uniquely eclectic group showed from the beginning their desire to link social sciences with the medical field. Trist recalled, “Among the 80 physicians who contributed six hours a week, many had little or no psychiatric training. Nevertheless, by the beginning of World War II the Tavistock had attained international standing.”²⁶⁴ The varied backgrounds of Clinic members fostered an early tolerance and integration of differing professional viewpoints which has remained a common element in the Tavistock Clinic’s work ever since.²⁶⁵

Eager to apply psychotherapeutic lessons learned with soldiers during World War I to civilians in peacetime, *Tavistock Square Clinic for Functional Nervous Disorders* was established on a three-year experimental basis and expected to be incorporated into larger hospitals’ methods once its value was recognized. The Clinic took up residency in an abandoned *Victory Club*, or veteran’s hostel, at No. 51 Tavistock Square, London WC1. Tavistock historian H. V. Dicks recalled that this neighborhood in London’s Bloomsbury section was rather rundown at the time, the building “depressing” and “gloomy.” Its furnishings, donated by sympathetic supporters, were “both sparse and ramshackle.” But “the lease was very cheap” and it was in the center of town, close to

Harley Street where many doctors who donated service had private practices, making the location an easy commute. When the Clinic finally opened, staff spirits were running high and founding director Crichton-Miller recalled “my dream has come true.”²⁶⁶

While writing this book, I was living quite close to Bloomsbury in a rented flat in London’s Islington section. One day I decided to visit No. 51 Tavistock Square, the origin and namesake of both the Tavistock Clinic and Tavistock Institute. It did not take long to get there winding down the hill of Great Percy Street, crossing Grey’s Inn Road, turning left on Judd Street then right to Tavistock Place and the Square. I entered a regimented square with a well-tended park in the center, bordered by a crisply painted black iron fence, whose gate would be locked at 5:18 p.m., and wandered among wide stately trees that I suspected might have been standing in 1920 when the Clinic first occupied No. 51. Secured by a wide sidewalk, the park’s perimeter was a bustle of rapidly walking business people in search of lunch, students enroute to the University of London, and tourists like me ambling along.

The low buildings guarding the perimeter, seemed to gaze reservedly through the trees, and comprised a mixture of old and new construction. Some clearly were pre-war buildings, others not. Which one was No. 51, I wondered? Searching for numbers proved difficult and I deduced that the original site of the Clinic was now occupied by the Tavistock Hotel, which spanned the entire city block.

The concierge behind the hotel desk confirmed that, although the hotel was “un-numbered,” it had been built in the 1950s after the demolition of a number of smaller buildings which most likely included No. 51. Undeterred, I crossed the street and entered the park, not sure what, exactly, I was looking for. Part of me expected to find a war statue or plaque commemorating people’s military service during the world wars. Yet, to my surprise, what I discovered at Tavistock Square were memorials to *conscientious objectors*.

In the center of the park stood a large, impressive statue of Mahatma Gandhi dedicated on “the 125th anniversary of his birth, October 2, 1996.” He sat cross legged and Buddha-like, peacefully gazing downward toward the viewer below. Around the base of the statue were dozens of offerings, freshly cut flowers and packages of food. I continued along the path, along which hundreds of flowers were already pushing up through the early spring muddiness, carpeting the earth in a profusion of yellow, purple and white. And scattered around the park were numerous dedications to “peace” on plaques attached to trees and benches.

As I approached the north side of the park an immense chunk of stone became visible under the trees to my left, seeming both to belong and not belong to the world around it. The imposing granite—large, dark, sharp and angular—seemed as if recently knocked off the side of some mountain by Zeus wielding a colossal hammer. A dissonant yet tranquil representation of solidity amidst London’s chaos, the trees and flowers surrounding it made it seem oddly at home. Affixed to the boulder, a plaque announced its austere purpose: “To all those who have and are maintaining the right to refuse to kill. Their foresight and courage give us hope.” This solid imposing form was dedicated by Conscientious Objectors to Military Service on May 15th, 1994 International Conscientious Objectors’ Day.

How ironic, I thought, the square which had housed the Tavistock Clinic and Institute, organizations owing so much to psychological insights gained during war, now

contained a park commemorating conscientious objectors! Would this seem inappropriate to Tavistock founders, I wondered. Or would they recognize it as an understandable—if not essential—sign that priorities had shifted over the last sixty years?

The staff of the Tavistock Clinic was proud of its contributions to the war effort, both in service and back home in London. Although the Clinic moved its offices in 1939 to a safer location at Westfield Women's College in Hampstead, it never closed its doors, continuing service throughout the war. Because of this move, much of the Clinic's records and furniture were stored for safe keeping in a unit on Store Street. The relocated Clinic evaded bombing, but the storage facility was destroyed, therefore few pre-war records have survived.²⁶⁷

Dicks recalled that, like many organizations after the Second World War, the Tavistock Clinic was challenged to pick up the pieces remaining of their once thriving organization and rebuild. "We had lost more than we had gained in pride and prestige. We had lost our building and our hope of extension, most of our records, most of our library; we had had to stop most of our training activities and research, which was beginning to pay off so handsomely both to the Fellows themselves and to our reputation as a serious scientific institution."²⁶⁸ In addition, the Clinic "had a paltry sum with which to restart," and was therefore reduced once more to "a beggarly small outfit by no means in the main stream of British psychiatry and anxious to find a role in the post-war world."²⁶⁹

Although Clinic staff may have felt a bit behind, the mood was in no way hopeless. Spirits remained high with a strong sense of camaraderie, as a common vision for the organization began to emerge from the post-war chaos. Clinic staff vowed not to attempt to compete or catch-up with larger, mainstream mental health institutions but rather to develop a new model by which to structure their organization. By capitalizing on input from their interdisciplinary staff group the Clinic began to formulate its plan. One of the hallmarks of this emerging Tavistock approach was a self-conscious recognition of, and dedication to, the process of evolving a new model. This hallmark, first espoused at the Clinic, would be passed on to the Tavistock Institute during its formation in the ensuing years.

On July 5, 1945, the National Health Service (NHS) was launched in the United Kingdom, essentially ushering in an era of socialized medicine still in use in modified form today. In response, an Interim Planning Committee was established at the Tavistock Clinic to consider the Clinic's future role within the NHS and redefine its mission in light of experiences gained during the war. This committee was chaired by Bion, who used his new understanding of groups, to help clarify issues and reduce conflicts within the committee itself, facilitating the committee's approval of his report by year's end. This report diagrammed the Clinic's tasks as: (1) exploration of the role of outpatient psychiatry based on a dynamic approach and oriented toward the social sciences in the still undefined settings of the new National Health Service and (2) incorporation of the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations for the study of wider social problems not currently seen as being within the purview of the mental health profession.²⁷⁰ This psychodynamically-grounded social science approach to the study and amelioration of wider social problems was visionary, paving the way for the development of the Tavistock Institute and its field of group relations. Yet Trist recalled "No one knew what

the demand was likely to be for out-patient psychological treatment. The Tavistock was the only institution entering the Health Service offering it in the adult field.”²⁷¹

The post-war reorganization of the Tavistock Clinic was so heavily influenced by the military experience of its staff, most former members of the invisible college, that it was jokingly nicknamed *Operation Phoenix*: Out of the ashes of war, the Tavistock Clinic had risen again, capitalizing on the group’s wartime experiments, especially those gleaned from Northfield.²⁷² The results of these experiences suggested that the best solution to the Clinic’s restructuring challenges would be found in group treatment. Trist recalled,

Once more Bion was called upon to become the pioneer, though this time many were soon to join him. I remember him putting up a notice: ‘You can have group treatment now or you can wait a year (or more) and have individual treatment.’²⁷³

Not surprisingly, people chose the former and the rest became history.

Although many of the Clinic’s staff supported restructuring and refocusing organizational purpose, as with all *idea organizations*, it was not expected that *all* staff members would be able to adjust to these changes and there were a number of resignations by senior staff, Dicks recalled.²⁷⁴ The root of the philosophical struggle lay in conflicts between new ideas about social psychiatry and about groups, predominantly supported by “the Army group” and “the more orthodox, old-fashioned Freudian group,” which regarded this shift away from traditional notions of individual treatment as a “betrayal of their principles.”²⁷⁵ Yet as a result of these debates, a new multidisciplinary model slowly emerged at the Tavistock Clinic. In time, these ideas about group treatment evolved to form the foundation of the Tavistock model of group relations.

In addition to contributions made as a direct result of war-time experiences, the changing social values and cultural constructs of the post-war period also influenced the emerging Tavistock model. Citizens of Great Britain had been deeply affected by their wartime experiences. Cultural changes The post-war construction of a British welfare state, in part a response to an increased awareness of the inequities of pre-war class distinctions, significantly changed the material structure of most British lives. Other social and political challenges emerged as well, such as tensions around English citizenship, gender inequities, the expansion of social programs, the establishment of the NHS and increased consumerism, all of which helped redefine post-war British culture.²⁷⁶

Cultural changes

In some people’s opinions, the positive aspects of these social changes were offset by the increase in prevalence and involvement of government institutions required to provide social services. Many war-weary Britons were left feeling overcome by a sense of alienation, powerlessness and fragmentation. As a result, some perceived a need to study leadership, authority and organizations as part of an effort to rehumanize life within the ubiquitous institutions emerging in modern British society.

While the Tavistock Clinic was reorienting toward its visionary new goals, post-war debt and economic decline put Britain in a financial slump. Thus, the larger culture contained mixed signals. On one hand, the time was right to develop a new way to research and evaluate organizations so as to understand the wider social implications of

society's post-war restructuring and widespread institutionalization. Yet, on the other hand, a pressing problem remained: How could such research and learning about wider social problems be funded? Additionally, what methods of investigation and application could be used to study and ameliorate social problems? Some answers to both problems were found over the next few years by a sub-unit of the Tavistock Clinic, the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations.

Tavistock Institute of Human Relations

Dicks recalled, it was agreed that the “new social and preventative social psychiatry work would be done under the guise of a new division rather than the Tavistock Clinic itself.²⁷⁷ Therefore, the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations became incorporated in September 1947 as a separate institute, yet still functioning within the matrix of the larger Tavistock Clinic. It was a time of introspection as both the Clinic and the newly formed Institute struggled to establish and sustain separate identities.²⁷⁸

Assisted by Elliott Jaques and Eric L. Trist, the Institute's first *Management Committee* chair was Alexander Thomson Macbeth “Tommy” Wilson. Wilson was a “brilliant kaleidoscopic figure” with a diverse range of skills and experience, a “unifying view” of life and “apparently inexhaustible source” of energy.²⁷⁹ He was a man “ahead of his times,” a combination medical scientist and psychiatrist, concerned not only with the “human individual” as a person but how that “translated into concrete terms” within wider society.²⁸⁰ He viewed with “singular clarity that no human or social problem could be satisfactorily tackled by one or two disciplines only.”²⁸¹ Instead, Wilson endorsed collaboration and an interdisciplinary approach, preferring “to treat society and its institutions rather than individuals.” Treatment

Like many strong figures in the history of group study, Wilson had a mixed reputation. He was known to possess a “toughness of mind and a very sharp set of intellectual teeth that made short work of illusion and pretense.” Yet he was remembered as “a controversialist and a radical,” who “could say the most outrageous things;” a habit which did not always endear him to his professional colleagues. Yet fellow Tavistock Institute member Ben S. Morris recalled Wilson's kindness, “coruscating wit” and “very evident humanity” allowed him to “get away with it nearly every time.”²⁸²

A Scottish psychiatrist, Wilson came to London in 1931 at the age of 26, to teach physiology at Middlesex Hospital Medical School. Between 1934 and 1940, Wilson was a Rockefeller Fellow at the Tavistock Clinic and then joined the war effort, working in army psychiatry with the others in the *Tavistock group*. This connection to the Rockefeller Foundation proved especially important to the Institute's future.

Wilson recalled that the Institute was established as a charitable not-for-profit organization, intending its work to be financed by grants, contracts and gifts. The goal was to provide “collaborative services” and undertake “studies concerned with human relations in the family, the factory, and the community.” Governed by a Council of eight members elected from an association of fifty, “the technical work of the Institute [was] directed by a Management Committee drawn from the staff.”²⁸³ In addition to Wilson, the original thirteen members of the Tavistock Institute were Wilfred Bion, John Bowlby, Harold Bridger, H. V. Dicks, F. Frost, John Harvard-Watts, Elliott Jaques, John Kelnar, Isabel E. P. Menzies, Ben S. Morris, H. Phillipson, J. D. Sutherland and Eric L. Trist.²⁸⁴

Ben S. Morris contended the Tavistock Institute was based on three principles: “First and foremost, a therapeutic approach to human problems;” second, the integration of “medical and social studies...through the insights of psychoanalysis;” and third, a “devotion to social action and related research and training.”²⁸⁵

Wilson described how the “Institute grew out of military psychiatric and psychological work during the last war,” where it was found that “prevention of emotional breakdown was at least as important as treatment.” An obvious reference to Bion’s idea of a therapeutic community and the work at Northfield, Wilson’s interdisciplinary staff were intrigued with two ideas: First, that prevention could be done on a large-scale basis and, second, that changes in the environment had a direct impact on “circumstances contributing to the breakdown.”²⁸⁶

In other words, based on war-time studies which had determined that *all* soldiers would eventually breakdown, Institute staff were intrigued by how environmental stressors might affect individuals’ emotional experience and productivity. They were interested in the interplay between social and technical elements within one’s environment. They grounded this perspective not only in their own war-time experiences, but also in a wide body of knowledge drawn from clinical psychiatry, depth psychologies, Lewinian field theory, group dynamics, psychoanalysis, social anthropology, social psychology and socio-metrics.

Financial support for the Institute’s new ideas grew quickly and by February 1, 1946 they had already secured a three-year Rockefeller Foundation grant from the U.S. for £22,000, along with two other anonymous donations. Dicks recalled, “As always, the Americans saw more in our work and ideas than our own people.”²⁸⁷ By the end of the 1949 fiscal year, the Institute had nearly doubled its income to £40,222 with £34,161 the result of three grants alone: Rockefeller Foundation, Medical Research Council grant and Elmgrant Trust. The remainder of the Institute’s income was the result of project earnings, lectures, consultation, articles and private donations.

Interestingly £1,715, almost 5% of the Institute’s income in 1949, was allotted to “fees paid for Psycho-analytic Training of staff.”²⁸⁸ As this figure reflects, many if not all Institute staff participated in some form of psychoanalysis during this period, which the Institute financially supported. Both Isabel Menzies Lyth and Ben S. Morris recalled this period as “the year of the half-colonels” because “between 1946 and 1949” many former military members were “students at the London Institute of Psychoanalysis.”²⁸⁹

Joining her colleagues, Menzies Lyth also started psychoanalytic training after the war recalling “everyone was going Kleinian, so I went too.” One reason behind Institute staff’s gravitation toward analysis, she recalled, was that they believed as long as their ideas were honest and valid, they would ultimately have to be accepted, and the psychoanalytic perspective helped in this approach: “Science will triumph as long as it’s honest.”²⁹⁰

This early grant funding afforded the Institute the luxury of time, reducing pressure to scramble for commercial clients during these foundational years. They were able to focus on their vision and what Wilson described as “opportunities for satisfactory work, and giving community organizations the chance to assess the competence of the Institute staff to assist them with their problems.”²⁹¹ As a result of this outreach, over forty projects were undertaken in the Institute’s first four years, some on short- and others on long-term basis.

These projects crystallized into seven main activity areas: governmental projects, selection and training for management, joint consultation, promotion schemes, social change, patterns of family living, fact-finding and surveys. During this time, Institute staff often worked closely with their Clinic colleagues, conducting joint research. The Institute focused on prevention, while the Clinic focused on treatment of mental instabilities.²⁹² In addition, Wilson noted between 1947 and 1949 five “self-study groups” were conducted at the Institute providing “a valuable experience for students of social science wishing to acquaint themselves at first hand with the phenomena of interpersonal relations and the development of social relations in groups.”²⁹³

On October 28, 1947, Tavistock Publications Ltd. was incorporated in order to publish work on the intersection of social science and psychoanalytic thought. This included the publication of a quarterly journal, *Human Relations*, whose focus is “the integration of the social sciences.” Edited by Eric Trist, the first volume of *Human Relations* was jointly sponsored with Kurt Lewin’s *Research Center for Group Dynamics*, University of Michigan and included his last major paper, *Frontiers in Group Dynamics*, published after his untimely death that year.

This joint sponsorship and publication of Lewin’s paper is one of the first demonstrable links between methods of group study being pioneered in the United States under Lewin’s leadership and those being developed in the United Kingdom at Tavistock. Eventually the Institute took over as the sole publisher of *Human Relations*, an arrangement that continues for this mainstay journal in the field of group study today. Lewin continued to have significant impact on staff thinking at the Tavistock Institute, especially influencing co-founder Eric Trist, who had met Lewin while a student at Cambridge before the war. Trist recalled Lewin had left Germany and was on his way to the U.S. when he visited Cambridge in the early 1930s. “One of the highpoints” of Trist’s life, he described a tea party hosted in Lewin’s honor where Trist’s mentor Professor Frederick Bartlett said “Trist, you have an hour to show Professor Lewin around Cambridge before his train.”²⁹⁴

They wound up at the statue of Issac Newton where “Kurt stood gazing at Newton” and then began to describe the “diagram that he was doing for the book on topological psychology.” Enthralled by his “advance view” of Lewin’s upcoming research, they nearly missed the train but Trist “just managed to open the carriage door and push him in. I always treasure that memory of Lewin being thrust, by me, into a railway carriage.”²⁹⁵ Years later, Trist negotiated to bring Lewin to London to work with him and his colleagues at the Institute. Unfortunately, due to Lewin’s death in 1947, this collaboration never came to fruition.

These early group theorists, working in concert, but from a distance, realized that a conceptual framework needed to be developed in which relationships within groups could be examined. During these early days, distinctions that now clearly separate the different group models, represented for example by the National Training Laboratories (NTL) in America and the Tavistock Institute in Britain, had not yet crystallized. Still in their formative stages, scholars on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean often shared common theories, methods and even language about working with groups.

Powerful individual contributions occurred both in the U.S. and UK, influencing this exciting post-war period. In the U.S., Lewin’s work with Ronald Lippitt, Kenneth Benne and Leland Bradford, and the emergence of the *human interaction laboratory*

during a 1946 *Connecticut Workshop in Human Relations*, had worldwide impact. In the UK, Bion's theories about people's behavior in groups and other socio-technical projects being pursued by Trist, Bridger, Rice, Jaques and Menzies at the Institute, also were influential.

Many people have noted the collegial spirit of these early collaborative times. Eric J. Miller, director of the Tavistock Institute's Group Relations Training Programme (1970-1996), recalled that "Lewin had significant influence on my early Tavistock colleagues in the late 1940s. The Tavistock group shared his conviction that conventional modes of scientific analysis would not uncover the 'Gestalt properties of complex human systems.'"²⁹⁶

Although Lewin died in 1947, the Tavistock Institute continued to pursue connections with his organizations. For example, in an effort to explore further opportunities to collaborate in the study of the complexities of human systems two Tavistock psychoanalysts, Tom Main and Isabel Menzies Lyth, traveled to NTL's facilities in Bethel, Maine in 1948 to a human interaction laboratory.²⁹⁷ In 1949, Trist recalled there was also "an international summer school" in London, which took place between Tavistock Institute staff and members of "the Research Center for Group Dynamics of the University of Michigan."²⁹⁸

The significant influence of this cross-pollination between American and British group theorists runs deeply through their early work. Miller makes this point clear: "The first Leicester Conference was explicitly a British 'translation' of NTL, using Bion's group-as-a-whole perspective from group psychotherapy."²⁹⁹ In addition Trist, director of the Institute's first Leicester Conference, noted that this event was "the first full-scale experiment in Britain with the laboratory method of training in group relations."³⁰⁰ Miller described how this reference to "the laboratory method" was an obvious credit to Lewin, the NTL and its human interaction laboratory method "which had strongly influenced the early Tavistock group."³⁰¹

In addition to evidence that the Leicester Conference design incorporated theories and methods adapted from NTL, there is evidence that the Tavistock Institute adopted NTL terminology as well. For instance, in 1959, Trist and Sofer published a report of the first Leicester Conference and in it often used NTL-like language—e.g. *laboratory*, *here-and-now*, and *social islands*—when describing Tavistock's group relations conference events. All of these terms were made famous a decade earlier in the U.S. by Lewin and his followers at the NTL.

Yet, despite evidence of early cross-pollination, Tavistock and NTL models soon began to diverge as differences emerged which would later become defining trends for these separate models. Menzies Lyth recalled how some of these differences were evident from the very beginning:

We had a huge conference [in 1949] in England, when a lot of the people came across from America, people from Michigan³⁰²...It was interesting because the differences began to appear, very clearly. The major difference between the American group and ours in England was, of course, our basis in psychoanalysis—that was a huge difference. I can remember that conference quite clearly and being quite surprised sometimes at the things the Americans said. Because they hadn't got our psychoanalytic—I mean I was an absolute babe in psychoanalysis at the time—but nevertheless it permeated our thinking...It was all very new...[NTL was] much more

‘scientific’. You know there was a lot of research, open research going on. And that again struck me as being extremely odd. Because they didn’t take any account of the effect the research was having on the members of the conference, on their behavior. It was really quite strange to me...It ceased really to have much effect on our work [after that].³⁰³

As Menzies Lyth makes clear, the theories and methods of the Institute began to drift away from their early connection to Lewin and NTL:

I think we were a little shocked by their naiveté in psychoanalytic terms and I think sometimes we made it rather plain that we thought so. I can remember one of the American gentlemen said ‘Let’s take a simple example, let’s take milk’ and we all went ‘What! Milk?’...We couldn’t see how—*why*—anybody could possibly think that milk was simple. I think they actually said bread, but we didn’t think bread was all that simple either.³⁰⁴ As a result of NTL’s focus at the individual level focus rather than group-as-a-whole, its fixation on “scientific” research methods and lack of awareness of psychoanalytic principles, Institute staff could not continue their previous cross-pollination.

Menzies Lyth recalled, as “the differences began to appear” between NTL and Tavistock perspectives, “we began to feel that we had perhaps got better bedfellows elsewhere. And then through Margaret Rioch we met people like Larry Gould...Kathy White was later...Margaret came with these various bright young men”³⁰⁵ and the Institute found a more psychoanalytically-versed connection in the U.S., which better matched their own interests.³⁰⁶ links

As the British economy struggled through its post-war reorganization, grants for research became scarce. The government formed an Industrial Productivity Committee whose goal was to make money available for research intended to improve worker productivity through better use of human resources. The Tavistock Institute seized this opportunity to test the applicability of its theories and models developed in war-time settings to non-military environments, applying for, and receiving, three separate grants that sustained its work over the next few years. Although these projects were successful, with one study resulting in the publication of the Institute’s first major book, *The Changing of a Factory* by Elliott Jaques in 1951, the response from the social science field was silence—much of the Institute’s work was too experience-based experiential learning and ahead of its time to receive much attention or support.³⁰⁷

Staff membership also had shifted. By 1950 eight Institute founders had departed for other employment, including Bion, Bowlby and Sutherland. The staff group now consisted of Bridger, Frost, Jaques, Menzies, Trist and Director Wilson joined by newcomers P. H. Cook, Adam Curle, Sidney Gray, Renee Hurstfield, Pearl H. M. King, Irwin Leff, Colin Legum, Alex Mitchell and A. K. Rice.³⁰⁸ Cultural change

Still considered a *small* group, by group study standards, the staff were a cohesive and productive organization. As A. Kenneth Rice pointed out a group this size is ideal because “the relationships that have to be sustained in groups with more than twelve to fifteen members become so complex that the group tends to split into subgroups.”³⁰⁹ Pierre M. Turquet made this point even more clearly, observing that “a membership of twelve seems to be getting near the upper limit of a single member’s capacity to encompass and take in, with sixteen as the extreme limit.” In a moment of historical foreshadowing, Turquet noted, any groups larger “seem to get little or no work done.”³¹⁰

As the 1950s continued, the Institute was challenged to evolve in new directions to sustain itself financially. As a result, it turned to consultancy and the needs of private industry as a new source of funding. These projects were priced in a way which provided support for the long-term social science projects that were too unconventional to be supported by traditional funding sources, such as foundations or government.³¹¹ Although the Institute had managed its first pressing problem adequately by the mid-1950s—financial support for its programs—the second challenge about what methods of investigation and application could be used to study and ameliorate *wider social problems* still remained largely unaddressed. Yet research conducted by Jaques at Glacier Metal Company, Trist in British coal mines, Rice at Calico Mills in Ahmedabad India and Menzies Lyth with hospital nurses all became influential.

Trist and Rice's research contributed to the field by developing a socio-technical approach which provided a way to optimize both human elements and technological imperatives within organizations without subverting either. Jaques³¹² and Menzies Lyth's research contributed to the field by providing a new lens through which to investigate how organizations develop mechanisms to defend against anxiety inherent in the system. These groundbreaking studies examined the interrelationships among external and internal forces on group dynamics and productivity, offering a general theory of social behavior and paving the way for further developments in the field of group relations.

As these examples evidence, the Tavistock Institute was amazingly innovative during its first years of existence. Yet as with all *idea organizations*, as it completed its first decade it was time to evolve theories and methodologies, and restructure the institution accordingly. Unfortunately, this challenge proved a daunting one as leadership changes exacerbated inter-group rivalries, thwarting efforts at reorganization. As a result, the organization was headed toward fragmentation.

7: Organizational Fragmentation

In 1958, Tommy Wilson resigned as chair of the Tavistock Institute to take up his new post as strategic adviser at Unilever, leaving the organization in the very experienced and capable hands of Eric L. Trist, as chair, and the rest of the management committee. An Institute founder, ten-year veteran of the Institute's management committee and former war-time member of the *Tavistock group*, Trist was a popular choice for the post. Often described as "a near genius," "ahead of his time," and "one of the most original thinkers," Trist seemed to embody all the Institute had represented in its first decade of existence, and signaled hope for a strong role for it in the future of the social sciences.³¹³

Born in 1909, the only son of a Scottish governess and Cornish Sea Captain, Trist was a grammar school (i.e. public school) boy who attended Cambridge on scholarship, studying English literature, then psychology. After graduation, he was selected as a Commonwealth Fund Fellow, a British form of Rhodes Scholar, to study at Yale University. He traveled to the U.S. in 1933 for two years of research in Depression-era America, an experience which ignited his political activist sensibilities. He returned to Scotland and a lectureship at the University of St. Andrews until war broke out.

From 1939 until 1941, Trist was a senior clinical psychologist at Maudesley Hospital in Mill Hill near London, where he treated war casualties. Members of the *Tavistock group* visited Mill Hill and, impressed with his work, urged him to join them in uniform. Ignoring advice against it, Trist accepted the invitation, joining the British army as a Captain in 1941. He was assigned to the War Office Selection Boards, where he made significant contributions with others from the *Tavistock group* assigned there. Toward war's end Trist, now a Lieutenant Colonel, became active in the development of Civil Resettlement Units designed to help returning prisoners of war readjust to civilian life. His work in this capacity earned him the coveted *Order of the British Empire* (OBE), awarded by the King.³¹⁴

Trist was a prolific writer and passionate social science researcher. For instance results of his 1951 research with K. W. Bamforth studying the longwall method of coal-getting in Great Britain earned him widespread recognition.³¹⁵ Trist's development of the concept of *socio-technical systems*, which recognized the inter-relatedness of technical and socio-psychological factors in the workplace, and identified of the importance of semi-autonomous work groups to worker productivity were hugely influential.³¹⁶ These innovations directly influenced post-war theories about industrial democracy, spawning an international *quality of work-life movement*, particularly popular in the U.S. and Scandinavian countries.³¹⁷ As a result of his creativity, ingenuity and enthusiasm, Trist attracted a strong and loyal followership among Institute staff, many of whom had served with him in the army. At least for a while, Rice was a loyal follower too.

Albert Kenneth Rice was not an Institute founder, like Trist, but joined shortly after its incorporation in March 1948. Born in 1908 Rice went from Nottingham High School to Cambridge, probably attending about the same time period as Trist, where he began studying mathematics but later switched to anthropology. After graduation Rice joined the Colonial Service, serving in Kenya before World War II, where he became

increasingly pessimistic about the British government's policy toward East African tribes, in particular the Kikuyu, whom he had worked closely with and very much adored. Eric Miller noted, "Neither then nor later was he a conformist," and Rice left the service in protest over inhumane policies. As a result, Miller added "One gets the impression that he was not popular with his superiors."³¹⁸ Returning to England, Rice first became assistant general manager at Lewis's department store in Birmingham and then, for most of World War II, personnel manager at G. A. Harvey & Company, a London engineering firm.

In 1945, Rice was a member of the first civilian training group held at the Tavistock Clinic under the direction of Bion, Rickman and Sutherland. It consisted of twelve members and although it only lasted six sessions it seemed to have profound influence over many group members. Rice, in particular, was so taken by these new methods that he volunteered as a member of Tavistock's *training group*, again under the direction of Bion, which met weekly as a small study group for a period of two years between 1947 and 1948. Although this program was suspended shortly thereafter, due mostly to cost, Miller noted it was a "powerful formative experience" for Rice.³¹⁹

From war's end until 1948, Rice was deputy director of the Industrial Welfare Society in London and a member of the Tavistock Institute's Council. Then in 1948 he resigned both of these posts to join the Institute staff. At first Rice teamed up with Jaques, Trist and Hill, among others, conducting research in their famous Glacier Metal project. A copious writer, Rice published at least six coauthored articles in *Human Relations* between 1950 and 1952, describing the findings of this study.³²⁰ These articles detailed the major contributions this research made to an increased understanding of employee turnover, the interrelatedness of institutional parts to the whole and, by applying Bion's thinking, relations between and within groups in an industrial setting.

During this period, as an *idea organization*, the Tavistock Institute appears to have been a lively, cohesive unit and, although there must have been disagreements amongst staff, the innovation of their work and Wilson's leadership seemed to contain any major conflicts. Perhaps also influential was the fact that most staff were actively engaged in some form of psychoanalysis at the time.

In the winter of 1952, Rice began what Miller described as "his seminal experiments on work organization with groups of weavers in an Indian cotton mill."³²¹ Incorporating Trist's socio-technical perspectives, Rice's goal was to develop self-managing, semi-autonomous work groups at the Ahmedabad Manufacturing and Calico Printing Company Limited. Rice's idea was that each group of weavers would be responsible both for the production output and maintenance of a series of looms. Visiting the mill four times, for periods between three to nine months, Rice's reorganization resulted in increased production and quality along with improved worker satisfaction, all sustained over time.³²² Like Trist, Rice was becoming an international success.³²³

Rice returned to London around 1956, taking up post as deputy chairman of the Institute's management committee under Trist as chair, and writing a book detailing his research in India. Supported through an Institute grant from Old Dominion Trust of America Rice was able to write fulltime, publishing *Productivity & Social Organisation: The Ahmedabad Experiment* in 1958. In this book, Rice thanked fellow Institute staff for their ideas and support, in particular, the influence of Jaques and the Glacier Metal

project on his thinking.³²⁴In addition, Rice emphasized the mentorship provided by Trist, to whom he stated, “I would like to pay a more personal tribute.”

The original concept of socio-technical systems was his, and it is to him that I have turned very frequently for help and assistance not only with the work, but in the preparation of the papers which proceeded the book and in the writing of the book itself. He always gives unstintingly of his ideas, his time, his knowledge, and his experience.³²⁵

Although Rice would continue to reference Trist’s work in his writings, this is the last published expression of fondness between Rice and Trist. In Rice’s foundational group relations book *Learning for Leadership*, neither Trist’s nor Bridger’s influence is mentioned.³²⁶

Like Trist, Rice, although known to despise the label *charismatic*, was seen as a creative thinker and charismatic leader, attracting a loyal followership both within the Institute staff group as well as outside the organization. But most of all, Rice was remembered for his savvy business acumen, no doubt acquired through his years of management experience in industry. As evidenced by the quote above, Rice was actively mentored by Trist, with whom he collaborated on projects and papers for years. Yet, something occurred between 1958 and 1961 which led to intra-organizational fragmentation at the Tavistock Institute not unlike that experienced within other *idea organizations*.

What could have happened? The exact details of this dispute are less than clear and, like psychoanalytic *Societies*, perhaps not as important as the existence of the feuds and splits, themselves. As Tim Dartington stated, “it’s nearly impossible to appreciate the force of an organizational split unless you’re in it.”³²⁷ Yet piecing together available data in the following chapter, I will shed some light on organizational fragmentation as a cyclic phenomenon within all *idea organizations*.

The Group Relations Conference

This exciting time of research innovation also coincided with the first *group relations conference* held at the University of Leicester in September 1957. The event was the amalgamation of Institute staff’s wartime experiences with officer selection and leaderless groups, Civil Resettlement Units, therapeutic communities and, more recently, Lewin’s National Training Laboratory’s (NTL) *human interaction laboratory* and T-groups held in Bethel, Maine. Directed by Trist, this first “study conference in interpersonal and inter-group relations”³²⁸ was deemed a “pilot experiment” designed “to meet the need for a course of training harnessing new knowledge and understanding about groups, but rooted in British as well as American experience.”³²⁹

Through the assistance of a grant from the Old Dominion Foundation, the Tavistock Institute co-sponsored this event with the University of Leicester, collaborating with Professor A. J. Allaway, Head of the Department of Adult Education. Miller recalled that although the Institute’s reputation was strong, “experiential learning of the Bethel type was still a novelty in Britain, and psychoanalysts somewhat suspect. Co-sponsorship by a university was seen as important in adding credibility.”³³⁰

Contrary to popular belief, there was no Leicester Conference in 1958. Yet the Institute continued soliciting financial support for its joint venture with the Department of Adult Education, eventually obtaining a grant from the Joseph Rowntree Memorial Trust.

As a result, a second group relations conference was held in November 1959 at Buxton and a third at Leicester in April 1960. Little archival data is available to provide detail about these events. The Tavistock Institute's annual report simply stated that the events occurred.

1961: Bridger and Rice Split

"In the early 1960s," Bridger recalled "the Tavistock Institute was beset with bitter internal splits."³³¹ The first rumblings of this intra-organizational fragmentation were actually experienced, not unexpectedly perhaps, at the Leicester Conference in April 1961, which was the last Leicester Conference Bridger ever attended. Called a "study conference" and entitled *Inter-Personal and Inter-Group Relation*, its aim was "to enable its members to learn something of the ways of working with people in and through the groups which they belong."³³² The staff certainly achieved this goal.

Although disagreements may have been percolating among Institute staff for a while, the issues came to a boil during the conference inter-group event (IGE) resulting in a confrontation between Bridger and Rice. Menzies Lyth, a conference staff member at the time, recalled there was a "huge row" in the staff room and consultants were asked to choose who they wished to support, Bridger and his emerging NTL-like *double-task* method or Rice and his more authoritarian model of *group relations*. Menzies Lyth recalled being concerned about the future financial viability of the group relations conference and thought that Rice's methods were more sound and his personal style more reliable. Some felt that Bridger's style of directing, and his habit of lengthy free associations, encouraged a certain dependency, while Rice's leadership style, focusing on leadership, roles and boundaries, fostered more autonomy within the membership. As a result, Rice was supported by the staff, and then later by the Executive Committee as director of the 1962 conference, infuriating Bridger.³³³ Barely a month after this event Rice generated a memo dated May 8th, 1961 addressing the major factors in the Bridger-Rice disagreement. In particular, concerns about clarifying the purpose of the conference and task of the IGE seemed paramount. Rice stated, "I am biased in my views about the inter-group project. Organizationally, I believe we should decide what is the primary task—to provide events for the conference or to study inter-group processes."³³⁴

About two weeks later, Bridger responded with a memo "To All Staff Members of the 1961 Leicester Conference" countering Rice's search to define the task of the IGE) by posing even broader questions: "(a) what are we expecting to do in running such Conferences; (b) what do individual members who come to the Conferences really want? In what ways are these aims common, complementary or diverse?"

Bridger's tone seemed one of frustration as he observed "apart from inter-personal difficulties in the staff group, one of the main problems stems, I think, from the many different theories of learning and from the different disciplines from which techniques and methods of learning and teaching are derived."

Rice countered with, perhaps predictably, a more structural interpretation noting, "I believe that some of our staff problems have been exacerbated by having such a mixture of people, i.e., at various stages of learning...I believe we should learn a great deal more if we ruthlessly eliminated everybody who was not absolutely essential to the conference design." This, he observed, would "give the staff group a better chance of recognizing some of its own problems."³³⁵ This also seemed a good way to isolate and address Bridger's concerns about "different theories of learning."

While Bridger posed theoretical questions, Rice, ever the pragmatist, looked for structural solutions within the conference design. Bridger persisted, at one point calling for “a complete rethinking of present Conferences, particularly in relation to their balance of group and individual work.” Revealing his NTL-like inclinations, in other words a more individual-centered training approach, Bridger proposed “to eliminate the Inter-Group Project” altogether and “rethink the form of Study Group, [to] include problem-solving sessions on an individual as well as group basis, and use case studies which allow review of group process and observation techniques.”³³⁶

Clearly, this was not what Rice had in mind:

The conference is a ‘social island’, ‘transitional community’ or whatever else you like to call it and as such there is a para-reality about it; made-up tasks, case studies or the like only add another ‘para’ dimension...I can only see one real inter-group relationship problem: the relationship between the staff group and the members. I believe it would be experimentally exciting to try to devise an event in which these relationships were investigated, but I cannot see how at the moment.³³⁷ The answer to this challenge about “how” to develop an event during which the members are “given the specific task of studying the inter-action of groups,” including the interaction of the member-staff groups, soon emerged as the revamped IGE).³³⁸

In addition, Rice made his “dislike” of the inclusion of lectures and seminars clear as well. Yet, interesting to note, he retained lectures in the Leicester Conference design until 1967, the first year without them. That year’s conference design eliminated all five periods of lecture (earlier conferences had as many as ten), as well as decreased the number of application groups from seven to six, in favor of increasing the number of large study groups to seven and the IGE from twelve to seventeen periods.

In addition to the inclusion of lectures, the first conferences showed films such as *Twelve Angry Men* in 1957. Another interesting difference compared to events today was the opportunity for conference members to “invite a colleague to the Conference for a day.” Rice went to great lengths to provide opportunity for visitors, seeing it as a useful means to “offer something more than a ‘reporting’ session back home.”³³⁹ He suggested a number of days on which visitors could arrive, but “if this arrangement is inconvenient, there is a limited amount of accommodation available for visitors arriving later.”³⁴⁰ The tone of these invitations seemed hardly to match that of the arrogant, Colonial authoritarian Rice was at times reputed to be.

This debate about conference theory and design continued into 1962. In a memorandum dated January 2, 1962 Bridger outlined some areas of divergence in thinking when distinguishing between the Group Relations Programme at the Tavistock Institute and the work being developed during Tavistock’s Leicester Conference. Bridger observed that technical divergences within the staff, namely Trist, Rice and Bridger and others outside of the Institute, existed from the start but that training urgencies allowed a “collusive rationalization” to emerge leading the staff to assume “the effects are the same even though we have different approaches.” He noted, subsequent events allowed these divergences to emerge “elsewhere in a variety of forms...until a crisis had been reached last Easter.”

Bridger pointed out if there had been a “sufficiently congruent technical viewpoint in Tavistock staff,” there would have been a healthier method for the “resolution of any problems arising from the policies and methods I was pursuing as

Programme Director.” Bridger intentionally does not detail the exact nature of these “technical differences,” referring to them “at this stage—as a domestic matter.” Yet others have since explored these technical divergences.

Laurence J. Gould, an American psychoanalyst and early A. K. Rice Institute leader, compared Bridger’s “more democratic ethos” to Rice’s model of working with groups, emphasizing that Bridger “thought that the tone of [Rice’s] group relations conference was a little too stiff, a little too formal, a little too hard edged, and a little too focused on transference to the consultant or the staff to the exclusion of other processes...especially with regard to the application of this kind of experiential learning to organizational life.”³⁴¹ Lisl Klein, a close colleague of Bridger’s at the Tavistock Institute, agreed recalling Bridger believed that Rice’s model “created authority problems in order to work on authority problems.”³⁴²

Regardless of criticism, Rice took over leadership of the Institute’s group relations program, developing the experiential learning event we recognize today, and Bridger continued his connection with NTL and its T-groups in America. In 1978, Bridger co-founded the Institute for Transitional Dynamics in Lucerne to promote his methods of working with groups.³⁴³

1962: Trist and Rice Split

The second organizational fragmentation at the Tavistock Institute occurred a short while later, this time between Trist and his followers and Rice and his group. Although the exact details of this split are just as murky as the first break between Bridger and Rice, evidence does show the Institute was struggling to reinvent itself in light of economic and cultural changes within British society. Cultural changes As is the cycle of *idea organizations*, the Institute was at cross-roads about its goals and purpose amidst the changing attitudes of British culture in the 1960s, both of which fueled organizational fragmentation.

Trist and Murray recalled the spirit and culture of the Institute during the early 1960s:

The Institute had become over-busy with its growing project portfolio. The quarterly meetings with consultants and the annual retreats were not kept up. The place that had so strongly affirmed the need to pay attention to the process side of organizational life had been neglecting its own. With the departure of Wilson, the MC [Management Committee] should have asked for a radical reappraisal of the whole situation; but the requisite meetings with consultants and with the staff as a whole were never called. It was assumed that the status quo would continue and that Trist would become chairman with indefinite tenure. It was as though a quasi-dynastic myth had inadvertently crept in to a supposedly democratic process.³⁴⁴

The root of the disagreement appears to have centered on three key issues: First, should the Institute continue to place significant emphasis on the application of psychodynamic thinking to group and organizational life, therefore maintaining connection with the Tavistock Clinic; Second, should the Institute branch out into more quantitative measures of organizational productivity such as evaluation and operational research; And third, could both psychodynamic and quantitative perspectives be maintained and successfully integrated within the staff group as a whole.

Trist and Murray recalled the underlying issues the Institute was struggling to address:

How far was the original definition of mission, made 15 years ago, still applicable? How far was the requirement of psychoanalysis for all still relevant? How to find a formulation that would no longer make the Institute appear as a para-medical organization but would express the broader idea of social engagement of social science.³⁴⁵

An internal Institute memo by Fred Emery dated May 27, 1960 entitled “Notes from Discussion on Swiss Cottage Proposal,” documented further this intra-organizational struggle. In his memo, Emery makes two points clear: First, he is eager to establish ways for the Institute to differentiate from university research and second, he is desperate for the Institute to disentangle from the Tavistock Clinic. Addressing these changes, Emery offers a new vision for the Institute, defining “the mutual enrichment of social science and the important practical affairs of man” as its core activity.³⁴⁶ He further observed that “the more we become so engaged” with our core activity “the clearer it is” that “our primary task is in important ways divergent to that of the Clinic.”³⁴⁷

This lofty goal probably seemed a bit too ephemeral and far reaching to the more pragmatic Rice and his business minded colleagues who saw value in applied psychodynamic thinking in organizations and continuing their fruitful relationship with the Tavistock Clinic, ethos upon which the Institute had been founded. After all, how could one measure the Institute’s impact on “the practical affairs of man” or more importantly, *who would pay for it?*

Miller recalled that Rice’s “business manager approach” was “at times unpopular with colleagues, who did not always relish being reminded that the fascinating ‘pie-in-the-sky’ projects they wanted to pursue had to be set on one side in order to earn the fees needed to secure institutional survival.”³⁴⁸ Clearly, this was one of those times because, Miller noted, Rice’s approach to organizational management became “so unpalatable to some members of staff that new internal subgroupings emerged.”³⁴⁹

During these discussions about organizational purpose, and an urge to shift away from links with psychoanalysis and the Clinic, some Institute staff became concerned about what they perceived to be a lack of attention to the day-to-day managerial functions of running the Institute. For instance, Menzies Lyth recalled she had become “a bit anxious” about a “slack” attitude and “certain carelessness” toward “administrative” details and “accounting” since Wilson’s resignation. Menzies Lyth emphasized that her disagreement was not with Trist or his leadership, per se, it was with “the way Trist’s followers worked—it wasn’t what the Tavi was set up for.”³⁵⁰

During this period, Institute staff numbers had increased to over twenty, beyond the size of a face-to-face group. As a result, the corresponding multiple and diverging interests, capabilities and projects challenged the Institute’s management structure in new ways. Not enough attention was paid to these new demands on the system. As a result, conflicts which had been dormant, yet rankling, erupted while Trist was in California on sabbatical.

In Trist’s absence, Rice was acting chairman and applied his new thinking about self-managing, semi-autonomous work groups by proposing that the Institute divide into “three self-accounting project groups.”³⁵¹ This restructuring was resisted by senior staff, “who wished to preserve the unity of the whole.”³⁵² Although this dispute was “partly

personal, partly professional,”³⁵³ the roots of the altercation were embedded in differing opinions about organizational purpose and how the Institute should be developed to meet the challenges of the changing environment. Yet the covert issues were clearly about power and authority within the system. Although plenty of leaders were emerging, there was little orchestrated followership as the Institute struggled to determine which group’s work would be prioritized, authorized to represent the future of the Institute. Some people thought Rice had seized this chaotic opportunity and “taken the leadership away” while Trist was in America.³⁵⁴ Others thought it to be a natural if not inevitable process.

Cultural changes

On his return, Trist tried to resolve the differing viewpoints, but in the end the organization fragmented into two groups: “Programme Group A” was led by Trist and included D. Armstrong, D. Barkla, H. Bridger, R. Cass-Beggs, F. E. Emery, J. Field, M. Foster, G. W. Higgin, J. Marek, H. Murray, A. B. Pollock, B. L. Thompson and H. J. J. van Beinum; and “Programme Group B” was led by Rice and included S. A. Cang, R. N. T. Higgins, J. M. M. Hill, I. E. P. Menzies, E. J. Miller, C. Sofer, P. Spencer and R. Wishlade.³⁵⁵

Although it may seem, based on his lifelong connection to group study, that Bridger would join Rice’s group, Menzies Lyth recalled that was not the case. Bridger, although technically in group A, remained “semi-detached,” operating independently of either group as a result of the previous Bridger-Rice feud. Similar to the *British Psychoanalytic Society’s* dispute, an organization to which many Tavistock staff belonged, the result was an “A” group, “B” group and independent group.

Menzies Lyth, who was deeply involved in the debate, described the Institute’s fragmentation as a “very difficult decision.” When it came time to vote Menzies Lyth, who was apparently counted on by supporters of both Trist and Rice, was the deciding swing vote. After a painstaking decision process, Menzies Lyth backed Rice based largely on her managerial concerns for the future of the Institute. Other Institute staff were appalled and not at all sympathetic to Menzies Lyth’s concerns about the viability of the organization, many treating her with open hostility as a result of their sense of betrayal. She recalled being “very sad” because she owed Trist a “huge amount,” but yet never regretted her decision because she felt “safer with Ken” who was “extremely good at planning and strategy.”³⁵⁶

David Armstrong joined the Institute staff in 1959 fresh out of Cambridge with his degree in psychology. He recalled in the early 1960s, when he was working with Eric Miller studying steel mills in South Wales, Miller often traveled back and forth to London, yet never alluded to the split brewing at the Institute.³⁵⁷

When Armstrong completed this field work and returned to London, he was told that he “had to choose” between working with Trist in the “A” group or Rice in the “B” group on future projects.³⁵⁸ Just as Menzies-Lyth had recalled, everyone “had to choose which group to stay with.”³⁵⁹ An answer to the third question—whether both psychodynamic and quantitative perspectives could be integrated successfully within the staff group as a whole—had been found, and the answer was no. One “had to choose.”

Hugh Murray, a loyal Trist supporter and co-editor of *The Social Engagement of Social Science* collection, felt that time had inflated this history and it was “not as antagonistic as people think.” It was merely a time of “differentiation.”³⁶⁰ He recalled

“there was no pressure. People just made their own choices about who they liked working with, which was basically who they *were* working with.”³⁶¹

Yet Armstrong recalled that he and his young Institute colleagues, felt like children of “divorcing parents,” experiencing the organization’s fragmentation as “very antagonistic.”³⁶² He agreed that he was not pressured, but was in fact encouraged, to investigate other areas before making his decision. Yet, Armstrong recalled being “completely ignorant of what was going on” anywhere else in the Institute and “talked to both groups” before deciding to stay where he was, in Trist’s group.³⁶³

Although today Armstrong often is referred to as the *premiere theoretician* in group relations, he was not involved in group relations or the Leicester Conference while he was a member of the Tavistock Institute from 1959-1968. The reason, he said, was simply “because Leicester was dominated by Rice’s group” and he was a member of Trist’s.³⁶⁴ Then in 1964, Armstrong was eager to participate in a special four-month group event, directed by Rice, during which Bion was taking a small study group. Since Institute members were “not encouraged to work across the ‘A’-‘B’ boundary,” Armstrong had to obtain special permission from Trist to apply for Rice’s event. Trist agreed and Armstrong considered it a memorable event to have had the opportunity to work with Bion.³⁶⁵ In 1996, almost forty years after his first appointment at the Institute, Armstrong finally was invited to join the staff of the Leicester Conference and since has participated three times in a staff role, successfully crossing the A-B boundary.

Further Morphing: Five Sub-Units

Typical of *idea organizations*, the inter-group dynamics that led to organizational fragmentation in 1961 and 1962 caused the Institute to morph again in 1963. This time it divided into five sub-units within the Institute as a whole: Group A became the *Human Resources Centre* (HRC) under Trist’s leadership; Group B the *Center for Applied Social Research* (CASR) under Rice; and to this organizational structure were added three other sub-units: the *Institute for Operational Research* (IOR) with W. N. Jessop as director; *The Family Discussion Bureau* with D. L. Woodhouse as chairman and the *Committee on Family Psychiatry and Community Mental Health* with J. Bowlby as chairman.

The HRC was the largest and most productive unit with nine fulltime staff members generating £111,057 in income, over 40% of the Institute’s revenue in 1965. Although still somewhat interested in group dynamics, Trist and the HRC did not place as strong an emphasis on the study of psychodynamic influences on group behavior, opting instead to develop general social psychology and systems theories.³⁶⁶ The Tavistock Institute’s annual report in 1964-65 noted the HRC’s studies included “the utilization of human resources, organizational alternatives, conflict resolution, adaptation to change, socio-technical systems, etc.”³⁶⁷

The Family Discussion Bureau was established as a non-medical means for people to deal with marital difficulties and *The Committee on Family Psychiatry and Community Mental Health* was a way that the Institute could administer the Clinic’s research and training. The *Institute for Operational Research* (IOR) was founded by Neil Jessop and Russ Ackroff during this period as a way to reestablish operational research’s links between the social sciences and real-world problems, reclaiming the field from the growing number of management and decision scientists focusing on mathematical

modeling in academic departments. This unit earned £52, 340 in 1965, almost 19% of the Institute's income.

The answer to the Tavistock Institute's second pressing issue—should the Institute branch out into more quantitative measures of organizational productivity such as evaluation and operational research—had been found. And the answer was yes. Emery was clearly pleased calling this new arrangement a “social matrix—a nourishing and facilitating environment for all components.”³⁶⁸

Central to this reorganization was the fact that staff members “had to choose”³⁶⁹ the department with which they would affiliate, a difficult task for many because their passions and research interests were varied. Previous work at the Institute had not been so neatly divided as evidenced by the fact that Trist and Bridger, both now HRC members, were previously quite active in the group relations area now considered CASR territory. These new divisions made it difficult to cross intra-organizational boundaries, as distinct silos began to emerge, and staff stuck to their own group.

In addition, Trist and Murray noted “The broader formulation of mission and the greater variety of activities and people made it no longer possible or desirable that all staff should undergo psychoanalysis.”³⁷⁰ Interesting to note, it was now assumed these concepts would just be “absorbed ‘by osmosis.’”³⁷¹ And, although it invalidated much of their own previous work, the “capacity to work with groups and the process side of organizational life was to a considerable extent a personal endowment.”³⁷² In other words, “the best practitioners” did not learn their skill; they were “naturals.”³⁷³ The answer to the first pressing issue—should the Institute continue to place significant emphasis on the application of psychodynamic thinking to group and organizational life, therefore maintaining connection with the Tavistock Clinic—was beginning to emerge. And the answer was no. Although, the Institute remained connected with the Clinic, sharing office space until 1994, in many ways this date marks the beginning of a thirty-year breakup period.

At this fragmenting point in Tavistock Institute history, we diverge from analysis of the Institute-as-a-whole in order to take up, more specifically, the history of group relations within *Centre for Applied Social Research* (CASR).

Centre for Applied Social Research

When the CASR was established in 1963, it consisted of just six staff members: J. M. M. Hill, I. E. P. Menzies, E. J. Miller, A. K. Rice, P. M. Turquet and R. Wishlade. Rice noted their goal was to provide “an adequate balance between consultancy and research services, sponsored research, and training. Our hope was that such a balance would help U.S. to avoid two dangers: on the one hand of losing contact with practical problems, and on the other of failing to articulate the concepts that were developed as of necessity in the consultancy practice.”³⁷⁴

They were an ambitious group, even attempting to “open a branch of the Institute” in India, which never materialized.³⁷⁵ They consulted, taught, conducted research, applied for grants and published, as well as actively pursued collaboration with other institutions. Many fruitful institutional partnerships developed worldwide as a result. As word of the CASR's organizational successes spread, they found themselves in the unique position of having more opportunities for work than current staffing levels could sustain, enabling

them to become more selective about which projects to accept. In 1965, CASR's revenue was over £50,000 accounting for 21% of the Institute's total income. By 1972, it was well over £133,000. The days of struggling for funding were over, at least temporarily, and CASR hired four new staff members in order to assist with the long-term contracts it was signing: Alistair Bain, M. J. Lesser, D. H. Price, C. M. Simpson and later W. Gordon Lawrence.³⁷⁶

As an *idea organization*, the Tavistock Institute seemed to have managed successfully its organizational restructuring, emerging as a more innovative and relevant organization. Although it was a painful process for many members, this reorganization allowed the Institute to remain profitable and its growing reputation enabled them to attract and retain the talented individuals the organization needed to survive, and excel, in the social science field. During this time, based largely on the contributions of Rice over the next seven years, group relations as an intelligible field of study was born.

8: The Rice Years (1962-1969)

Although through Klein, Bion provided the theoretical underpinnings of the field of group relations, it was A. Kenneth Rice who proved to be the visionary, dedicated and charismatic movement leader the burgeoning field needed to grow and thrive. An astute planner and assiduous pragmatist, Rice took over chair of the *Centre for Applied Social Research* (CASR) and directorship of its conflict-ridden framework for a group training event at the Tavistock Institute in 1962. With few trained staff, barely able financially to break even at first, he managed to develop a thriving worldwide movement of group study in less than a decade. One can only imagine how things might have been different at the Tavistock Institute and in group relations today, if Rice had lived past the young age of 61.

Perhaps the single most commonly mentioned—and respected—aspect of Rice’s leadership was what Miller called his “single-minded commitment to the task in hand.”³⁷⁷ Isabel Menzies Lyth agreed, noting that Rice would listen attentively for hours to staff concerns and points of issue before calmly declaring, “I have listened to you all and have now decided in my role as director that this is what we are going to do.” And even those individuals, for whom the solution was not ideal, were able to accept Rice’s decision because they “had felt listened to *and heard*,” Menzies Lyth emphasized.³⁷⁸

Although Rice was a savvy business manager with an “extraordinary conceptual mind,”³⁷⁹ “extremely fluent, very sharp”³⁸⁰ in group processes, he was not without human flaws. As evidenced previously, some people viewed him as authoritarian, over controlling and even arrogant. His trim build, crisp dress and military mannerisms gave him the air of being “very, very British”³⁸¹ in a stodgy sort of “colonial”³⁸² way. David Armstrong recalled how Rice could seem at times “almost too clever,” for example, acting a little too pleased with his own brilliance at group interpretation, which was aggravating to some people.³⁸³ Yet, John Bazalgette of the Grubb Institute of Behavioural Science in London suggested that Rice’s appearance and mannerisms proved an interesting contradiction to his personality, which was unconventional and open, making him “quite approachable, not frightening.”³⁸⁴ Laurence Gould agreed, recalling “Despite his external proper demeanor,” Rice was “really quite radical and revolutionary.”³⁸⁵

To the benefit of social historians, Rice also was a diligent note taker, often filing away typed copies of his detailed “field notes.” The Tavistock Institute archives contain hundreds of typed pages of these notes along with dozens of handwritten reflections. Most of these documents detailed Rice’s thoughts dating between 1962, when he took over as Leicester Conference director and CASR chair, and his death in 1969.

During this period, Rice made a deliberate effort to document every aspect of his thinking and planning about group relations as a methodology. For instance, his field notes described his conference experiences, experimentation with conference design, development of new group events, consulting techniques, staff training and selection, methods of directing, and plenary speeches. No detail of the conference experience or its impact on him and the group was too insignificant to escape Rice’s consideration.

Uncannily, he seemed already to have a sense of the foundational importance of his contributions and made every effort to leave behind an amazingly detailed and coherent record of his thoughts and decision-making processes.

Rice's Directorate

Although the theoretical underpinnings of the group relations conference can be traced back to Bion, and his application of Kleinian theory amidst a therapeutic community, Bion never attended a Tavistock Institute group relations conference.³⁸⁶ It was Rice who had the vision and determination to conceptualize the conference design. Miller recalled Rice, and others at the Institute, “envisaged an ultimate unifying theory of human behavior. The Conferences seemed to offer one potential matrix within which such a theory might begin to be developed and tested.”³⁸⁷

Yet Rice was not alone in this endeavor, acknowledging in his foundational book *Learning for Leadership* his “deep debt to my colleagues Isabel Menzies and Pierre Turquet for their major contributions to the thinking and planning of both conferences and courses.”³⁸⁸ Miller recalled the circumstances of Rice’s appointment as Leicester Conference director, “The reasons were largely pragmatic: the conferences had been losing more money than the Institute could afford, and Rice was willing to try to make them financially viable.”³⁸⁹

Mannie Sher reported “It started off the idea of a laboratory” and “Rice would have been talking to people like Trist, Turquet, Gosling, and Eric Miller of course, and others.” The idea was that “Rice’s clients would come to this laboratory, and Miller’s clients, and Turquet’s clients” and these clients would “learn about things and take the stuff back into their organizations and, at times, take the consultants back with them into the organizations. So, there would be a fruitful link between the Leicester Conference” and its application to “the ongoing consultation that Rice and others were having with their client organizations.”³⁹⁰

This new way of thinking, learning, and then applying this knowledge back into organizations quickly became known as the Tavistock method. This model used group relations conferences as a way to relieve clients of the organizational distractions of their business world by bringing them into a cultural island or temporary institution which would provide a realistic experiential learning environment. This environment would provide a common language and experience with which to build upon when the clients and consultants returned to the client’s organization. It is not too difficult to see the vestiges of Bion’s therapeutic community, as well as the influence of Lewin and the NTL’s human laboratory, in the design of this experiential learning event.

Structural Influences

At approximately the same time that the theoretical and methodological underpinnings of the Tavistock model and the group relations conference were emerging, the work of L. von Bertalanffy came to the attention of social scientists at the Tavistock Institute.³⁹¹ While Fred Emery was on sabbatical from the Institute in Australia in 1951, he became aware of the work of von Bertalanffy and notified his colleagues back in London about von Bertalanffy’s *open systems* perspective, providing a new way to

consider individuals, groups and organizations in relation to their environments.³⁹² The amalgamation of open systems thinking with the Institute's previously popular socio-technical perspective proved extremely influential to Rice's thinking about conference design.

Miller recalled "systemic thinking was not, of course, novel"³⁹³ in the field of group study, as Lewin's contributions, and development in socio-technical systems perspective, proved. Although the socio-technical system perspective provided a way to optimize both human elements and technological imperatives within organizations without subverting either, it had immediate application "at the level of the primary work group rather than the wider organization," Miller noted. "The notion of the *open system* made it possible to look simultaneously both at the relationships between the part and the whole, the whole and the environment...between individual and group, individual and enterprise" as a way to understand organizational defense mechanisms.³⁹⁴

In other words, open systems theory built upon, yet expanded, the premise of the socio-technical system in ways that permitted an understanding of the interrelatedness of the organization's internal dynamics and its external environment. As a result, the open system perspective became the core of Rice's group relations conference design.

The classic model of a *closed system* is a mechanically self-sufficient organization, neither importing nor exporting across the boundaries of the organization. "*Open systems*, in contrast, exist and can only exist by the exchange of materials with their environment" Rice noted, "The process of importing, converting, and exporting materials is the work the system has to do to live."³⁹⁵

Miller provided examples to illustrate Rice's point: "Thus a manufacturing company converts raw materials into saleable products (and waste)" and a "college converts freshmen into graduates (and drop-outs)." Between these processes there lies a boundary "across which these materials flow in and out," both separating and linking the enterprise with its environment.³⁹⁶

This permeable boundary region came to be viewed by open system theorists as a critical area for the exercise of leadership. If the boundary is too loose, the outside environment can become too influential, disrupting the internal work of the organization. But if the boundary is too rigid, the internal organization can stagnate, becoming inflexible to market demands and environmental changes. Miller emphasized organizational "survival is therefore contingent on an appropriate degree of insulation and permeability in the boundary region."³⁹⁷

Rice considered the group relations conference an open system, for instance, importing members and staff from a variety of organizations and disciplines as well as food, beverages, newspapers, and administrative supplies. The conversion process encompasses every minute of every day during the designated conference period and after completion of events, members and staff are then exported back to their home lives and places of employment. Other elements also are exported from the conference, such as payments for services rendered or the production of reports, articles and books. In 2003, the Leicester conference exported a website,³⁹⁸ planned and created during the conference conversion process.

In addition to an open system, a group relations conference could be considered an *idea organization* because, as a temporary organization, it is designed to generate intellectual concepts and experiences, rather than to directly produce goods or services.

Therefore, in order for the conference as an *idea organization* to remain an open system its import-conversion-export process must be fairly permeable and oriented toward innovation. If the organization is not, for instance, actively recruiting innovation during its import process then, by default, it will be highly challenged to innovate during the conversion or exportation process. Conversely, if boundaries are too rigid and staff and membership circles are not being expanded constantly, events often lack the innovation needed to remain relevant to the wider organizational world. This stagnation results in a group relations conference feeling more like a therapy session or individual growth event than an event focused on the study of inter-relatedness within the group and conference institution, as a temporary organization, with real world application.

Although highly influenced by these factors, Rice's group relations conference design was not only the product of open systems thinking, socio-technical perspectives, and Lewin's human relations laboratory, but also was influenced by Elliot Jaques' study at Glacier Metal and Isabel Menzies' research with hospital nurses. These studies illuminated how organizations develop mechanisms to defend against anxiety inherent in the system. Therefore, Rice recognized that the conference could be used to study the nature of organizational anxiety, just as studies of organizations had been used to develop the conference model, again illustrating the feedback loop of open systems theory.

Expanding his ideas about boundary management, Rice noted "In the mature individual, the ego--the concept of the self as a unique individual--mediates the relationships between the internal world of good and bad objects and the external world of reality, and thus takes, in relations to the personality, a 'leadership' role."³⁹⁹ Therefore when an individual engages with a "a new boss," for example, he or she "will not simply respond in a rational way to what the boss actually says and does, but he will bring forward, from his internal repertoire of objects and part-objects, his experience of earlier authority figures including mother and father," Miller explained.⁴⁰⁰ As a result, when one is involved in organizational or group life, one is influenced by myriad factors both from the external environment of the work setting, as well as from one's own internal environment. In Rice's words, "The mature ego is one that can define the boundary between what is inside and what is outside, and can control the transactions between the one and the other."⁴⁰¹

However, Miller noted, the group also can evoke more primitive feelings in the individual, such as those "in the areas of dependency aggression and hope. The individual is usually unaware of this process: these basic emotions slip under the guard, as it were, of his ego function."⁴⁰² This is why group relations experts, like Rice and Miller, believed the self-managing leadership role could be examined and honed through experiential laboratory environments such as group relations conferences, so that individuals could study the impact of this group phenomenon and related anxieties in themselves and others.

Although primitive feelings and defenses might go undetected by the individual, they often have an impact on the group and are sensed by others within the organization. According to Rice "The tendency for most human beings to split the good from the bad in themselves and to project their resultant feelings upon others is one of the major barriers to the understanding and control of behaviour."⁴⁰³ When people come together in groups, individuals' primitive feelings and defenses can get mobilized on behalf of, and in service to, the group and the bad feelings often are split off and projected onto authority figures,

whose task it is to regulate the boundary region. The study of this phenomenon is the purpose of the group relations conference and its focus on leadership and authority.

Primary Task

Although Rice noted organizations perform many tasks simultaneously, providing “mechanisms at both conscious and unconscious levels for the satisfaction of human needs and for defense against anxiety,” he proposed at any given time there is only one “*primary task—the task it must perform if it is to survive.*”⁴⁰⁴ Therefore, the primary task of the group relations conference is “to provide opportunities for members to learn about leadership” and each part of the conference is “designed to contribute to the primary task of the whole.”⁴⁰⁵ The challenge is to achieve integration by studying the sometimes inevitable conflicts “between the primary task of the parts and of the whole.”⁴⁰⁶ In other words, similar to real organizations which often have departments whose goals are at odds with each other, tasks within the conference can seem in conflict and even unachievable.

Yet Rice believed that “leadership involves sensitivity to the feeling and attitudes of others, ability to understand what is happening in a group at the unconscious as well as conscious level, and skill in acting in ways that contribute to, rather than hinder, task performance.”⁴⁰⁷ Therefore, when he developed the conference design he provided opportunities to learn about these areas as critical areas for the exercise of leadership. Yet he was quick to note, “Increased sensitivity and understanding are means, not ends, and the end is the production of more effective leaders and followers.”⁴⁰⁸

The challenge to members of this temporary institution called a group relations conference is the acquisition of these skills. Therefore, conferences are designed using experiential learning events that *provide opportunities to learn* these skills through direct experience. The emphasis here on *opportunities to learn* is important because central to the conference is the notion that each participant can make what they wish of the events. There are no right or wrong interpretations.

As a result, group relations events give conference participants, called *members*, the opportunity to examine their own responses to authority and the act of authorizing, as well as the responses of others. Members are urged to examine the feelings that become mobilized as a result of taking up these varying roles. For example, participants experience the pressure and conflicts of filling leadership roles and examine feelings fostered by both leading and following in a relatively safe environment compared to their work organizations. Miller noted “What the members make of the role, authority and person of the consultant, and what he in turn experiences of their projections on to him, constitute primary data for the elucidation of group processes.”⁴⁰⁹

As the group relations conference progresses, members and staff are challenged continuously to accomplish the primary task: “To study the exercise of authority and leadership through the interpersonal, inter-group and institutional relations that develop within the conference as an organization.”⁴¹⁰ Rice elaborated on his intentions when devising this event: “The definition of the task of the conference as the study of its own behavior, and the absence of structure save for that of the staff, force members either to set up an ‘organization’ for themselves or to abandon the task.” As a result, “it is in the attempt to set up ‘organizations’ and in the taking of roles in them that members have the

opportunity to experience for themselves the forces that are brought to bear on them when they take roles requiring leadership, and the forces they bring to bear on others which demand their following.”⁴¹¹

Rice noted the conference design is intended to “construct situations in which the conventional defenses against recognizing or acting on interpersonal and intergroup hostilities and rivalries are either removed or at least reduced.” By lowering “barriers to the expression of feeling, both friendly and hostile,” conference members have the opportunity “to check fantasy against reality,” allowing participants the “chance of learning or not learning, as they wish, or at least of learning at their own pace.”⁴¹²

Group Relations Conference Design

Interestingly, while the influence of both Lewin and Bion is clearly evident in the development of the NTL’s human interaction laboratory and Tavistock’s group relations conference—neither man ever attended a laboratory or conference sponsored by their respective organizations. Lewin died in 1947, the year of the very first NTL human laboratory, and Bion seemingly had moved out of group relations work in order to pursue his psychoanalytic work by 1957, the year of Tavistock’s first Leicester group relations conference. It was the next generation of group relations scholars and practitioners which operationalized these early founders’ ideas into the highly successful experiential learning events.

After a brief evolutionary period between the first Leicester Conference in 1957 and the early 1960s, the design of the Leicester Conference began to stabilize, enabling the format to become more predictable (See appendix A). Miller recalled, “The essentials of the approach, including its theoretical underpinnings, were largely established by the mid-1960s. Since then, the ‘Leicester Model’ has provided the basis for numerous” other events, some sponsored by the Tavistock Institute and some by a diverse range of institutions worldwide. “In most cases these were developed with the active support of the Tavistock Institute.”⁴¹³

Although the *structure* of the conference has remained largely unchanged, the *experience* of a group relations conference is never the same. The dynamics among member and staff groups vary; consequently, no two conference experiences are ever alike. Yet certain conference events have become hallmarks of the Leicester Conference design and those events that emulated it. A review of forty-two years of Leicester Conference brochures revealed the following regularities⁴¹⁴:

1. Every conference member was assigned to a *small study group*, made up of approximately nine to twelve individuals from all walks of life. The task of this small group is to study its own behavior as it unfolds, in the *here-and-now*. A consultant is assigned to assist the group in this task by offering insights for the group’s examination about the group’s behavior.

2. All working conference members attend the *large study group* which usually consists of the entire conference membership sitting in a spiral seating arrangement. Not part of the original conference design, the large study group was first added in 1964 based largely on the contributions of Pierre Turquet.⁴¹⁵ The task of the large study group is to study behaviors that might occur in a crowd or in meetings that consist of more people than can easily form face-to-face inter-personal relationships. It is

not uncommon for sub-groups to form or split, anti-groups to emerge, and fantasies and myths to be played out, fueled by deep seated emotions. Three to four consultants are normally assigned to assist the group at its task to examine this behavior as it occurs in the here-and-now.

3. An *inter-group event*), not included in the first conference design, was added successfully in 1959 largely through the work of Harold Bridger.⁴¹⁶ During the inter-group event, members are free to form their own subgroups within the pre-determined conference groups in order to study behaviors within and between groups in any manner they choose. Early Leicester Conferences included *inter-group 1* during the conference's first week, where "the two groupings of membership will be treated as independent sub-conferences, each with its own staff group;" and *inter-group 2* during the second week, which involved "the total membership and staff."⁴¹⁷ Consultants are available upon request during both events.

At the September 1969 *Authority and Organisation* conference, co-sponsored by the Tavistock and Grubb Institutes, a new inter-group event was introduced called the *institutional event*. Similar in design to inter-group 2, this event involved "the total conference membership" in order to "study the behavior of the institution of the conference, in the here-and-now."⁴¹⁸ John Bazalgette recalled this decision was made by Bruce Reed and Barry Palmer, who felt that the title *institutional event* better represented the event's primary task. This event replaced inter-group 2 during the 1974 Leicester Conference, and has remained a fixture ever since, perhaps the last significant change in conference design.⁴¹⁹

4. Near the end of the conference, all members are assigned to *review and application groups* made up of five to ten people, usually from similar or complementary backgrounds. The goal of the application group is for members to reflect on their conference experience in order to consider how their learning can be applied to similar roles outside the conference. A consultant is assigned to assist individuals in their interpretations and application of their new knowledge. When a training group is included in the conference design, this role often is taken up by training group members under the supervision of staff.

After having experienced the events of a conference, it is up to the individual to decide upon their own authority which conference experiences and learning are most valuable to them. Therefore, Miller observed, what each individual learns, is "unique to him. He cannot be told what he 'ought to have learned': indeed, that phrase itself is an expression of dependence on authority." During conference events other participants, "including the consultant, may offer their views of a situation, but only the individual member is in a position to understand, in light of the role he has, the relationship between what is happening around him and what is happening inside him; hence it is on his own authority that he accepts what is valid for him and rejects what is not."⁴²⁰ This perspective is unique to the Tavistock model, a central element which makes it distinct from other methods of group study.

A Need for Institutional Security

Rice observed, since "learning about the real feelings underlying one's behavior towards others and their behavior to oneself can be painful and even distressing, then a

conference that provides opportunities for such learning must provide some measure of security for its members and for its staff.”⁴²¹ The conference structure provides this security—fostering an environment that can both contain participants’ anxiety as well as facilitate learning—by engaging four strictly enforced “boundary controls.”

First, once the conference begins the external conference boundary cannot be broken by visitors, guests or other non-participants. Conversely, no report of member behavior is ever shared with participant’s employers or other external contacts.⁴²² Second, each conference event has a primary task defined in writing in the conference brochure and although it is upon the member’s own authority whether to participate or not, events do not overlap. Third, each staff member has a designated role and is tasked to “stay in role,” as defined by the primary task of the various events. Finally, Rice noted, all conference “events start and stop on time so that members know for how long the study of behavior will last, and for how long staff will maintain particular roles.”⁴²³

In many ways these boundary controls, although purposeful and containing, also increase participant anxiety—for both member and staff—which then becomes another learning opportunity. Essentially, how these four boundary controls are managed, “how the conference is designed,” and “how competently the staff carry out their tasks are all” situations where “learning can take place,” Rice noted. “Everything that happens in the conference, therefore whether by design or accident, is material for study.”⁴²⁴

Staff Roles

Rice emphasized, “Conferences are for the benefit of members and the task of the staff is to help members” learn.⁴²⁵ It has been said that the staff consult to the conference membership and the director consults to the staff group. As a result, both staff and director take up two roles within the conference framework: group consultant and representative of conference management.

In their role as consultant, staff will use their own feelings to sense what is happening within the group around them. Rice noted, “The skill of the consultant lies in his capacity to analyze—on a barely conscious intellectual framework—his feelings, and to express them in ways that will help the members of the group to understand their own feelings as they are experiencing them.”⁴²⁶

For example, the consultant may find him or herself feeling angry, sad, bored or sexually aroused and—assuming that this feeling is being projected onto him or her by the group and not the result of a personal idiosyncrasy—must then determine an interpretation about its origin which will be helpful for the group. The consultant must resist the narcissistic pull to speak for its own sake, because it is time to speak or to exert one’s authority. It is perfectly acceptable, in fact preferred, that the consultant sit in silence until he or she has determined what Pierre Turquet called the “because” clause; The reason behind the group’s apparent behavior.⁴²⁷ Using him or herself as an instrument in this manner can ensure that these sensations are alive within the group at the moment. Yet the consultant must ponder why here, why now?

As a representative of conference management, staff are the inevitable recipient of members’—and other staff’s—projections; their fears, fantasies and anxiety about authority and its power. Rice noted, “The analysis of this projection requires the analysis of the relationships among the staff themselves to distinguish what is intrinsic to the staff

group and what is projected onto them by the members.”⁴²⁸ As a result the authority relationships amongst staff and the way staff interrelate, as individuals and a collective, is also a means of here-and-now learning. Rice pointed out, “If the staff cannot learn from experience of their own interpersonal and intergroup relationships, then it is unlikely that they will be able to help the members learn from theirs.”⁴²⁹

For instance, when a disagreement occurs between two staff members, or more likely a staff member and the director or associate director, again one must ask why here and why now. Is the staff group trying to purge its anxiety about the conference as a whole, or a particular event, through this individual who is expressing the conflict on behalf of the entire staff, or a faction thereof? Is the membership projecting its criticisms of the director’s leadership into the staff room via this staff member in an effort to split the staff group? These questions are not unlike those experienced within the management of any organization. Yet, Rice noted, the staff group at a conference are additionally challenged to examine their own difficulties, differentiating fantasy from reality, in order to enhance learning opportunities for the members.⁴³⁰

Director’s Role

Rice contended that the role of conference director had often been called “a lonely one,”⁴³¹ and at the beginning he “did not want it.”⁴³² When in role as director, Rice noted, the staff consulting to member groups “always appear to be doing the exciting things, having the revealing experiences, bringing about the changes in members’ attitudes.” As a result, they are often “full of their experience, experiences” the director wishes he had, but could not in role as director.⁴³³

Since the director consults to the staff group, he or she often sees “far more of the staff” than of the conference membership, per se, although, more recently, conference directors often take up a consultancy role in the large study group. As the director struggles to “get a view of the conference as a whole,” he or she attempts “to provide a framework in which” other “things can happen,” trying to fit staff “views into an overall view of the total conference process.”⁴³⁴ Yet a “framework is cold and uncomfortable when others are having the close personal contacts with the members for whom the conference is designed.”⁴³⁵

It is a challenging job and, like the group consultants, the director often only has his or her own feelings and observations as a guide to what is going on in the group. As a result, the director considers these feelings and observations of staff, and sense of staff’s feelings about him or her, compiling evidence of “what is really happening” within the conference as a whole. For example, Rice noted, “when the staff start criticizing my direction of the exercise, I can infer that the members want to quarrel with me also, and they have succeeded in getting the staff to take up the cudgels on their behalf,” by projecting their concerns and anxieties directly into the staff room.⁴³⁶ Although the criticism may be valid, the director must consider the membership’s attempts to split the staff group if the director changes his or her mind. One also has to ask, Rice noted, “whether my own anxiety about my performance is making me even more obstinate than usual” exacerbating the situation further.⁴³⁷

Given the details of these observations and the important implications staying in role has for boundary management, it becomes clear why, in these early days, the

Tavistock Institute's policy was that conference staff roles would be filled by individuals with many years of experience in psychoanalysis, if not analysts themselves, "who were both able and willing to learn the new group techniques." The rationale behind this decision was that "the only way a consultant could find out what was happening in a group was by examining how he himself felt and why he felt it." Therefore, a consultant "had to know sufficient about himself and about his own feelings to be able to use them for the benefit of the group."⁴³⁸

Yet early group relations founders were in a quandary. Rice recalled, "It seemed inappropriate to pretend to build a collaborative institution" with the University of Leicester when the university did not "require any such qualification for membership of its own staff."⁴³⁹ In fact, even if one was interested in psychoanalysis, no program was available in the town of Leicester at the time. This disparity prompted discussions about the conference's purpose and a reexamination of assumptions about competencies and qualifications for staff similar to those underpinning the Bridger-Rice split in 1961.

Rice pondered, if staff qualifications were to be changed, what would be the repercussions? How could the conference design be modified to "increase the security obtainable from the institution" during what seemed a loosening of one of the four boundary management devices: the ability to stay in role?⁴⁴⁰ The result was to more clearly define staff roles and tasks of conference events, strengthening the conference director role, and enhancing the executive power of conference management.

For instance, the first few conferences attracted a lot of outside interest. Visitors from many areas, such as researchers from the NTL in America or psychoanalysts wishing to observe these new group methods, were provided supernumerary staff roles and the freedom to observe at will. Rice recalled, "Our intention to use the conference institution to provide security meant that we could no longer, as in the past, have supernumerary staff at a conference." In other words, people "without specific and public tasks. Members had to know who the staff were and what their roles and functions were."⁴⁴¹

In a fascinating insight into organizational dynamics, Rice concluded "Observers, research workers, and others with vague titles and indeterminate roles, yet with all the privileges of staff members, would weaken institutional boundaries and hence diminish the capacity of the institution to provide security."⁴⁴² As a result, two changes occurred in the 1962 conference design: University staff members who already had had supernumerary roles at conferences and used similar techniques in their courses could now consult to groups under supervision, and there would be an Advanced Training Group (ATG). As a result, an explicit four-step training program began to emerge: 1.) Conference membership; 2.) Invitation to the ATG; 3.) Selected staff roles under supervision; and 4.) Full staff roles. Rice observed "These steps, we believed would reduce some of the need for security that could be found only in the clinical qualifications of individual staff members."⁴⁴³

As noted, the ATG was by invitation only, designed for individuals who had attended group relations events previously and were expected to become staff members at future events. Therefore, they were largely drawn from academia, the Tavistock Institute and Clinic, clergy, and prison system—all organizations which had previously shown great interest in the program.

The ATG tended to be regarded as conference middle management thereby receiving all the projections one might expect of management in organizational life. It was a difficult role as ATG members were neither members nor staff. Rice described the challenge, “Members turn to the advanced training group as to a possible alternative to the staff group. If the advanced training group tries to take such a position, it invariably comes under fierce attack from the members.” Yet, if the ATG “tries to join conference members in attacking the staff, it finds itself encouraged but seldom followed.”⁴⁴

In another interesting display of methodological insight contained in detailed conference field notes, Rice outlined the “complex processes—and hence complex pattern” of relations to authority he observed during the Leicester conference’s IGE in 1962. Using an intricate system of diagramming, Rice detailed the manner in which the conference members split themselves during the IGE and hypothesized why. Rice noted at the start of the IGE, the member “exodus” took about “20 seconds” after he had wordlessly entered the room and reflected on the group’s “unconscious plan” to flee. “By staying and testing whether I could help they would have discovered the reality—might, might not. The important thing was not to put it to the test. I could then be preserved as the secure ‘good’ director—leader of the dependent group. But in preserving the dependent leader he can also be got ready for the ultimate slaughter.”⁴⁵

As the IGE unfolded, Rice offered detailed reflections about the temporary organization’s changing structure, sketching six different diagrams of the evolving system. Themes emerged such as members’ attempts to destroy staff authority, identity crises and member-staff competition—competition, Rice noted, not just about authority but also about knowledge, experience, and integration. He also detailed how conference participants unconsciously explored whether the membership could form a new management, replacing the existing one with themselves and tested whether the ATG could be mobilized for such purposes.

Although Rice’s reflections may seem common enough to those of us who have experienced an IGE, what strikes me is the passionate detail with which Rice preserved his thoughts and experiences. This was a man who believed in this methodology and was dedicated to the development of this field as an intelligible field of study. He seemed constantly in tune to the systemic, interpreting only at the level of the group as a whole. As a result, the documents he left behind were clear, concise and the points often amplified through the use of diagrams.

Evolutions

Between 1964 and 1965, the eighth and ninth Leicester Conferences, Rice made significant changes to the conference design. First, he changed the long-standing title from *Inter-Personal and Inter-Group Relations* to *Learning & Leadership: A Working Conference on Inter-Personal and Inter-Group Relations* [see photographs]. As previously noted, the large study group was added. Revamping the conference brochure, Rice seemed both to simplify the language as well as enhance the descriptors. For instance, he eliminated lengthy references such as “conference in Inter-Personal and Inter-Group Relations” inserting instead simply “programme.” Yet he replaced “group processes” with the more detailed “individual personality, and of group and organizational process.” He also called the event a “workshop” not a “conference,” which then changed to “working conference,” in the final copy. Perhaps one of the most distinct changes was publishing the existence of the ATG in the conference brochure, although still “by invitation,” this was the first time it was ever listed in a conference brochure.

In a letter to Robert Gosling dated May 23, 1962 Rice detailed some of the challenges he inherited when agreeing to take up development of the *Learning & Leadership* conference and attempting to expand group relations into previously untapped markets. Rice recalled pursuing a policy that had been outlined in a meeting in fall 1960, which “laid down that the two Conferences of ’62 and ’63 were to be transitional, after which the Conference would be run entirely by Leicester with only consultant help from us.” It is unclear whether this arrangement was preferred by the Tavistock Institute, the University of Leicester or dictated by funding sources, but it obviously forced a rigorous training agenda into the conference design, which Bridger had already begun to implement as director before Rice.

To accomplish this goal, the Institute invested “£2,000 for the planning and running of the 1962 Conference” while £1,400 for member bursaries and £450 for the advanced training program was provided by the Rowntree Memorial Trust grant.⁴⁴⁶ Professor A. J. Allaway of Leicester’s adult education department was assigned responsibility for ATG recruitment and Pierre M. Turquet of the Tavistock Clinic supervised the training. With a clear eye on organizational application, this program was not only concerned with training conference staff, but also “the development of those who wish to apply learning and methods from the Conference (or equivalent experience) in their own work.”⁴⁴⁷

As a result, in 1962, thirty conference participants each paid £100 and six ATG members each paid £30. (by comparison, in 2004 working conference participants paid £3,300 and training group members £3,650.⁴⁴⁸) This income, plus the £2,000 invested by the Tavistock Institute, allowed Rice to carry forward £941 for the 1963 conference, achieving his initial goal of making the conference financially viable. Yet, he noted “the conference institution itself appears now to be adequately established and is financially viable. The need now is for support for research into its effectiveness.”⁴⁴⁹

The first steps toward establishing this research agenda were taken by Turquet during the 1964 Leicester Conference where he supervised Eric Miller, who was participating as an ATG member. A letter dated March 23, 1964 from Turquet to Miller asked for his “permission to make tape and stenographic recordings of all our study group sessions” so that we might “examine in detail our technique, procedures and aims in taking groups.”⁴⁵⁰ Without this data “it will be difficult to make the necessary technical

progress,” plus Turquet noted, “somebody has to make a start in this matter.”⁴⁵¹ In Miller’s prompt reply he raised “no objection” to Turquet’s plan, concluding his letter by stating “I look forward (I think!) to seeing you next week.”⁴⁵² Yet little subsequent efforts were made in this area.

Miller recalled that he and Rice had “devised a complex methodology for evaluation” of the Leicester Conference in the 1960s but because of the “synergism of the conference processes” and reluctance about “intermingling research and educational tasks,” they deferred researching the actual conference events.⁴⁵³ Instead, they proposed a “before-and-after set of in-depth clinical interviews combined with assessments by colleagues in members’ work-settings,” yet it proved too costly a scheme and was abandoned as well. Miller noted, “We therefore remain reliant on impressionistic and anecdotal evidence, from past members, from people who know them, and from our own observations.”⁴⁵⁴

By 1963, the Leicester Conference structure was starting to become more stable and conference staff more experienced. In addition to Rice, as director, assisted by Turquet and Allaway, conference staff included J. W. Tibble from University of Leicester, E. M. Churchill and J. E. Richardson from the field of education, N. A. Bishop and E. A. Towndrow from the prison system and E. P. G. Michell from the Tavistock Clinic. Four of these six staff members had gained experience through the A.T.G. program. It seemed that Rice’s system was working.

The 1963 Leicester Conference was particularly pivotal in the development of institutional relationships as Canon Richard Herrick of Chelmsford Cathedral, Reverend Bruce Reed of Christian Teamwork, Margaret Rioch from Washington School of Psychiatry, Morris Parloff from National Institute of Mental Health, and N. A. Bishop Governor of H. M. Prisons were all in attendance. Herrick attended as a conference member, Reed, Rioch and Parloff in the Advanced Training Group and Bishop as staff.

Canon Herrick and Reverend Reed were so taken with Rice and his group relations methods that they organized their own conference held in November of that year, a *Training Conference in Group Relations* held at the Waverly Hotel in Clacton. Rice directed while Herrick, Reed and Turquet staffed the four-day event. Thus, began a very fruitful relationship between the Tavistock Institute, Chelmsford Cathedral and the Grubb Institute. Herrick went on to staff roles in twenty-four group relations conferences sponsored by the Tavistock Institute over the next seventeen years as well as incorporating group relations methods into his work in the Episcopal church. Reed founded the *Grubb Institute of Behavioural Studies* in 1969, which had developed out of Christian Teamwork, co-sponsoring over eighteen group relations events with the Tavistock Institute over the next fifteen years, as well as running their own independent events, which continue to this day.

Rioch and Parloff were influential because, once back in America, they set in motion activities that directly led to the importation of group relations to the U.S. in 1965 and the creation of the A. K. Rice Institute for this purpose.

The last important institutional connection comes from Bishop and the prison system, which collaborated with the Institute on a number of events including in-house group training. Bishop brought in J. H. Fitch and D. G. Hewlings from the prison system as well, but by 1968 all three had drifted away.

Rice Goes to America

On October 6, 1963 Rice traveled to New York for two weeks seeking collaborators and funding for future group relations work. He met with a variety of people including encounter group guru Kenn Rogers, Fritz Redlich and his staff at the Department of Psychiatry at Yale University School of Medicine, as well as he Riochs, Margaret and David, in Washington DC.

Toured around Yale's campus as a celebrity, Rice visited with a number of departments including "an experimental ward for psychotics" which he noted had "47 staff-24 patients!" Unfamiliar with psychiatric work Rice observed operations, attended staff meetings and research discussions, offering insights as he went. Although he thought he was "asking rather obvious and simple questions" because he "never had any experience of ordinary patient groups let alone hospitalized psychotics," he later found that he had "had a disquieting and frightening impact" on his hosts. By asking questions about boundary definitions and organizational aims, Rice was felt by some to have made a "devastating analysis of their group structures and tasks."⁴⁵⁵

It is important to note these early assumptions made by Americans and their explicit linking of the Tavistock Institute's group relations model with the mental health field, as well as their assumptions about Rice's interest and experience with psychotic patients. It was if they mistook Rice for Bion and Bion's wealth of experience treating shell-shocked soldiers at Northfield. As Rice clearly noted in his field notes above, he "never had any" experience in this area and was surprised they assumed he had.⁴⁵⁶

On October 11, Rice was invited to take part in a small, informal staff seminar on Yale's campus. To his surprise, it turned out to be eighty people from the medical, psychology and management departments, including Chris Argyris of the NTL, crowded into a room awaiting his lecture. Apparently unflustered, Rice delivered a compelling lecture followed by endless questions culminating in "half a dozen inquiries" about whether he could come back for a semester or year as a visiting faculty. Yet Rice's response reflected his guarded optimism, "Before we really judge the impact we'll wait to see if they materialize—nothing has from Harvard or M.I.T. from last year's visits."⁴⁵⁷

It is clear from Rice's thirteen pages of typed field notes he is at times confused and disappointed about much of what he experienced in the U.S. at the time. He noted "One difficulty on this trip is that I find some (if not all) of my prejudices strengthened" particularly in relation to Americans' naiveté about groups and group research. "Our Leicester conferences are in danger of becoming the new Mecca in this country of eternal panacea-seekers."⁴⁵⁸ Everyone assumes that the Tavistock Institute knows "more about groups, have done more and better thinking etc. etc. than anybody else in the world. I know it sounds crazy, but this is how I am being treated by the staff I meet. Authority I suspect will have different ideas!"⁴⁵⁹

And authority, in the form of Yale's Department of Psychiatry chair Fritz Redlich, did have different ideas. Apparently influenced by the Riochs' enthusiasm for the Tavistock's group relations model, Redlich seemed only reluctantly to have agreed to host Rice's visit to Yale. Rice recalled Redlich "didn't seem terribly interested in me even before I arrived, and he didn't seem overjoyed by the marked interest displayed by his staff after I got there." This luke-warm reception for Rice is curious when juxtaposed

against developments in the group relations field in the U.S., in which Redlich played a central role, just two years later.

The Riochs harbored no such reservations about Rice or the Institute's group relations work. They threw numerous parties for Rice, touring him through the Pentagon, spending days at Walter Reed Army Institute of Research (WRAIR). Rice recalled "Margaret has spread our fame (sic!) wide. In Yale she has made no bones about her opinions of Leicester in comparison with Bethel. In Washington she has outdone her Yale performance—and Morris Parloft, whose reputation is for cautious, critical appraisal, has backed her." People here say 'We all know Margaret, she gets enthusiastic. But Morris is careful—but he says the same kind of thing!'" Rice worried "God help us, but we can't avoid having to live up to an incredibly high standard."⁴⁶⁰

Of course, the U.S. was deep in the middle of the Vietnam war in 1963, which affected many of Rice's conversations at WRAIR, focused as they were on army psychiatry, current treatment methods and possible ways to proceed. There even was some discussion about development of a WRAIR-Tavistock sponsored team of three anthropologists, working for a year or two in Vietnam. Rice reported in his field notes: "The Army, at war, wants its psychiatric division to act as a drain—get rid of its screwballs, eccentrics, alcoholics, schizophrenics, morons, etc.—the method of performance is mainly diagnostic, the organization geared to disposal—get them out of the army's hair."⁴⁶¹

This WRAIR-Tavistock collaboration never came to fruition, but it is a clear sign of the scope of Rice's thinking and innovation regarding the myriad of applications for the burgeoning field of group relations. Rice obviously only envisioned conferences as one means to deeper understanding of group behavior. The real challenge, which Rice whole heartedly engaged, was to find applications for the Institute's group work. And, as evidenced by the example above, Rice was thinking big, perhaps even over his head, and he knew it. On October 14 he wrote in his field notes: "The hopes, in the American scene, scare the pants off me. Formally I've turned this into the need to build—if we are to continue—an Anglo-American institution for training and research" and people here now talk "as though a 1965 conference in America is assured!"⁴⁶²

Yet it is curious that although the NTL was at the height of its popularity, and the was widespread availability of all types of group study, what people immediately recognized was something different about Rice and the Tavistock Institute's groups. Rice reflected, "A large number of insightful Americans find U.S. so much better than they are at dealing with hostility—that we try to expose it, explore it and understand it gives us the aura of scientists or practitioners who can handle the really dangerous." Although they quarrel in their t-groups and encounter groups, "apart from the observation that people are angry and have permission to be so, they seem to get little else from their consultants." As a result, Rice noted "We are perceived therefore not as braver or better scientifically so much as far more skillful."⁴⁶³

1967-An Experimental Conference

Once Rice managed to make the group relations programme at the Tavistock Institute financially viable he turned to his next agenda point: research and the expansion of group relations theories, practices and applications. A letter addressed to T. G. Weiler,

Esquire of the Home Office prison system, dated June 2, 1966 detailed some of Rice's insights and ideas in this regard. A version of this same letter appears to have been sent to numerous recipients. In it, Rice described how during the last meeting of the Executive Committee of the Leicester/Tavistock Conferences, they "tried to 'take stock.' As a result, we agreed to try a number of experiments for the 1967 Conference."⁴⁶⁴ Conference design

First, they entirely eliminated the lecture format in favor of including more experiential events. Second, they invited, "Those institutions that have set up conferences or courses modeled on the Leicester/Tavistock programme to provide two members of staff" for training. In order "To obtain as much technical progress as possible" they only invited "an experienced staff" so that "senior staff would not be distracted by problems of supervision." They then "divided the staff into two groups. One group would be responsible for small group behaviour and the other for inter-group behaviour."⁴⁶⁵

Rice noted that in addition to their hope of making "technical progress" with this new design, they felt "that it is high time that we corrected the impression now around that progress from membership to Advanced Training Group to staff membership in successive years is automatic." There has been "too strong an implication that we believe that this is the only valid form of training for staff membership." In addition, he noted, "Our experience of the past two years has been that members of the Advanced Training Group have been rather more concerned with giving a demonstration of 'good behavior' as a bid for staff membership than with learning." Rice concluded his letter by requesting that the prison system nominate David Hewlings and John Fitch to staff positions and K. Gibson and E.V.A. Williams to the Advanced Training Group. This method of inviting individuals to join the ATG, rather than today's common practice of accepting applications continued until 1977.

Although the entire decade of the 1960s was extremely productive for developments in the group relations field, the peak attendance year, in terms of number of participants attending Tavistock's group relations events occurred in 1969⁴⁶⁶ when 716 people participated. Of this, 55% (393) of the participants were from industry and commerce and 20% (139) from medical, social, or other professional fields.

The Tavistock Institute sponsored six group relations events that year: Two were co-sponsored with Bruce Reed and the Grubb Institute, two with Margaret Rioch's fledgling A. K. Rice Institute (AKRI) and the last was the two-week Leicester Conference solely sponsored by the Institute through CASR since 1967, when University of Leicester ceased involvement. These events also had particular significance in different ways.

In August 1969 the AKRI group relations conference held at Amherst College was the first and only conference that Wilfred Bion ever attended. Directed by Roger L. Shapiro, this event included an all-star staff: Margaret Rioch as associate director and Jane Donner, Marvin H. Geller, William Hausman, Edward Klein, Donald N. Michael, Garrett J. O'Connor, A. Kenneth Rice, and William D. Trussell.⁴⁶⁷

Rioch recalled it was a "fascinating year when Wilfred Bion, our spiritual ancestor, appeared for the first time." Roger Shapiro had "invited him to make his way from Los Angeles, where he then lived," to take part in the event.⁴⁶⁸ This was a particularly historic event because it also was the only time that Rice, the mastermind behind the group relations conference design, and Bion, the father of group relations

theory, had worked together within the conference framework.⁴⁶⁹ Due to his untimely death in November that year, it also turned out to be Rice's last group relations conference.

W. Gordon Lawrence, previously co-director of the Tavistock Institute's Group Relations Programme, recalled "for years I had the fantasy that if there hadn't been Ken Rice, there wouldn't be conferences."⁴⁷⁰ And then I fantasized that "if Bion had been asked to run a conference it would be a dud" because there was "a wonderful description in his letters about being at" the Amherst conference in 1969 "and it was clear that he didn't know the rules."⁴⁷¹ He was talking with members after consulting to the large group and suddenly the staff had disappeared, yet he still "carries on with the member...Ken Rice came looking for him," saying "we are having a staff meeting. And Bion ruefully writes to his wife 'I didn't know that Ken Rice's model of group relations rested on split second timing.'"⁴⁷² Clearly Bion was not privy to the nuances of Rice's group relations conference design.

Edward B. Klein, psychology professor at the University of Cincinnati and early AKRI leader, was a staff member at the time and recalled the problem with "having Bion on staff" was that "we all had his persona in mind," what we thought he would be like "and then the real experience of him was quite different."⁴⁷³

I think the staff learned a lot about him too, not just the members. Rice once said 'It would be a poor conference if the staff didn't learn' and I think that was a good conference, because I think we did learn. We learned that "our assumptions about [Bion] were mostly wrong."⁴⁷⁴

In another important event that year, AKRI was challenged by the first in a series of struggles over organizational purpose. Social pressures of the times, such as changing cultural attitudes about race and gender, were alive in all facets of American life, and exerted pressure on AKRI as well. As a result, the 1969 AKRI National Conference became a pivotal event, requiring Rice and AKRI leadership to reflect upon what Laurence Gould called its "institutional sensibilities and commitments."⁴⁷⁵ Cultural change

This conference, held at Mount Holyoke College on June 7 to 20, included, once again, Rice as director and Rioch as associate director, as well as Arden A. Flint, Marvin H. Geller, Laurence J. Gould, William Hausman, Edward B. Klein, Eric J. Miller, Garrett J. O'Connor, Ken Rogers, Roger L. Shapiro on staff.⁴⁷⁶ It is important to note that, in keeping with the AKRI's traditions at that time, there were no people of color or women, save Rioch herself, included in the conference leadership and all staff members except Rice were from mental health related fields.

In a sense of foreshadowing, the conference brochure described the purpose of the conference: "to explore the dynamics of power and responsibility with opportunities for learning about interpersonal and intergroup problems of leading, following and participating."⁴⁷⁷ Yet this statement seems ironic when read in the context of who had—and who did not have—formal authority within that conference structure. How could a conference apparently established "to explore of the dynamics of power and responsibility" effectively accomplish this task with so little diversity represented within the staff group? This irony would not be lost on the membership during the course of the event and, predictably, the issue surfaced during the institutional event, where members

were free to form their own groups in order to examine conference dynamics at the institutional level.

Gould recalled that at this conference, the last one Rice ever directed, “the Institutional Event once again became the focus of powerful, current social dynamics—race relations and racial equality.” Especially because “that year there were a substantial number of black colleagues in the membership including Rhetaugh Dumas, Ophie Franklin, Rachel Robinson, Leland Hall and Claude Thomas.”⁴⁷⁸

As the institutional event unfolded, these issues about the dynamics of power and responsibility moved center stage and combined with racial issues that had been imported into the conference from the wider social environment. It became clear to Rice that the issues about race which were surfacing “were so important and compelling that they could not be constructively dealt with within the boundaries of the conference—that is, interpretively—and as such, a focus on these issues made the task of learning all but impossible.”⁴⁷⁹ As a result, Rice devised a plan in private, which he shared with the conference staff later that night at the evening meal. Gould recalled Rice “had decided to meet with the black members alone, outside the working session boundaries of the conference, to engage them in an exploration of their relatedness to the conference institution, both in the here and now, and in the future.”⁴⁸⁰

This search to define the relatedness of an issue to the conference institution and the environment is the very definition of an open system. Rice was employing the techniques central to the Tavistock tradition and attempting to role model leadership in an open system. Yet, Rice’s staff was livid as they struggled to understand their feelings of outrage and betrayal by their leader. They believed his actions had gone against everything he had ever taught them. “How, we demanded, could he even consider doing that?” Gould recalled. “And why couldn’t we join him in such a meeting if he did? And how about the impact on the rest of the conference membership? And didn’t this violate everything that he taught us about primary task and boundaries, and sticking to them? And wouldn’t doing this destroy the conference?”⁴⁸¹

As was his style, Rice calmly listened to his staff’s objections, then patiently tried to explain his thought process and reasoning, but to no avail. “First, this issue of race was more important, and had broader implications, than any one conference ever could,” Rice explained and second, “alienating and insulting the black membership by only responding to their quite real concerns interpretively, would have long lasting and destructive consequences for the future of group relations work in America.”⁴⁸² Third, none of the white staff members were asked to join him because they had not shown themselves to be “sufficiently clear-headed” about these racial issues to be of any use in the conversation.

483

As a result of the dialogue between Rice and the black membership, it was decided to arrange an extended meeting in the near future to examine further these issues and the meeting was held on September 21 and 22, 1969 at the Washington School of Psychiatry. Every black member of this initial conference group, except one, attended the September meeting and many went on to take conference staff roles, recruiting other people of color to join the group relations movement. Gould recalled some of these influential pioneers included “Rose Miller, Earl Braxton, John Johnson, Jan Ruffin, and somewhat later, Leroy Wells.”⁴⁸⁴

It is clear from the story above that Rice understood the implications of exclusion, the dynamics of power, and its potential impact on the future of AKRI and the field of group relations. One might even infer that Rice recognized that the primary task was not the conference itself but *addressing* whatever major issues about power and authority it had stoked and *applying* this learning to affect wider social change. For instance, by respecting the seriousness of the black members concerns and the potentially far-reaching implications on the future of the group relations movement in America, Rice facilitated movement away from a closed system examining “white people’s stuff” towards an open system that valued a diverse membership and its relatedness to its physical and social environments. As was the conference’s goal that year, Rice exemplified how to explore the dynamics of power and responsibility in a way that sustained an open AKRI organizational structure—at least temporarily. Yet after his death, there is clear evidence that AKRI struggled to sustain this open structure. racial issues

Sadly, these vast contributions to developments in the group relations field, as well as innovations in leadership of the CASR, were some of the last Rice made. On November 15, 1969 he died in London after a brief bout with liver cancer. Yet, in an interesting sense of foreshadowing, Rice already had been withdrawing from central roles in the Leicester Conference as well as the CASR. For example, the previous year Eric Miller had assumed the role of director at the Leicester Conference, with Rice as his associate director. Miller had also taken over as chair of the CASR on October 1, 1968, over a year before Rice’s death.

Perhaps Rice already knew he was unwell. Yet Miller infers not, recalling that these leadership changes were instituted because of Rice’s fear that “the institution’s he had created would remain too dependent on him and so perish without him; so he pushed leadership at others.”⁴⁸⁵ Miller recalled, “In both cases,” directing Leicester and chairing the CASR, Rice “remained the most competent person for the job and in both cases he knew handing over he would be facing problems of interpersonal rivalry. To hold onto the leadership would have been easier; but he stuck to what he believed was institutionally right.”⁴⁸⁶ Miller would adopt somewhat similar leadership strategies, pushing others to discover their authority during his nearly forty-year tenure at the Tavistock Institute.

9: The Miller Years (1970-1996)

If A. K. Rice became an *institute* for group relations work, Eric John Miller became an *institution*, a fixture within the field of group relations.⁴⁸⁷ Fondly recalled as “Miller the pillar” and “Eric the enabler,”⁴⁸⁸ Miller’s “hallmark” was “his quiet steady capacity” to mentor “people in professional and personal development,” helping them “manage what previously felt unmanageable.”⁴⁸⁹

Miller’s steadying capacity affected me, as well. I first wrote to him on September 3, 2001 on the suggestion of a mutual colleague, Mary Rafferty, who was aware of my interest in group relations. In this email—the email of an eager young graduate student—I asked Miller what he might make of some statistics I provided. They showed that although the latest business texts discussing organizational change called for more relationship-oriented business practices, better communication, and less hierarchical approaches to leadership, there seemed to be a distinct lack of connection between these concerns and group relations, with its reinterpretation of how to study authority and leadership, or to the value of experiential learning. I wondered why, at the moment when group relations training and group dynamics theory might be enjoying its widest application, there appeared to be a distinct silence about it in most publications addressing today’s organizational challenges.

In what I would learn was *classic Eric behavior*, he wrote back “if I were to do justice to the questions you raise I would be writing your dissertation for you!”⁴⁹⁰ Nevertheless in the remainder of this three-page letter, he encouraged my work, sharing some of his own concerns about the field and how “difficult” it is “to know what is being done in the name of ‘GR’” these days. “Obviously I don’t and shouldn’t have any control over this—though I admit that at times I’ve wished I had!” he continued, adding “What I have done over the past 15 years is to try to define the ‘Leicester model’. That makes comparisons possible.”⁴⁹¹

We exchanged correspondence more than thirty times over the following months, sometimes on a daily basis, and finally met on January 12, 2002 for the first and last time. This relatively brief, yet intense, connection with Miller, from September 2001 until his death from complications of lung cancer on April 5, 2002, solidified in my mind both the merit of my research into the history of group study and my own sense that I could undertake such a challenge. Like countless others, Miller helped me to locate my own authority.

He accomplished this first by being present—listening, responding, engaging and seeming to enjoy the dialogue as much as I did. Second, he constantly, yet gently, pushed, always offering another book to read, journal article to find, or thought to ponder. Third, he paid attention to himself. For instance, twice, I recall, he apologized to me. The first time was when he had initially underestimated the breadth of my knowledge, suggesting for instance that I read texts like Bion’s *Experiences in Groups* and Rice’s *Learning for Leadership*, books I had already tattered the covers of. I had not been insulted by Miller’s assumption that I was just a beginner, but he was concerned that I might have been.

The second time was when I had asked him, this time in person, about tears. We were talking about how one “stays in role” as a staff member and I had asked if tears were “in role.” He had said “no, not for him” in a way that ended the conversation rather abruptly. But he must have been troubled by his response because he wrote to me shortly after. He said that he was wrong, that tears could be “in role,” and that he thought his illness and thoughts about death had influenced his answer. This allowed me to share my thought that our engagement may have been influenced by the fact that I was a young woman, a member of a demographic group stereotypically marked as prone to tears. It was a fruitful exchange for me, one which I will always remember, as I will that entire eight-month period I communicated with Miller.

Life Story

Similar to Rice, Miller was not a Tavistock Institute founder, but belonged to the next generation, joining the Institute staff in 1958. Born in High Wycombe, England in 1924 Miller attended the Royal Grammar School, becoming an exhibition scholar at Jesus College, Cambridge. Miller’s university education was interrupted when he volunteered for military service during World War II, serving as an officer in Britain, India, and then Burma with the Royal Indian Artillery. After the war, he completed his education at Cambridge, earning a doctorate in anthropology.⁴⁹²

Miller spent many of the post-war years outside of England, traveling in Northern Thailand and conducting research on the caste system in Kerala, India. His social science philosophies were influenced by the human relations movement in the U.S. when he spent a year at Harvard in the 1950s. In a twist of fate, Miller accepted a two-year assignment at the Calico Mills in Ahmedabad, India in 1956, where he first met and exchanged ideas with A. Kenneth Rice, who had begun making innovative transformations to the mill’s organizational system. After returning to England in 1958, it seemed only natural that Miller would join the Tavistock Institute staff. In 1959, he attended his first Leicester Conference, joining the advanced training group in 1964, the staff in 1965 and directing in 1968.

Rice’s Death

In December 1969, Miller declared in his memo to “Leicester 1970 Staffing” that he had been given “the miserable task of finding a substitute for Ken” Rice, due to his death on November 15.⁴⁹³ Whether by design or default, it fell on “Miller the pillar” to become this “substitute.”

Although Miller initially may have felt like a “substitute” for Rice he was clearly a man with his own opinions, making his mark over time by taking the Tavistock Institute’s group relations programme into previously unexplored directions. Laurence Gould recalled that Miller’s greatest legacy, in addition to his writings, was his role as “builder of institutions globally.”⁴⁹⁴ During Miller’s tenure as director of the Tavistock Institute’s Group Relations Programme (GRP), group study institutes developed in Australia, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Israel, India, Italy, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, and South Africa, in addition to expanding the connections Rice had previously established within the UK and U.S.⁴⁹⁵

Perhaps more akin to a steady burning star—than Rice’s blazing comet—Miller was the stabilizing force within the GRP, weathering a number of *idea organization* cycles of innovation and dissension during his tenure as director from 1968 until 1997, when Mannie Sher took over. The most experienced man in group relations history, Miller occupied directorate roles in over twenty-five group relations conferences worldwide, serving on staff of over a hundred, and taking up director or associate director roles at the Leicester Conference a record eighteen times.⁴⁹⁶ Cumulatively, Miller must have spent almost two years of his life actively engaged in group relations events, almost a year in role at Leicester Conferences alone.

Many people recalled “life with Eric was never dull.”⁴⁹⁷ He loved music, social events, drinking and smoking, and was often the life of the party. He had a razor-sharp mind, quick wit and a dry sense of humor. Yet he was also a patient listener and excellent communicator, both written and verbal, conversing in an accessible way that made sense to all types of people. He was a courageous risk taker, every ready to get involved in things he did not yet understand, seeing new situations as a chance to develop new skills. Yet Miller also was tremendously modest. Never insisting on being heard, he often seemed more comfortable leading from behind or within a group, a guide on the side rather than the sage on stage. He also had an amazing gift for attracting people to him. Gould called Miller a “most charismatic, uncharismatic person.” In this way, he represented the “antithesis of charismatic leadership.”⁴⁹⁸

Yet, Gould and others noted there also was a “dark side of Eric’s intellect.”⁴⁹⁹ His laser sharpness could be experienced as harsh, and he sometimes seemed easily annoyed. He was considered by some men, in particular, to be difficult to work with, although most women found him charming. Tim Dartington, a Tavistock Institute staff member from 1970 to 1976, found Miller “easy to work with, though you could never relax” around him and he thought that other colleagues sometimes found Miller “difficult to get hold of.”⁵⁰⁰ During group relations events, for instance, Miller was known to sit, pondering and smoking in silence for extended periods, leaving his colleagues to wonder where their director had gone. This “dark side” had organizational implications as well.

Although the five sub-units⁵⁰¹ which emerged at the Tavistock Institute in the early 1960s solved some organizational problems, in particular alleviating tensions between Trist’s group and Rice’s followers and allowing innovation to thrive, perhaps even preventing organizational destruction, this organizational splitting created other challenges for the *idea organization*. For instance, throughout the 1970s each unit within the Institute had adopted an isolationist strategy, creating classic silo organization conditions. Dartington recalled it was an “exciting,” yet “competitive” era in Tavistock history with tremendous pressure on each unit to maintain financial viability.⁵⁰²

Authority grew within the separate units, not the institution as a whole. As long as each unit maintained financial self-sufficiency, they could pursue any work they wished without interference. As a result, each unit pulled the organization outward in its own direction, diverging from the central core. Little coordination of work between units was attempted. In one example, representatives from separate Tavistock units surprisingly found themselves bidding against each other on the same client project.

Under Miller’s leadership the CASR continued to evolve in the early 1970s identifying two pressing organizational issues. First, they determined that they were *responding* predominantly to the needs of clients and working in areas that they were

asked to investigate--not *directing* their future in an autonomous way. As a result, they decided to extend their “areas of work to include research into current social dilemmas, such as those posed by disabling conflict and poverty.”⁵⁰³

Second, the CASR noted that their current system “did not provide sufficient opportunities for young people to join us and to learn.”⁵⁰⁴ Instead, the current structure encouraged consultants “to shed junior staff and to live in a world bounded by clients. Our consultants were in danger of a future that implicitly involved simply growing old together with no obvious successors.”⁵⁰⁵

In response to these two challenges, the CASR restructured its organization and hired new staff, remaining committed to its original values “to maintain considerable emphasis on consultancy and social science practice directed to facilitating social change” as a distinct part of their orientation.⁵⁰⁶ W. Gordon Lawrence was one of the CASR’s new staff hired in 1971 and he recalled how the Tavistock model and its group relations conferences were a way to get to “the truth of organizations; a glimpse of the shadow world of organizations.” When attending a Leicester Conference, “The feeling was that you were at the edge, you were always at the sharp end of learning and this was particularly demonstrated by Pierre Turquet.”⁵⁰⁷

Turquet, a psychiatrist at the Tavistock Clinic, was deeply involved in the Tavistock Institute’s group relations developments, in particular large group phenomenon, working with Rice right from the start. Miller confided that although he believed Turquet was more qualified to take over the Leicester Conference director role after Rice’s death, Miller was selected because of his organizational experience and education in anthropology. Group relations experts in England at the time uniformly held that having a non-clinician in this role was essential.⁵⁰⁸

Miller recalled “Rice was insistent that it was inappropriate to have a psychiatrist or analyst in the director role because such a person was likely to have more difficulty in holding on to group-as-a-whole dynamics.” As a result, conference “membership would tend to set up individual causalities to mobilize the director to his therapeutic role. I have certainly seen this happen with Turquet and others.”⁵⁰⁹ This is a fascinating contrast to the manner in which group relations conferences were staffed in America at this time, which was almost entirely with mental health practitioners.

Nevertheless, Turquet directed the Leicester Conference⁵¹⁰ along with other group relations events until his untimely death in an automobile accident in 1976.⁵¹¹ Many people have described with great admiration the impact that Turquet had on their learning, on developments in the field of group relations, and the tremendous sense of loss they felt at his death.⁵¹² Lawrence recalled Turquet’s “gift” was his total “commitment to the idea of group.” He “was a remarkable man,” very sharp and well read. During group events one “sort of *felt him* to be thinking...He was thinking all the time.”⁵¹³

Isabel Menzies Lyth also remarked on Turquet’s immense talents and influence within the group relations field. Turquet “was a very large man, he was probably even bigger than Bion. He was very gifted” with “a lot of very innovative ideas.” Central to his contributions was his grasp of “psychosis,” she noted, vitally important because “psychosis is absolutely alive in the large group.” For instance, Turquet “understood about how a person in a group could apparently lose his *self*, altogether, and change in the

most incredible ways because of other members. And I personally rather try to specialize in the subtleties of why that's done. Because it can sound like magic—and it isn't."⁵¹⁴

Lawrence recalled, although "They were quite extraordinary conferences" in the 1970s, they "were only a small part of the work that we did" at the Tavistock Institute. One fascinating phenomenon, Lawrence noted, was that often "the problems that you were having" outside the conference in organizational life "could be brought into the conference and could be, if not directly talked about, illumined through the work that you were doing and visa versa. Whatever you learned at the conference could be taken out again. And that movement between the two was always very important." In other words, the conferences at the time provided a way to examine "the whole idea of how people defend against the anxieties of the workplace." This had been based on the work of Isabel Menzies Lyth, he noted, and was "the crux" of the Tavistock model at that time.⁵¹⁵

The peak year, in terms of number of participants in CASR's group relations training programs, occurred in 1968 when 716 peoples attended. Of this, 55% (393) of the participants were from "industry and commerce" and "in-company," 23% (162) were from "research, training and professional institutions," "academia," and "other educational institutions," 20% (139) from "medical, social, and public services," and 2% (22) from "church."⁵¹⁶

In response to this growing public interest in group events, the 1970s witnessed further expansion in the availability and variety of events both in Great Britain and in America. In 1971, the Tavistock Institute began offering *two* 14-day residential Leicester Conferences, one in the spring and one in the fall, as well as other non-residential conferences, and weekly small study group events at their London facility.⁵¹⁷

By 1973, enrollment had stabilized with 552 annual participants of which 38% (212) were now coming from medical, social, and professional fields and 34% (192) from educational institutions, including universities, and only a small percentage of participants originated from industry and commerce—obviously a significant change in member demographics over just four years.

Although Miller and his colleagues at the CASR were pleased with the popularity of its group relations program, they noted some concerns about the unbridled spread of their methods in the U.S. in particular. "A more intractable problem is a growing number of conferences which carry the label of the 'Tavistock model' but which are organized by bodies that have no affiliation either to the A. K. Rice Institute or to CASR."⁵¹⁸

Demise of the Five Sub-Units-1973

In October 1973, approximately ten years after establishment of the five sub-unit organizational structure, the Tavistock Institute staff undertook a review of their organizational purpose and structure in what could be considered part of the healthy lifecycle for an *idea organization*. Institute staff were concerned that the previous five sub-unit structure had served some staff members' needs, yet conflicted with others. Disagreements over organizational purpose and structure were further exacerbated by the breadth of professional approaches embraced within the Institute as a whole. Staff noted, "Looking to the future, one view is that the Institute should reduce its diversity of approaches and become a more unitary body with a more precise mission. Against that, it is argued that the variety is itself a major asset."⁵¹⁹

In response to these questions, it was determined that the five sub-unit structure “no longer matched operational realities.”⁵²⁰ Therefore a new structure was established empowering “a number of semi-autonomous working groups”⁵²¹ of varying sizes to be “responsible for establishing and operating” their own accounts, retaining and applying its resources as it sees fit.⁵²² The silos were replaced by a flatter, yet still highly differentiated, organizational structure, which pulled away from the core in even more diverse directions.

Yet, operations initially worked well within this new organizational structure based in part on environmental receptivity for their ideas. 1979 was one of the best financial years in Tavistock Institute history, with the Institute earning nearly one million pounds, employing over one hundred staff members in three locations and carrying forward nearly £277,000 in reserve funds. Yet, 1980 marked the beginning of a devastating period for Great Britain in general, and the Tavistock Institute in particular.

Thatcher Years

In 1979, Margaret Thatcher became Great Britain's first woman prime minister, serving longer than any other in the twentieth century. Great Britain in the 1970s was highly bureaucratized with almost 30% of the workforce employed in public sector jobs and government subsidies sustained declining industries like coal. Inflation was high and exchange rates declining. Britain had low growth in industrial productivity, a high rate of worker strikes, rising unemployment and per capita income well below the average for Western Europeans. In response, Thatcher initiated the *Thatcher Revolution*—with its battle cry “there is no such thing as society”—instituting a series of social and economic changes that dismantled most aspects of Britain's postwar welfare state. Thatcher's goal was to reduce the power and influence of trade unions, privatize national industries and combat inflation. She shared many of American President Ronald Reagan's conservative attitudes toward governmental responsibilities, sharply reducing government spending, decreasing taxes for higher-income individuals and supporting policies that favored big business.

Miller noted “Between the end of World War II and the late 1970s, British society generally and its employment institutions in particular were dominated by a dependency culture, in which individual's relatedness to the state and the organization was dynamically similar that of infant and mother.”⁵²³ As the inability of government and organizations to provide for worker's needs became clear, various symptoms of this “failed dependency”⁵²⁴ emerged, such as feelings of alienation, rage, fear and disappointment resulting in the activation of societal defense mechanisms such as withdrawal, retreat and displaced aggressions. Although one might have expected “sweeping changes to be taking place in a wide range of organizations,” Miller argued, “successful experiments are rare,” changes are often precarious and it has become difficult to disseminate innovations.⁵²⁵ As a solution, Miller urged a reconnection between personal authority and the enterprise task via new forms of organizing work and management strategies.

Obviously, Rice's design of the group relations conference was the perfect forum for exploration of this reconnection. Yet, Leicester Conference membership numbers had dwindled. In 1977, only 269 people attended the Institute's group training events as

compared to over 700 annually, ten years prior.⁵²⁶ In response to this waning interest, 1980 was the last year the Institute offered two residential Leicester Conferences.

Between 1979 and 1980, Tavistock Institute revenue dropped £200,000 resulting in a £49,000 deficit as widespread recession created substantial problems throughout the non-profit community. Yet, Institute leaders optimistically noted, “The Institute has the ability and understanding to help society cope with these problems and the availability of adequate funds to enable the Institute to contribute more in these areas is in the interest of the community as a whole.”⁵²⁷

In 1981 the Institute continued to struggle, yet produced a small surplus,⁵²⁸ which “was only achieved by reducing costs” that inevitably meant “further staff redundancies,” as staffing levels dropped 20%.⁵²⁹ A combination of economic recession, resulting in a reduction of corporate contracts for industrial and organizational consultancy, and reduction in government support for social science research significantly decreased the Institute’s profitability margins. In addition, government’s funding cutbacks for university programs further heightened the competitive field.⁵³⁰

As a result of these challenges, the Institute reorganized once again as a healthy *idea organization* must do, in order to survive. “Largely in response to this reduction in size from October 1980, the staff, with the agreement of Council, elected to manage itself through a small Staff Management Group of four, as against previously a much larger representative group of 19.”⁵³¹ This new Staff Management Group replaced the semi-autonomous working group structure previously in place since 1973. This smaller leadership group, consisting of E. L. Hilgendorf, W. G. Lawrence, E. J. Miller, and E. D. Stern, was better able to meet with Council to address the financial challenges of these difficult years. As a result of this reorganization, power appeared to be restored to the central organizational core away from the numerous, diversified semi-autonomous working groups which pulled from the center.⁵³²

The year 1983 was the worst in Tavistock Institute history with revenues the lowest since 1971, and staffing numbers down to 25 from their height of 141 in 1973. By 1987, the organization seems to have weathered the worst of its challenges as income was restored to pre-crisis levels, staff numbers increased to 36 and the Institute amassed a £46,000 surplus.

In 1990, ten years after its last reorganization, the Institute restructured once again in light of the changing economic and political times and its growth since the lean years of the *Thatcher Revolution*. As a result of this restructuring, staff were “organized into a series of groups and programmes led by senior staff members, who take the lead in the development of the Institute’s work.” These senior staff constituted three groups: *The College*, which provided a forum for scientific discussions and elected the *Strategic Management Group*, which represented staff to Council and guided the evolution of professional policy and a *Finance and General Purposes Committee*, which oversaw day to day financial and administrative concerns.⁵³³ This structure seemed productive for a while as the annual report noted “steady and significant growth in the activities of the Tavistock Institute.”⁵³⁴

Over the next few years different units began to emerge within this structure. For instance, in 1990 the *Evaluation, Development and Review Unit* (EDRU) was established with several major long-term contracts for evaluation services and new staff were recruited. In 1992, the *Organisational Change and Technological Innovation* (OCTI)

programme was created and in 1993 the Advanced Organizational Consultation (AOC) programme was launched. As in previous years, these subgroups tended to pull from the *idea organization* core as power became decentralized, increasing competition between subgroups.

Another major change occurred in 1994, influencing life within the Tavistock Institute as an *idea organization*. The Tavistock Institute moved from its location within the Tavistock Centre on Belsize Lane, where it had been located within the Tavistock Clinic facilities for the previous thirty years, to its own building on Tabernacle Street. In many ways, this move represents the final break—first instituted back in the early 1960s—away from the influence of the Tavistock Clinic and psychodynamic perspectives toward a focus on social science research. Or what David Armstrong described as a move away from a “psychoanalytic/anthropological” approach, toward a “classic social psychology/general systems theory” perspective.⁵³⁵

Perhaps not coincidentally, that same year a new programme emerged at the Tavistock Clinic called the Tavistock Consultancy Service (TCS). The TCS was developed by Jon Stokes along with Claire Huffington, David Armstrong and Neil Crawford, and the support of Tavistock Clinic director Anton Obholzer, to fill the void in “psychologically informed consultancy on the human dimension of organizations”⁵³⁶ abandoned by the Tavistock Institute. Armstrong noted TCS was “set-up to re-occupy the founding ground of the Tavistock Institute,” which had been abandoned long ago. He observed that the Institute’s departure from Tavistock Centre was just the final physical sign of what had already happened “spiritually” a long time before.⁵³⁷ Miller made this observation himself, noting as “the mid-‘60s and mid-‘70s” brought “a number of staff from disciplines other than the social sciences” it meant “that the psycho-analytic perspective, which was still predominant in the late ‘50s (at which time it was still mandatory for new staff members to embark on a personal analysis as part of their professional training) is no longer a distinctive trademark of the Institute as a whole.”⁵³⁸

John Bazalgette considered that the void created as the Tavistock Institute moved away from its roots in psychodynamically informed consultancy and group research to have provided opportunity for other organizations, in addition to TCS, to flourish. Organizations such as the Grubb Institute of Behavioural Studies in London and the International Foundation for Social Innovation and Societe Internationale des Conseillers de Synthese in Paris, among many others worldwide, moved to fill this void in their own innovative and unique ways.⁵³⁹

The history of the Tavistock Institute as an *idea organization*, shows an accordion-like reorganization strategy, expanding out into numerous sub-groups then contracting back approximately every ten years. This phenomenon occurred in 1963 when the five sub-units were formed, in 1973, when semi-autonomous working groups were established, in 1980, when the *College, Strategic Management Group and Finance and General Purposes Committee* structure was put in place and again in 1990, when the staff reorganized into “a number of units and programmes” managed by the *Staff Management Board* comprised of representatives from each of the leading units and programmes and a *Management Committee*, which oversees day to day management and interfaces with council.⁵⁴⁰

Unlike some people, who might view this restructuring as faulty leadership or bad management, I contend that this institutional reorganization is not only healthy but should

be viewed as an imperative for *idea organizations* which want to continue to thrive within the changing environments in which they operate. As one might predict, based on the ten-year cycle this history has evidenced, the Tavistock Institute currently is revisiting its goals and purpose, and undergoing another structural reorganization. Where it will take itself remains to be seen.

10: NTL & Groups in America: The Cultural Context

Living through World War II affected people in Great Britain in ways sharply distinct from those experienced in the United States. In Britain the proximity of war to everyday life, especially in the cities, meant air raids, civilian casualties and widespread destruction of private homes and businesses besides military and governmental targets. Although the U.S. felt the impact of the war at home and thousands of U.S. soldiers were killed, post-WWII America was nothing like post-war Britain. cultural change

The United States had far fewer war-damaged structures. While countries throughout Europe turned their attention to rebuilding their demolished infrastructures, the U.S. concentrated on expanding its industries. Faced with little competition, and provided with a ready-made customer base in destitute Europe and Asia, the U.S. economy thrived in the post-war period. By 1945 the U.S. was well on its way to becoming the world's leading technological and industrial power.

New industries such as electronics, chemicals, plastics and aerospace were created, employing large populations of highly skilled workers.⁵⁴¹ Since inflation was negligible, the dollar was strong, and social optimism drove consumerism to an all-time high. Dubbed the *age of affluence* few people, save obscure think-tanks, environmentalists and liberal-minded musicians and writers, worried about the repercussions of these expansionist efforts. Most Americans were not yet concerned about, much less aware of, depleting natural resources, increasing pollution or the ethics of globalization.⁵⁴²

Instead, a freshly minted middle-class drove big gas-guzzling cars out to cookie-cutter homes in newly created suburbs in order to eat fast-food dinners while watching quiz shows on new medium called television. Disgusted by what appeared self-indulgent ethnocentrism, war-weary Europeans looked on with both envy and resentment.⁵⁴³ Of course, another side of this *age of affluence* played out on the streets of Harlem and the backwoods of Mississippi, where America's newly discovered prosperity had not reached and inequities persisted.

American movies, music and literature both reflected and propelled the morphing culture of the fifties and sixties. Influential messages spread by these media created a powerful force that fueled the formation of a number of different *movements* in the U.S. such as the students', civil rights, women's rights and anti-war movements. Another movement of sorts had formed on the fringe of the literary world to guard against what they perceived to be the "deathly pallor of middleclass culture."⁵⁴⁴

Scorning American society and consumerism, conventional schooling and mainstream Christianity, a group of young intellectuals called *Beats* caught the attention of youths eager to resist conformity. Almost exclusively young, white and male, and coming from middle-class families, this group had a lust for life, freedom and individuality, embracing a bohemian lifestyle of non-conformity. Even though by the early 1960s many of the original beats, such as Jack Kerouac and Allen Ginsberg, had moved on, their message had been picked up by a new group of young enthusiasts that

included both high school kids in the suburbs and part-time bohemians at Ivy League universities.

Many of this *beat* generation were walking contradictions. Although they were children of the bourgeois class which these new industries were designed to privilege, their search for individuality led them to reject much of its so-called benefits. They took advantage of privileges their family's affluence afforded, yet began to demand freedoms, both ideological and corporeal, of which their parents had never dreamed. This new generation of young, educated, idealists wanted more out of life than a job with a huge corporation or a house in the suburbs. Rather, they adopted *Beatnik* poets like Jack Kerouac, leftist folksingers like Bob Dylan and Joan Baez and events like Woodstock as examples by which to live.

Their irreverence infuriated an establishment that did not take lightly to insinuations that their leadership was faulty or that post-war society was not the utopia they believed it to be. Few times in U.S. history have Americans so clearly grappled with the very ethos of what it meant to be an American. The confrontation between a critically thinking younger generation, hardened through experience in a myriad of political and social movements, and an apparently close-minded establishment, prone to harboring secrets, resulted in a pervasive distrust of authority.

By the mid-1960s, in fact, the theme *question authority* had become a ubiquitous battle cry as different groups coalesced into a loosely coordinated, disenfranchised, anti-establishment movement. By the time the Tavistock model, with its foundation in the study of authority, was exported to the U.S. in 1965 the cultural ground had already been prepared to foster a rapid growth of the Tavistock approach on American soil.

An Indigenous Group Relations Model: Lewin and the NTL

In fact, the cultural ground was so fertile that an indigenous approach to working experientially with groups already had sprung up in the U.S. during the post-war period. Organizationally this approach was rooted in the *idea organization* called the *National Training Laboratories*, now known as *National Training Laboratories Institute for Applied Behavioral Science* or simply *NTL*. NTL's conceptual roots can be found in the theories of sociologist Kurt Lewin, a theorist who, as previously noted, had significant impact on the Tavistock Institute, especially its co-founder Eric Trist. The precursor of, and to some extent the prototype for, Tavistock's group relations conference and NTL's *human interaction laboratory* had been a 1946 *Connecticut Workshop in Human Relations* held in New Britain, Connecticut. Lewin, director of the Research Center for Group Dynamics (RCGD), was asked to create a program which trained community leaders to cope better with the growing intergroup tensions within their communities. Sponsored by the Connecticut State Department of Education, the Connecticut State Inter-Racial Commission, the Connecticut Valley Office of the National Conference of Christians and Jews and the Commission on Community Inter-Relations of the American Jewish Conference, the organizing committee's minutes dated February 27, 1946 noted that the conference aim was: "Eliciting cooperation and trying to educate people in a clear understanding of how people of different races, colors, and creeds can live and work together, and how best we can achieve harmony."⁵⁴⁵ racial issues

Lewin agreed to organize the conference, undoubtedly, in part, because he was committed to the democratic nature of the conference goals. Furthermore, the need for greater racial understanding was obvious as the civil rights movement had already begun to organize, in part, fueled by black Americans returning home from serving in World War II feeling entitled to compete for better jobs and educational opportunities, which had not previously been open to them.⁵⁴⁶

Lewin accepted the Connecticut Commission's invitation because it provided an opportunity to conduct further research on behalf of RCGD.⁵⁴⁷ He and his staff intended to document and study the process by which conference participants dealt with the controversial issues presented throughout the event. This research element played a significant part in the first conference and was a key element in the design of the NTL, an emerging *idea organization*. Founded after Lewin's untimely death by Ronald Lippitt, Lewin's graduate student, and two of Lippitt's friends, Kenneth Benne and Leland Bradford, NTL had similar goals as those of another *idea organization*, the Tavistock Institute—to develop and study methods for preserving and enhancing democracy within society and its institutions.⁵⁴⁸

Lewin approached the *Connecticut Workshop in Human Relations* with two goals: to help people learn how to live better together by embracing democratic values and to treat the conference as an opportunity for action research. Lewin devised a training program consisting of three learning groups, each containing a leader and an observer whose task was to record the interactions among the group participants. Lewin asked Lippitt to lead one group and invited Benne and Bradford to lead the other two. What happened at the workshop would become legendary in the study of groups and the field of group relations.⁵⁴⁹

Three of the conference participants asked to attend the evening staff meeting, which was usually devoted to staff reports of the day's events. Much to the chagrin of the staff, Lewin agreed to this unorthodox request. As the all-male staff reported, one of the female conference participants disagreed with a staff member's interpretation of her behavior that day. A male participant agreed with her assertion and a lively discussion ensued about behaviors and interpretations. Word of the session spread, and by the next night, more than half of the sixty participants attended the evening staff meeting. By the last evening of the conference most, if not all, participants were attending these sessions, which often lasted well into the night. This new concept of learning in the moment, respecting peoples' different interpretations of events, and providing feedback became a cornerstone of the NTL model, and was influential to other *idea organizations* such as the Tavistock and AKRI Institutes.⁵⁵⁰

It is interesting to note similarities between how Breuer's engagements with young Anna O., in particular her request to be "listened to," ultimately led to development of Freud's free association methods, and how the young woman participant in Lewin's *Connecticut Workshop in Human Relations*, who questioned the interpretations of the all-male staff, ultimately led to development of the human laboratory method as well as Tavistock's group relations conference. Both innovations within these *idea organizations* came through direct confrontation between diverse groups, in particular, knowledgeable outsiders—two women—confronting establishment insiders—typically men.

It was clear to all involved at this Connecticut workshop that something exciting had been discovered about adult learning and groups. Lewin's hypothesis that adults

learn more effectively through experiences shared in training groups rather than traditional didactic seminars was supported by conference data. It also was noted that if one intends to modify behavior, especially with adults, involving participants in group processes designed to expose and examine conflicting points of view was essential.⁵⁵¹

The First NTL Human Interaction Laboratory

In 1947, the first NTL human interaction laboratory was held to develop further and test Lewin's ideas. Although Lewin did not live to see his ideas come to fruition, other men such as Kurt Back, Fred Bales, Morton Deutsch, Henry Reicken, Stanley Schacter and Paul Sheats joined Lippitt, Benne, and Bradford to carry on his work.⁵⁵²

Supported by funding from the Office of Naval Research and the National Education Association (NEA) and conducted at Gould Academy in Bethel Maine, the *Basic Skills Training Group* or *T-Group* was born. The Bethel location was selected in part because of Lewin's belief that intense personal learning experiences should be conducted on a *cultural island* where participants felt safe to try out different approaches.⁵⁵³ The goal of this first laboratory was to experiment with new methods for changing human behavior and informing social relationships. The educational process at the core of these initial and subsequent NTL workshops was called *sensitivity training* and was transmitted to the participants via small groups of people meeting in T-Groups.⁵⁵⁴

The basic structure of the NTL human laboratory, originally three weeks in length and now slimmed down to just six and a half days, consisted of T-Groups in the morning and an A-Group in the afternoon. The T-Group emphasized interpersonal and intrapersonal learning. The A-Group, or Action Group, emphasized skill training and social change.⁵⁵⁵ The pedagogy employed at the NTL workshops was one in which participants were helped to diagnose and experiment with their own behavior and relationships during group learning activities. Staff members, called *Trainers*, guided participants learning within the laboratory community and facilitated the transfer and application of learning outside the laboratory.⁵⁵⁶ This philosophy of learning from one's own behavior in a specially designed group environment assisted by staff, rather than a traditional teacher, is central to all experiential group events—whether conducted at an NTL, Tavistock, or AKRI event.

Although both the NTL and Tavistock models are based on a similar experiential pedagogy—investigating the group as a microcosm of society, studying behavior as it occurs in the *here-and-now*, and providing opportunities for individuals to interpret their own experiential learning experience—there are distinctly different areas emphasized within the context of similar processes. For example, NTL's *T-groups* employ an individualistic lens, increasing members' awareness of self in relation to others by exposing them to group dynamics based on direct participation. Tavistock's *small study group* approach emphasizes a focus at the group level, not the individual, assuming that members' behave on behalf of the group-as-a-whole or some sub-set of the group.⁵⁵⁷

More specifically, the NTL model's human laboratory *focuses on modifying individual's directly observable behaviors and attitudes* through a variety of feedback exercises. In contrast, the Tavistock model's group relations conference *provides opportunities to examine covert and unconscious group behaviors*, especially in

relationship to authority figures, within the temporary social institution of the conference structure.⁵⁵⁸

NTL as an Organization

NTL's first human laboratories were joint ventures between the National Education Association (NEA), the RCGD and the NTL. The legitimacy gained by connection with the NEA and the fruitful research collaboration with RCGD enabled NTL to survive these early years. Small yearly grants from the Carnegie Corporation kept the NTL afloat through the fledgling years of the late 1940s.

NTL quickly gained a worldwide reputation as an organization at the cutting edge of social science research and innovation in understanding group behavior. Attracting the attention of a broad range of scholars and practitioners, NTL staff during the 1950s was a veritable who's who list of influential people from the social science field. In addition to summer labs in Bethel, trainers held events around the U.S., Canada, Australia, and Puerto Rico. A number of labs were sponsored in Europe between 1954 and 1956, supported by Marshall Plan funding made available to teams of American academics and researchers interested in assisting European organizations to increase productivity.⁵⁵⁹

Co-founder Leland Bradford recalled that a \$100,000 grant from the Carnegie Foundation in 1950 provided an increased sense of "assurance of continuity and made possible the establishment of a year-round office and program for NTL to be located within the National Education Association."⁵⁶⁰ In many ways, obtaining the Carnegie Foundation grant marked the end of NTL's formative period, allowing them to move from a fledgling organization scrambling for funding to a relatively stable one with a future, at least for a while. Yet, this funding would also challenge the organization in unforeseen ways.

In an evaluation of the previous human laboratory, Carnegie Foundation auditors had posed what seemed an innocuous question: Were these human laboratories art or science? NTL founders, naturally influenced by their academic backgrounds, were eager to portray their human laboratories as scientific study—in other words, to consider them replicable by other social scientists. Confident their methodologies would work for anyone, they hired a new group of trainers from a wide range of disciplines, with potentially conflicting orientations, without much forethought about their ability to work together effectively, and then paired them indiscriminately. The results, as one might have guessed, were catastrophic as competing personal and professional perspectives emerged, fueled by inter-group rivalry amongst the staff. The cohesiveness of the early pioneers and their dedication to democratic values and social change vaporized as NTL completed its first evolutionary cycle as an *idea organization*: Who would be in, who would be out and what would this organization stand for?

While NTL grew as a formal organization, the NEA gradually lost interest in its programs as NTL expanded activities outside human laboratories toward more lucrative projects in an emerging field called *organizational development* (OD). In addition to organizational changes, methodological changes also occurred. The T-group was now "supplemented by S-groups (skill development), A-groups (action), C-groups (community leadership), and X-groups (for those not benefiting from the T-groups)."⁵⁶¹

From the late 1950s onward OD began to be the major revenue generator for NTL, enhancing its name recognition and prestige within the business world but moving away from the ethos established by Lewin a decade prior. By the end of the fifties nearly every major OD practitioner in America was affiliated with NTL and it began to formalize its membership structure. As a result, in 1957 Richard Beckhard, Jack Gibb,

Murray Horowitz, Gale Jenson, Gordon Lippitt and Alvin Zander joined founders Lippitt, Benne and Bradford to expand the NTL network.⁵⁶²

1960s: The Golden Age

The 1960s were dubbed the *golden age* of NTL because of the steady increase in program enrollment and the growing popularity of its philosophies and methods worldwide.⁵⁶³ Throughout the decade, NTL events continued to draw famous and influential scholars to Bethel. For instance, Douglas McGregor of *Theory X and Theory Y* fame, Abraham Maslow of *Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs*, and Carl Rogers, leader of the *Encounter Group* movement, all attended NTL events. Harold Bridger, co-founder of the Tavistock Institute and early director of the Leicester Conference, first came to Bethel in 1957 to run a workshop and returned virtually every year after to bring his version of Tavistock's socio-technical systems theory.⁵⁶⁴

During the sixties, NTL's membership doubled, revenue increased five-fold and contracts expanded nine-fold. The corporate demand for NTL trained OD consultants rocketed as organizations sought to reduce turmoil, in many ways wrought by the social challenges of the changing times. As its organizational priorities shifted to meet the market demand, a new type of member became affiliated with NTL. Demographics swung from a high percentage of academics and intellectuals toward increasing numbers of business entrepreneurs who prioritized economic goals over democratic values and the study of group behavior.

These new members did not share Lewin and his followers' vision for NTL. Instead, they were viewed by many early NTL members as "crass materialists," interested only in furthering their careers at the expense of the organization. Of course, the careers of early members were enhanced by training this second generation, but early members often had academic affiliations, claiming only to need NTL for collegiality, not income.⁵⁶⁵

As NTL's popularity grew in the areas of sensitivity training and OD, the research agenda aggressively pursued in the 1950s and central to the vision of early organizational founders fell by the wayside. Instead, NTL placed emphasis on development and marketing of professional skill building programs while within the organization an increasingly anti-intellectual climate emerged, suspicious of the value of earlier research designs. In fact, after 1957, little research was conducted at NTL events as lucrative training contracts took center stage.⁵⁶⁶

Over time people became confused about NTL's mission. Two concerns were raised: *ideologically*, people questioned NTL's service of large exploitative and undemocratic organizations and *interpersonally*, people wondered about the membership struggle between the new OD vision and the previous intellectual one. As with many *idea organizations* enduring the challenges of reorganization, the older generation of NTL members felt a profound sense of loss as a consequence of the organizational shift prioritizing OD. Many older members drifted away. Paradoxically it was NTL's success during this *golden age* that subsequently led to organizational implosion in 1970.

1970s: Period of Decline

Although NTL enjoyed tremendous success in the 1960s, the end of that decade marked the beginning of a financial and ethical identity crisis not uncommon in *idea organizations* as they enter their second decade of existence.⁵⁶⁷ By early 1970 NTL had imploded, subverted by the very egalitarian philosophies it claimed to support: the civil rights', women's and anti-establishment movements. NTL President Diane Porter recalled, "Part of that implosion had to do with people feeling that the organization was dominated by white males and [it was time] to bring in more women and people of color."⁵⁶⁸ Perhaps not so coincidentally, AKRI experienced similar challenges from similar quarters 20 years after its initial incorporation date as well. (NTL was incorporated in 1950 and fragmented in 1970. AKRI was incorporated in 1970 and fragmented in 1990.) gender issues, racial issues In addition to these social challenges, there were other financial problems plaguing NTL, hastening its decline. First, the American economy was heading into a recession and, with a glutted membership of well over 500, NTL had essentially trained itself out of business. Independent OD consultants, trained by NTL, now competed with NTL for the lucrative contracts the parent organization desperately needed to survive. Porter recalled:

There had been this rapid expansion and growth and there were field offices in five or six different locations around the country. And it never really operated as a business because it was just this thing, this association that people came to, and then there was a realization that you had all this expense...by the 70s we had trained so many people to do the same thing that we did—they were out doing it for the business that would have automatically come to NTL.⁵⁶⁹

There were other financial challenges as well: The NTL's training facility in Bethel required extensive renovations and the Department of Defense had cancelled a major training contract. As a result, NTL was having difficulty managing some of the same organizational challenges that it so famously had helped other organizations to overcome.

Another factor contributing to NTL's decline was a *core value*, established by NTL founders, to share their theories and methods with whomever could benefit. There was never any sense of copyright or non-disclosure agreements and by the 1970s this philosophy had become a huge financial liability. Porter discussed the financial impact of these early decisions on her organization today:

There is an economic struggle at NTL because we have never acted like a business, we never trademarked anything we did. We started with the philosophy that education was to be given away. Well, now there are other companies that are taking our stuff and are making a million dollars off of it and we created it...We've always operated, for 57 years, on an economic shoe-string and it was just enough to pay the bills. We've had a love-hate relationship with money in the organization because, I think, we always thought that money was just an evil medium. We needed it just to get by. We've never had large reserves, so when you live on a shoestring and something causes you to break that shoestring then you're in trouble.⁵⁷⁰

Yet, NTL's problems were not only financial. Replication of their theories and methods became so widespread in America in the sixties that it fostered a full-fledged movement, the *personal growth* or *human potential movement*. Groups within this movement, generically called *encounter groups*, traced their origins to the theories of Lewin, the methods of NTL and the concept of sensitivity training capitalizing on NTL's

fame and previous successes. Yet encounter groups lacked the structure, focus and application, which other methods of studying groups had contained. As a result, they often attracted negative publicity and criticism to NTL because the general public had difficulty differentiating between the two.

Some of the harshest criticisms of encounter groups were based on the questionable expertise of group trainers, psychological danger of some exercises and lack of standardized training goals. For example, a variety of *non-verbal exercises* were used in encounter sessions consisting of almost any imaginable scenario--some included the deprivation of sleep and bathroom facilities or forced interactions among naked group members--all as a way to explore the fringe of social taboos. Another criticism of encounter group workshops was their enthusiastic claims of success based on anecdotal evidence which encounter group experts such as Jane Howard and Carl Rogers freely admit were unsubstantiated.⁵⁷¹

Yet, during the height of its popularity, this human potential movement was a heady representation of the changing American culture, often referred to—albeit sometimes satirically—in movies such as *The Diary of a Mad Housewife* and *Bob and Carol and Ted and Alice*; television programs such as *Dragnet*, *The Courtship of Eddie's Father* and *The Phil Donahue Show*; and popular magazines such as *Time*, *Vogue*, *Redbook*, and *Psychology Today*. Few encounter groups remain in existence today, but their underlying ideology can be found in mainstream self-help programs such as Alcoholics Anonymous, 12-Step programs or even some daytime television talk shows.

In addition to sensitivity trainers, OD consultants and encounter groups replicating NTL's work, a number of colleges were able to operationalize the vision of early NTL founders by creating university programs based on NTL's theories and methods of working with groups. For example, Case-Western Reserve University developed a doctoral program in OD and Benedictine College, Fielding Institute, George Williams College, Pepperdine University and the Union Graduate School all developed master's degree programs. Today, there are over twenty graduate programs in the U.S. alone owing homage to NTL.⁵⁷²

Yet NTL was not involved directly with, nor did it receive any financial reimbursement from, these lucrative university programs that built upon their ideas. Although it had sacrificed its role as a premiere innovator in social science and group behavior research twenty years prior, by the mid-seventies NTL no longer held a leadership role in OD either. Its organizational focus became simply to avoid extinction.

In 1975, with mounting unpaid debts and intra-organizational strife NTL's Board made one final effort, with bankruptcy contingency plan in hand, to avoid dissolving the organization. They formed a committee called *The Four Horsepersons*, consisting of Barbara Bunker, Hal Kellner, Edith Seashore and Peter Vaill, to develop a plan of action to save their faltering *idea organization*. In order to survive, a massive restructuring was undertaken to reduce overhead, maximize revenues and become a more inclusive, democratic organization.

First, every one of NTL's 500 members was "fired."⁵⁷³ Then a select group of 65 past members were rehired under a new cohort system designed to ensure better representation of women and minorities. This new membership was asked to volunteer two weeks of unpaid service to the organization over the next two years. In addition,

NTL stopped its once popular, but now no longer lucrative, publishing business, except for continuing to publish its *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* and an occasional book. It also closed the six regional field offices that were located around the U.S. in favor of one national office. Finally, the Board was reconstructed to include one-third white males, one-third women, and one-third minorities. Racial issues gender issues

In 1975, Elsie Cross, the first woman and first person of color to join the Board, was elected as Chair and Edith Seashore became the first woman NTL President. Yet some people felt that a high price had been exacted during the restructuring process. Many talented, creative individuals drifted away either because they were not invited to rejoin or declined the invitation for various reasons. For example, well-known group theorists such as Chris Argyris, Warren Bennis, Warren Burke, Harvey Hornstein, Barry Oshry and Marvin Weisbord, all NTL members before 1975, were no longer on the roster after 1976.⁵⁷⁴

Although this tumultuous restructuring was difficult and alienating to many NTL members, it offers an excellent example of the cycle *idea organizations* must work through in order to stay competitive and innovative within their field; whether NTL has achieved that goal remains uncertain. What is clear is that systemic changes were required for NTL to survive as an institution. And while the process may not have been ideal, the changes made stabilized the faltering organization. Perhaps the only criticism we can level, in hindsight, is that NTL's restructuring had not occurred sooner in organizational history.

By 1979, NTL had partnered with American University and developed a jointly sponsored master's program in order to begin finally to capitalize on the success and popularity of its own ideas in a university environment. By the close of the tempestuous seventies, NTL was able to pay its past debts and its training laboratories were once again thriving.

1980s: NTL's Missed Opportunities

As a leaner more focused NTL emerged from restructuring, one might have expected it to be an organization now primed to innovate as the 1980s ushered in a more competitive global marketplace eager to harness the rapid technological innovations bursting forth at the time. Businesses in dire need of NTL's assistance in their struggle to restructure, downsize and reengineer their organizations in order to compete in the new global marketplace should have provided ample opportunity for NTL's work. Yet, this expansion and innovation never occurred. Instead, NTL focused on repackaging the same workshops into numerous certificate programs, such as diversity management, OD consultation, and experiential education. A remarkable opportunity for NTL to capture market-share and reestablish itself seems to have been squandered.⁵⁷⁵

"What went wrong?" we might ask. Evangelina Holvino, a senior researcher at Simmons School of Management and experienced NTL and AKRI scholar, provided one answer. She observed that continuing to repackage once successful workshops into a product and then, once the market was saturated, refocusing the themes of these same workshops into a train-the-trainer product, undermined NTL's success. By concentrating on providing these products, the NTL stopped experimenting, researching, and pushing

the boundaries of group study in innovative ways, as the organization had done in previous decades. Holvino recalled:

I do think [NTL] has shifted from its original work which was a lot more focused on learning, was a lot more focused on research, learning about groups, experimenting with modes of working with groups... Pressured by the need to make money to survive in the context of a very [competitive] market environment, where profit is what makes sense, in that context NTL had to consolidate its learning into a *product*. And began to sell the product and the product is now *human interaction labs*. And when that didn't bring enough people, then we developed other products to sell. We invented, for example, how to teach people how to be diversity consultants... So I think we got stuck in a form of T-Group that is maybe from the 70s or 60s or something. There is no on-going learning and research pushing the boundaries of what we are doing.⁵⁷⁶

When asked to compare the causes of NTL's shift in ideals over the years from a research and experimental approach towards a more product-oriented approach, Holvino pointed out:

We need to put all this in the context of the social environment in which we are. Those were also the days when there were big grants for research and for learning. Now learning is totally tied to the corporate environment. Even universities depend now on corporate monies to do their research. So, I think it is unfair to say that it is an NTL problem I think it's a problem of who's doing the learning in a U.S. capitalistic context today, who can afford to do learning?⁵⁷⁷

Although these are perfectly plausible answers to the question of "What went wrong?" I suggest that, in addition to these factors, as an *idea organization* NTL failed to continue to reorganize and restructure itself to meet market demands in a timely fashion. Instead, NTL rode the waves of its success in training programs ignoring the closed, self-serving system it was creating. By the time the organization fragmented in 1970, twenty years after incorporation, it was nearly impossible to recover, so much intra-organizational damage had been done.

1990s: Continuing Identity Crises

The 1990s continued to be a time of tremendous potential for the theories and philosophies of the NTL as organizations struggled to meet the demands of a changing world and a more global marketplace. Yet, NTL continued to miss opportunities to excel. Instead, practitioners trained by NTL, using NTL methods and never-copyrighted training materials, established their own companies, making millions of dollars satisfying this market demand.

Meanwhile, NTL focused on tightening its bottom-line costs and developing a replicable product to sell, apparently losing sight of its foundational ethos. In 1998 Diane Porter, an experienced and savvy business woman, was hired as Director and President of the NTL. She is the first non-practitioner ever to hold this position and brings a different, more business-oriented perspective to the job. Porter recalled that when she was hired, there "was a feeling that the organization wanted to move outside itself rather than to stay so inwardly focused and pick its President from one of its existing members."⁵⁷⁸

In a positive sign, one of the main challenges Porter and the NTL continue to wrestle with is the question of organizational purpose. Porter stated:

The big issue is: Do we do our programs for our own benefit, and the people who pay to come to them just happen to be necessary bystanders to help pay for this experience? Who do we serve? Do we serve our clients, or do we serve ourselves?

And I think we are still wrestling with that question today.⁵⁷⁹

Such questions about organizational purpose are essential for *idea organizations* and were replete within the Tavistock Institute's history, although noticeably absent during most of the history of AKRI, as we will see in subsequent chapters. Finding an answer is essential to the future viability of the *idea organization*.

For many of the older generation who were involved in the group movement and NTL at the height of its popularity during the *golden age*, these changes represent a sad turn of events. Today, the new generation of professionals in group relations and OD are often not even aware of NTL's vast contributions to innovation in groups; many do not even recognize the name.⁵⁸⁰

11: AKRI as an idea organization

The following two chapters analyze the history of a fourth *idea organization*, that of the A. K. Rice Institute for the Study of Social Systems (AKRI) in the United States. Methodologically AKRI claims lineage to the Tavistock Institute's model of group relations, yet *organizationally* AKRI has always been an institute of a very different sort.

The Tavistock Institute had been developed as a social science research center focused on the study and amelioration of wider social problems in family, industry and community. Undaunted by the enormity of this self-assigned challenge, Institute staff sought to change society in ways similar to their implementation of *therapeutic communities* and *New Army* values during the Second World War. At the pinnacle of its success in the 1960s and early 1970s, the Tavistock Institute was a social science Mecca attracting dozens of "visiting social scientists," from around the world to conduct research. It was large and profitable. In 1973, for instance, the Tavistock Institute employed 141 people, 73 scientific researchers and 68 administrative staff in four locations throughout the UK: two in London, one in Coventry and another in Edinburgh.⁵⁸¹ Institute income that year reached nearly £700,000.⁵⁸² In today's dollars, that figure would equate to approximately \$5 million. During this period, Tavistock's Centre for Applied Social Research accounted for about a quarter of the Institute's total income, as much as \$1.25 million annually, the result of consulting, research, training and publication contracts.

AKRI never reached this level of staff or income. In fact, AKRI remains unique among psychodynamic *idea organizations* because, unlike Tavistock or NTL, or most organizations for that matter, AKRI is a virtual organization, existing only on paper. Without any physical structure, AKRI lacks an institute or office space one can visit. Nor does it provide a journal⁵⁸³ for members to read or in which to publish. And although AKRI has one dedicated administrator, it has no group of full-time employees with which to engage. AKRI is an organization-in-the-mind.

Unlike Tavistock or NTL, both of which have detailed written histories, AKRI appears to have made scant effort to document its institutional past. I make this observation not only because few published accounts of AKRI history exist,⁵⁸⁴ but also because few primary sources were available for analysis, leading one to conclude that AKRI's history over the past 39 years has existed almost exclusively as an *oral tradition*, passed down from generation to generation via word of mouth.⁵⁸⁵

Oral History

Previous research has shown organizations that rely on oral traditions foster a climate fertile for the development and circulation of myths, rumors and legends.⁵⁸⁶

Therefore it is not surprising that AKRI's lack of documented, written history has fostered an informal oral tradition where myths, rumors and legends shaping AKRI's culture have emerged in its place. Oral traditions exist, to some extent, in all *idea organizations*, and can fuel intra-organizational tensions by fostering the sense that there are rival groups competing to control the institute's legacy—an *in-group*, privy to institutional oral history and power, and one or more *out-groups*, who lack access to the "official story." Yet, the more exclusively an organization relies on oral traditions, the more likely such rivalries will be fueled.

As a researcher, I was concerned about having to place such a heavy and almost exclusive emphasis on oral history as a method of data gathering with which to study AKRI. Yet, as historians have noted, the practice of history always depends on what story can be told from the available records and all records, whether written or oral, official or informal, remain only partial accounts of "what happened." And the story told always reflects the historian's own interpretation of available data. Whether the data consists of official archives of written records and other documentary artifacts, or has been provided through eye witness accounts, the sources the historian uses to create a story about the past are never innocent of perspective. Data, whether written or spoken, are not unmediated, self-defining "facts" about a situation, but reflect systems of documentation and perception, which also shape what is recorded or said to have happened.

When the data available are based almost exclusively on an oral history record, one must approach the task of interpretation with particular caution. I have weighed carefully whether and how to present AKRI's history through such records and have been concerned to avoid both being manipulated—forced to choose a side—and manipulating—becoming an unwitting spreader of unsubstantiated rumor. To ensure that I was not misrepresenting any informant, I shared my reported findings with each one before publication.⁵⁸⁷

A further complication in telling AKRI's history is that I am an American, a member of AKRI and on the board of directors for Grex, AKRI's west coast affiliate. Would an organization with little apparent interest in preserving its history allow it nevertheless to be written by a member of the younger generation? Or was it not imperative that this challenge be taken up by the new generation in order to repair psychological damages inflicted across generations. Was it not time to make reparation in order to allow the organization to become unburdened of its contested past?

Central to this unburdening would be an exploration of how the innovation AKRI required to survive became the victim of covert processes and attacks, fostering inter-group rivalries that put the organization at risk. Like many *idea organizations*, these dynamics had been present throughout AKRI history. Yet these dynamics—inherent in any *idea organization*—were further exacerbated by AKRI's early leadership strategies and organizational structure. Important to this analysis are the personality and predilections of AKRI's founder, "the mother of group relations in America,"⁵⁸⁸ psychoanalyst Margaret Jeffrey Rioch and her followers.

Rioch's Story

The story of Rioch's life is a fascinating one and quite unusual for a woman of her generation. Born in Paterson, New Jersey in 1907, Rioch and her mother moved in with

her grandmother after her father's untimely death the year after her birth. She grew up an only child in a household of three women, all of them teachers: her mother, grandmother, whose own husband had died at a young age, and her mother's unwed sister. As a result of this upbringing, Rioch recalled, "it seemed to me very natural that a woman should have a profession. In fact, it would seem to be unnatural for a woman *not* to have a profession of significance and importance to her. Marriage, on the other hand, did *not* seem so natural."⁵⁸⁹

Although this was depression era America, Rioch attended Ridgewood High School, then Wellesley College and Bryn Mawr College for her doctorate, studying philology, literature and philosophy. After graduating in 1933 she taught German, first at Wilson College, then at Wellesley College, where she met future husband, David McKenzie Rioch, M.D., Professor of Neuroanatomy at Harvard Medical School. The two married and moved to St. Louis where David became the first Chair and Professor of Neuropsychiatry at Washington University School of Medicine.⁵⁹⁰

Rioch recalled, "It never occurred to me to raise any questions about" the move "although it meant for me giving up a job and a promising career." Hopeful she would find new employment, she soon found that Washington University had a policy against nepotism, therefore there was no chance of "getting a job there as long as my husband was employed in the medical school."⁵⁹¹ Although initially disillusioned, Rioch made the best of her situation. "Fortunately marriage gave me leisure and financial security enough to pursue graduate work in psychology."⁵⁹²

In 1943, Rioch received her Master of Arts Degree from Washington University in Psychology and began pursuing research using the Rorschach test, a new psychological assessment tool gaining notoriety at the time. This work convinced Rioch that her interests lay more in qualitative rather than quantitative research methods, and drew her towards clinical work and psychotherapy.⁵⁹³

After five years in St. Louis, David Rioch decided to return to the east coast, taking a post at Chestnut Lodge Sanitarium in Rockville, Maryland. Rioch recalled "Again without questioning I went along and found my own niche in the Community Mental Hygiene Clinic in Rockville and, later, as psychologist at Chestnut Lodge, where I was the only psychologist ever permitted to do therapy in that very medically, psychoanalytically-oriented hospital."⁵⁹⁴ Rioch, who had been influenced by Harry Stack Sullivan and Frieda Fromm-Reichmann, started to explore the relationship between psychotherapy and religion including the influence of Zen Buddhism teachings, training in Paris with Hubert Benoit, collaborating with Alan Watts, Daisetz Suzuki and Martin Buber.⁵⁹⁵

Rioch's claim to fame as a psychologist came in 1960 when she conducted *A Pilot Project in Training Mental Health Counselors* with Charmain Elkes at the National Institute of Mental Health. In this project, Rioch trained middle-aged mothers whose children were now grown to use psychotherapy as mental health counselors. The purpose was twofold: first to help meet the demands for community-based, low-cost mental health services; and second, to provide older women with meaningful second careers. Rioch recalled "When the children no longer need them" middle-aged women often felt "unused, unneeded, empty." Yet she knew "that many of these women were intelligent, perceptive, and potentially very good therapists." Meeting "a great need at that time for low-cost psychotherapy," Rioch thought "for many intelligent women whose husbands

were at the height of financially successful careers—doctors, lawyers, etc.—the financial rewards were not [as] important” as the personal rewards were.⁵⁹⁶ Gender issues

Although by today’s standards Rioch’s thoughts about women’s economic needs could be considered sexist and elitist, evaluated within its historical context her approach to mental health was revolutionary. Of course, examples of using trained, yet non-medical, professionals in therapeutic communities can be traced back to Freud and his support for lay analysts as well as to the *Tavistock group* during World War II. Yet Rioch’s research proved pivotal to spreading the idea of using *paraprofessional* mental health workers in the United States, easing the burden on clinicians as well as broadening opportunities for underrepresented groups to gain entry into medical fields. Rioch’s attraction to the idea of using psychotherapeutic techniques with non-clinicians could be another reason the Tavistock model appealed to her as she became quickly dedicated to its successful importation to America.

The Tavistock Model Goes to America

The story of Rioch’s attempt to bring the Tavistock model of group relations to American soil begins in 1963 when she attended Tavistock’s *Leicester Conference* at the suggestion of her British friend, Cyril Sofer, a Tavistock Institute member.⁵⁹⁷ Rioch and her colleague, Morris Parloff from the National Institute of Mental Health, traveled to London to participate in the Advanced Training Group, the second of its kind. This was the fifth Leicester Conference, the second directed by Rice assisted by A. Allaway, N. Bishop, E. Churchill, E. Michell, J.E. Richardson, J. Tibble, E. Towndrow, and P. Turquet on staff.

The 56-year-old Rioch was enthralled by both group relations and by Rice himself. She recalled “Since my college days there is no one I regard so much as my teacher, mentor, and in many ways a role model” as Rice. In particular, she admired “the discipline with which he held to any task he took on, but particularly that of conference director.”⁵⁹⁸ Rioch immediately invited Rice to conduct a group relations conference in the U.S. Yet after discussion, it was agreed to first conduct a trial conference for Americans in England and Rice and Rioch began organizing the event for the following summer.

Once home, Rioch attended an NTL human interaction laboratory with the goal of ensuring that these novel British group relations conferences were not already being held in America, in another form. She noted “The whole attitude, the philosophy, the principles, and what one could learn, seemed to me to be quite different” at NTL than “what I had experienced in England.” As a result, she felt confident Tavistock “would be bringing a new injection into the American bloodstream.”⁵⁹⁹

In the summer of 1964 Rioch and twenty-five Americans, predominantly from mental health fields, journeyed to London where they joined twenty-five Europeans, mostly Tavistock clients from the business world, at a group relations conference. Although not much has been written about this historical event, it must have been a success because, in June 1965, the first American group relations conference was held at Mount Holyoke College in South Hadley, Massachusetts.

Jointly sponsored by the Tavistock Institute through the support of Rice, the Washington School of Psychiatry (WSP) through Rioch and the Department of

Psychiatry, Yale University School of Medicine through Fredrick Redlich, Rice directed this first American conference. He brought Pierre Turquet and John Sutherland from the Tavistock Clinic to join Rioch, Redlich, Irving L. Janis, Harold S. Kolmer and David M. Rioch on staff (See appendix B).

Over the next four years Rice served as director, with Rioch as associate director, for what would become the annual *Holyoke Conference*, predecessor to AKRI's National Conference. During those years, the conference was jointly sponsored by Tavistock, WSP and Yale. The conference format closely resembled the Tavistock's *Leicester Conference* in its structure of small group, large group, inter-group, and application group events and the primary task of studying the dynamics of authority and leadership in an experiential fashion.⁶⁰⁰

This first event was so successful that in 1966 two group relations conferences were held, both directed by Rice with Rioch as associate director. First, the *Holyoke Conference* in June with Marshall Edelson, William Hausman, Harold S. Kolmer, Jacob Levine, Fredrick C. Redlich, David M. Rioch, Roger L. Shapiro, John D. Sutherland and Pierre M. Turquet on staff. Then, in September, at the Connecticut College for Women with Arden A. Flint, Harold S. Kolmer, Ruth G. Newman, Pierre M. Turquet and Lyman C. Wynne on staff.

Two conferences were held in a similar manner annually until 1970: AKRI National in the spring at Mount Holyoke and a second conference in the fall at Amherst College. After 1971, only the AKRI National Conference continued with regional centers now conducting their own events.

Although the instant popularity of the Tavistock model in the U. S. in the 1960s can be attributed to a social climate inclined to *question authority* and a population primed by NTL methods and encounter groups to study group behavior, it can also be attributed to Rioch's personal connections and charismatic powers of persuasion. Fondly remembered as often having a very traditional feminine side, Rioch was nonetheless known to be a highly driven, career woman with powerful political and institutional connections which she enjoyed exercising.⁶⁰¹ Perhaps honed by her employment experiences in male dominated professions, Rioch seemed to thrive in competitive arenas.

For instance, Laurence J. Gould, an early AKRI leader and Rioch friend, recalled: "Margaret was always thought to be a man's woman and not a woman's woman."⁶⁰² She grew up professionally "in a man's world" and "she was a woman who liked men, clearly."⁶⁰³

In addition to her charisma, connections and ability to excel in a competitive male dominated world, Rioch had a passionate, sometimes overwhelming commitment to seeing the Tavistock model succeed in America. Edward Klein, another early AKRI leader and Rioch friend, recalled Rioch was "dynamic, very goal focused, driven." AKRI "was her baby" and "she really pushed for it, was tremendously involved in it." She also was "very assertive" and "made things happen" by getting people to do things. Without Rioch's influence, the Tavistock "approach wouldn't have taken off as well" in America.⁶⁰⁴

Yet Edward Shapiro, a second generation AKRI leader, described another side of Rioch's leadership. She was "a formidable woman," a real "tough old bird." Although "incredibly smart" and "passionately involved in this work," she could be "a difficult

person.” She was “a woman of definite opinions” and “if there was something about you that offended her, and she was easily offended, you were off her list. And it was hard to get back. She was difficult.”⁶⁰⁵

Klein also observed that Rioch’s leadership fostered inter-group rivalry as she “developed a number of younger men who were coming up and sort of taking over, becoming the next generation.” As a result, “women felt somewhat left out.”⁶⁰⁶ Others have echoed these sentiments about Rioch’s patterns of exclusion. Gender issues

Patterns of Exclusion

It seems shocking, yet ultimately not surprising, that a strong, assertive woman like Rioch, who herself had apparently struggled to succeed in a male dominated profession, would create an organization that would essentially foster an exclusionary climate. Yet, a review of 39 years of AKRI history supports the claim that women were predominantly excluded from leadership roles on the AKRI Board of Directors, National Conference directorship and staff roles until the mid-1980s.⁶⁰⁷

For example, between the years 1966 and 1970, Rioch was the only woman to serve on staff of the Holyoke Conference.⁶⁰⁸ In 1970 one woman, Rachel A. Robinson, wife of baseball player Jackie Robinson, joined Rioch and the six men on conference staff. In 1969, when the AKRI Board of Directors was established, Rioch was one of two women, the other being Elisabeth Solomon, appointed to the board with six men. This trend to have one, perhaps two, women in leadership roles continued for the first 15 years of AKRI’s existence.

Some informants noted, similar to NTL’s history, this dearth of women in leadership roles was merely a reflection of the lack of diversity in American leadership at the time. In other words, if Rioch wanted to get powerful and influential people to support her fledgling organization in order to ensure its success, she had to recruit men because they held the influential roles in American society. Klein observed that the men Rioch selected “were in a position to vouch for something” and AKRI’s success was based on the leadership of “the senior males in those places. It’s possible that it could have started more equally but then it wouldn’t have reflected our culture.”⁶⁰⁹

Yet, women were not the only people who felt “somewhat left out.” Another, perhaps less visibly distinct group on the periphery of the AKRI leadership circle consisted of people from organizations not affiliated with mental health related fields. For example, the entire American staff of the first four Holyoke Conferences were exclusively people from mental health professions. The only exceptions were the two Tavistock representatives, Rice and Miller, both anthropologists. In 1969, Kenn Rogers, a Professor of Business Administration and Organizational Behavior at American University, became the first American non-healthcare professional to serve on conference staff.

It was not until 1986—21 years after the first American conference—when Earl T. Braxton directed the AKRI National Conference that a non-clinician was selected as director.⁶¹⁰ In fact, since its inception, only 32% of AKRI National Conference Directors had been from non-mental health backgrounds (excluding Rice’s early guidance in this capacity). This AKRI trend to use, almost exclusively, clinicians on staff dissipated slightly in the 1990s, but 60 to 70% of AKRI National Conference staff continue to hale

from mental health related professions. In addition, although two women have directed the AKRI National Conference, Faith Gabelnick (1992 to 1994) and Charla Hayden (1998 to 2000), to date Braxton has been the only person of color.⁶¹¹

Important to note is that Tavistock's Leicester Conference was staffed during the same period with men and women from a wide range of disciplines such as academia, the clergy, the prison system and social science fields with only a small percentage of mental health professionals. Why does this matter? I believe that AKRI's early trend under Rioch's leadership to prioritize the use of mental health professionals significantly affected the manner in which the AKRI group relations model developed within the cultural context of the United States. As a result, there was a more therapeutic focus with emphasis on the individual's experience, overshadowing the need for application to organizational life.

AKRI president Robert Baxter agreed, "It may well be that prioritizing the use of mental health professionals led to a more internally focused organization than might have evolved if there had been a broader disciplinary representation." As a byproduct, he noted, "This internal focus ultimately led to confusion about AKRI's primary task."⁶¹² Similar to the struggle within NTL in the 1970s, Baxter noted the question within AKRI in the 1990s was whether it was "to be an educational organization or a membership organization, focused on the 'care and feeding' of its members."⁶¹³

One could argue that American culture itself was more individually oriented, as opposed to British culture's emphasis on socialistic and collective dynamics. The influence of indigenous group methods in America, like NTL and encounter groups, should also not go unrecognized. This influence was felt not only methodologically, with an increased focus at the individual level, but Rioch may have felt pressure to differentiate from these preexisting groups by selecting mental health professionals from outside these spheres.

Yet, why was a more interdisciplinary group not selected? One reason, Arthur Colman, a Jungian analyst and past AKRI president mentioned, was that group relations in America attracted "liberal, '60s radicals," "hotshot psychologists and psychiatrists" who were anti-corporation types. These people were not interested in seeing corporate people such as organizational managers, police, religious figures or prison administrators in positions of authority. They were rebelling against those arenas of institutional power.⁶¹⁴

Psychoanalytic Focus

Wesley Carr explained AKRI's shift away from the Tavistock Institute's interdisciplinary ethos toward this more psychoanalytic focus. The American group relations model "was much more psychoanalytic" with "psychoanalysts, psychiatrist, psychologists" and their "whole world much more present both in the staff and membership than it was in England. In Great Britain it was always much more spread among industry, government, church, psychology. It was all part of a field, a set of fields." Once group relations in America became lodged in that world, "I don't think that it ever quite broke out."⁶¹⁵

Yet, this begs the question of why should it matter whether group relations events are staffed with mostly clinicians, as in the U.S., or a diverse range of professions, as in

the UK. Carr noted “When you have a conference of members and staff who are largely in the psycho-therapeutic world, then you have to be very particularly wary of collusion into that world. When you’ve got a variety of worlds on both staff and members you’ve got a better chance of something being picked up” for what it represents within the conference, not outside of it. “I won’t say that it is superior or better but it’s just different and slightly more invigorating, I think.”⁶¹⁶

Given the extent to which group relations theories have been intertwined with psychoanalytic theories, one might infer that the more one knows about psychoanalytic theory the more one could contribute on staff. Yet Carr disagreed, noting the Tavistock model is “based upon psychoanalytic thinking but it is *not* based on being psychoanalyzed.” There was a time when it was felt that to be on staff one should have been psychoanalyzed. But, he noted, “I don’t think that has ever been held too strongly in Great Britain” and “it *is* certainly untrue today. I mean I’ve not been psychoanalyzed and I’ve directed two Leicester Conferences and a lot of other conferences.”⁶¹⁷

On the other hand, Gould emphasized the importance of returning to stricter psychoanalytic interpretations within the conference setting. “We’ve probably strayed a bit too far from the psychoanalytic roots.” In my generation, conferences were “distinctly more psychoanalytic, distinctly more about unconscious processes, distinctly more about transference.” Today, “conferences are probably less about authority even though it continues to be in the title.” “If you read *Experiences in Groups*, Bion talks mostly about the groups’ relationship with him,” to me that is “still the model about how one positions himself within the conference.” There are, of course, lots of other interesting dynamics that go on in groups but exploring those is “just not what we are about.”⁶¹⁸

In many ways Gould exemplifies Carr’s assessment of the American movement’s focus on psychoanalysis when he recalled, “We were much more steeped in the psychoanalytic world in every possible way, including knowing the literature.” Today, Gould contends, “there is a considerable lack of knowledge and conversant with these books, articles, and ideas except in a very superficial way...Most people in AKRI these days don’t really understand *basic assumption* life terribly well.” To understand Bion and *Experiences in Groups*, Gould argued one must understand “Klein’s notions of the paranoid schizoid and depressive position.” To his generation, he said, “broadly speaking, those were things that people thought about, worried about, talked about. I don’t think that is part of the conversations any more in AKRI. I think, probably, almost nobody has really read Klein or read Klein deeply.”⁶¹⁹

Yet, Solomon Cytrynbaum claimed it is this myopic fixation on early theorists’ work that has negated the influence of more recent research. “It is surprising to me that for many Tavistock theoreticians and practitioners, Bion’s *Experiences in Groups* remains the dominant viewpoint with respect to the understanding of small group processes and development.” The inference is, he suggests, that a whole “body of systemic research and theory accumulated over the last twenty-five years” has had little impact on “theory and practice of small group consultation in the Tavistock Tradition,” despite the fact that a “host of systemic and rigorous, observational, empirical and clinical studies within an ego-psychological framework (certainly reflecting the Kleinian influence)...indicate that group processes and development are much more complicated and sophisticated than Bion had originally articulated.”⁶²⁰

As a leadership scholar, Theresa Monroe brings yet another perspective to the debate. “I’m not sure that there is one best way to prepare for conference work...Different staff members bring different strengths with them. I think there is a role and a place for people that have done a lot of work in psychology. They bring an awful lot to the staff. People who have been really immersed in organizational life also bring a very important perspective.” There is certainly not one best way to prepare for organizational life, and “that is a really key piece of this work, not conferences. It is what conferences are geared for...improving people’s ability to exercise leadership and authority in group settings, organizational settings, all kinds of groups.”⁶²¹

Kathleen Pogue White, a psychoanalyst and second generation AKRI leader, embraced these philosophies. “My picture of the ideal future is that we self-consciously continue to offer the orthodox group relations opportunities--AKRI conferences, Leicester Conferences--just as they have always been...A part of me that fights for orthodoxy; and fights for looking down at the floor...and for the rigid boundaries” because that tool, for some, is exquisite.

White added that the future includes figuring out how to get group relations “into the mainstream,” beyond sending people to conferences. Until recently the average person was frightened of the notion that there is an unconscious world that we cannot control, she noted. But now the idea of the unconscious has become more mainstream. “People use common parlance around all these ideas: transference, projections, unconscious.” Psychoanalysis has gotten “that kind of material into the mainstream consciousness” so perhaps we can “be less stymied” in our pursuit of group relations application now.⁶²²

Evangelina Holvino, a senior researcher at Simmons School of Management, introduced yet another perspective regarding the study of authority. She noted “You put people that represent different nationalities or races or genders in a staff, not because you are necessarily *politically-correct* but because you do get different dynamics around authority.” It is just “not the same to have a white man in an authority position than to have a black woman,” for instance. Without the study of these differences, Holvino contended, AKRI remains in danger of becoming an elitist organization, only interested in “white people’s stuff.” If AKRI wants to maintain relevancy and make group relations useful to everyone, it must attract people from all demographic groups and “by pushing for things that are relevant to those [excluded] groups.”⁶²³ Racial issues

Princes

Some informants argued that instead of being intentional AKRI’s exclusionary practices merely reflected the social inequities of the era. Yet regardless of whether women, people of color, or non-mental health professionals were intentionally excluded, culturally left out or simply overlooked, one cannot ignore the structural implications of exclusion within the AKRI organizational system as in-groups and out-groups became delineated. This culture can, in some ways, be traced back to the early leadership of organizational founders. As Rioch began to organize her fledgling organization, a trend began to emerge in the ways she chose people to join her inner leadership circle. As

already alluded, Rioch's inner circle tended to be white, male, often Jewish, and typically from the mental health professions. This group became known as Rioch's *Princes*.

Exactly how and when the colloquialism *Princes* came into vogue remains uncertain. Perhaps because Rioch had imported the Tavistock model from England she became known as the Queen, with her court of protégés known as the Princes. Perhaps it had more foundation in the manner with which Rioch held her authority, in a *Queenly* manner. Whatever its roots, the appellation gained an international reputation as Isabel Menzies Lyth jokingly remembered "Margaret, and all her young men" visiting London and the Tavistock Institute in the sixties and seventies.⁶²⁴

Gould, one of Rioch's Princes, described his memory of this phenomenon: "Margaret had her...couturier of favorites—her court, her inner circle. Clearly, by the way, Garrett O'Connor was her Number One Prince. I was the Number Two Prince."⁶²⁵

Eric Miller recalled it somewhat differently: "Roger, Larry and Garrett, possibly in that order, were the three crown Princes, waiting for the laying-on-of-hands by Queen Margaret." Interestingly, Miller volunteered "I have no recollection of a Princess."⁶²⁶ Edward Klein listed the order of Princes in yet a different way: "Roger Shapiro, who was a little older than the other Princes, really spent a lot of time with Margaret." Then "Garrett O'Connor, Larry Gould, myself, maybe there were some other people."⁶²⁷

Robert Baxter, past AKRI president and president-elect, contended that: "Margaret's boys" included "Jim Miller, Larry Gould, Glen Cambor, Lars Lofgren, Roger Shapiro, Ed Klein, Arthur Colman, Garrett O'Connor and Ed Shapiro." Men who were chosen to develop regional AKRI centers. Shapiro was "the last person Margaret created a world for" in the Boston Center.⁶²⁸

Although which males claimed lineage to a Princely title remains up for debate, one detail that every informant agreed upon was that, "Until the day she died, Margaret never had a Princess."⁶²⁹

How did one obtain access to Rioch's inner court and the coveted Princely title? Klein observed that it "was some combination" of "hard working, pretty aggressive, pushy, somewhat flamboyant" young men who Rioch "saw promise" in. Basically, "she liked being surrounded by young, bright, good looking men."⁶³⁰

Arthur Colman explicitly noted the sexually charged atmosphere of the times, recalling that Rioch, who even "as a woman in her early sixties, was still staggeringly beautiful and was used to that attractiveness getting her what she wanted."⁶³¹ This technique worked especially well with men he contended, like her Princes, who were all "metaphorically at least, hopeful lovers."⁶³²

Shapiro had a somewhat different interpretation of the Princely role. "It gets attributed to charisma or to a relationship with Margaret or some other fantasy." But, what it really "has to do with is those people who made significant contributions" to the field. Yet "In an organization...built around group dynamics, the issue of differentiation and envy is powerful. Every time anybody differentiated themselves—*every time*, either through their capacities or their skills—it would invoke competitiveness and envy and murder."⁶³³

With so much knowledge about group behavior, early leaders of AKRI should have been aware of the negative repercussions on the dynamics of the group that could result from having an inner circle of chosen ones. What remains curious is that this

phenomenon not only was tolerated, but also nurtured beginning with Rioch's leadership and continuing into the next generation.

White believed this phenomenon to have been ignited and perpetuated by the group relations conference experience itself, which suggested that one could be brought into the AKRI *castle* by a Prince, yet not be welcomed into Queen Rioch's *inner court*. "All these people at these big conferences wanted to get into this little tiny tight circle of well held, united, divine, *chosen ones*." Yet, "the problem with 'Mother,' was that she had her" group of young men and "each of them may have had one or two [protégés]. I was one of Larry's." And Rioch "didn't like this second tier out there because the guys, rightly so, [had] figured they needed to bring some women in." "So Margaret had these step-daughters that she did not like at all."⁶³⁴

If AKRI had restructured around the ten-year point when these issues became apparent, by developing more explicit links to organizational application and becoming more inclusive, it may have avoided much of the fragmentation the organization later endured. Yet, in ways similar to NTL's history, AKRI ignored these warning signs that it was time for their *idea organization* to innovate and evolve in order to remain healthy.

Rice's Death

Rice's untimely death on November 12, 1969 was a devastating blow to AKRI leaders. In part blinded by their organization's quick rise in popularity during the anti-establishment era of the 1960s, AKRI appeared to have been fantasizing that their leader Rice might live forever and assist to develop organizationally. The now incorporated name-sake, the *A. K. Rice Institute*, picked up the pieces as best it could yet in many ways remained immobilized, since little formal infrastructure had been put in place.

The first Holyoke Conference after Rice's death was extremely challenging for AKRI and especially painful for Rioch. She recalled, in those days "we tended to be very forehanded about brochures," so as a result, the Holyoke brochure for next June was already at the printer with Rice listed as director. "Although we of the American staff knew Ken had not been in good health in the summer, we had not known that his ailment was so serious, indeed fatal."⁶³⁵

In response, a simple statement was typed inside the conference brochure "Notice: The Board of Directors of the Mount Holyoke Group Relations Conference announces with deep regret the death of Dr. A. Kenneth Rice on November 12, 1969. Dr. Margaret J. Rioch will be director of the 1970 Conference. Dr. William Hausman will be associate director."⁶³⁶ As a result of these staffing changes, Rioch opened the conference stating simply "Ladies and Gentlemen, this conference was to have been directed by Kenneth Rice. As you no doubt know, he died last fall and I am directing in his place with the agreement of the staff."⁶³⁷ She then proceeded to introduce the staff which included Flint, Gould, Hausman, Klein, Miller, O'Connor, Rogers, and R. Shapiro.

Gould recalled after that conference that Rioch had told him "she didn't want to be the Director" because "she wasn't Ken."⁶³⁸ True to her word, Rioch never directed the AKRI National Conference again. She says of that decision, that the 1970 conference "had been more than enough emotional strain for a while."⁶³⁹

Yet Rioch did continue in staff roles at the National Conference in 1973, 1976, 1977 and 1978, also serving on staff of the Tavistock Institute's Leicester Conference in

1966, 1968, 1969, 1973 and for the last time in 1987. In addition, Rioch “very actively took up Ken’s philosophy of stimulating” development of the regional centers by staffing or directing “many of the local conferences of the centers as they formed to help them get off the ground,” Gould recalled.⁶⁴⁰

Yet, as Carr put it, although Rioch “obviously inspired considerable devotion among a lot of people,” she got herself “into the position of being the sort of ancient leader who is just sort of there and there and there.” As a result, the next generation was “pushing quite hard to do things and as a result doing things differently.”⁶⁴¹ White concurred recalling how Rioch’s lack of attention to succession ultimately led to a leadership coup. Rioch was getting “very, very old and sort of losing her sharpness” and if she had had some insight into “the way she held her authority, she might have set up a transition to another authority,”⁶⁴² form which might have ensured the long-term viability of the organization. Instead AKRI was heading for fragmentation.

Even into the 1990s, although “losing her sharpness,” Rioch remained vigilant and involved in all aspects of AKRI. Numerous informants recalled that few changes were made without the “laying on of the hands” by Rioch.⁶⁴³ She continued her clinical practice, group relations work and teaching as a professor of psychology at American University until failing health forced her into retirement in 1991. She died of a heart attack in her home in Chevy Chase, Maryland on November 25, 1996 at the age of 89.

Lack of Application

As AKRI matured intra-organizational tensions inherent in all *idea organizations* became particularly acute as a result of three unique factors: an early leadership structure which fostered exclusion, a lack of application orientation and a weak organizational structure. Yet, since many Americans were already attracted to the notion of examining group behavior and experiential learning, primed by NTL, encounter groups and the human potential movement, the instant popularity of AKRI’s conferences masked the need for an organizational infrastructure that could provide long-term viability for the fledgling institute. What was missing from AKRI was a structure that would support its group relations work yet tether it to application and purpose in the wider organizational world.

Mannie Sher, director of the Tavistock Institute’s Group Relations Programme, observed that “at some point” shortly after Rice’s death in 1969, group relations “moved off in two directions. You’ve got in Britain, Ken Rice developing a laboratory to study groups and organizations *with direct application value*...Whereas in the states, you have group relations *as a phenomenon* developing.”⁶⁴⁴

Sher makes a critical observation: American group relations differed from that in Britain because the U.S. perspective lacked “application of group relations theory, thinking, and learning to actual real life organizations.”⁶⁴⁵ If AKRI leadership had been drawn from the *diverse work settings* advertised in the conference brochures, rather than predominantly from mental health professions, then AKRI might have been better able to find application for its group relations work in a wider array of organizational life. Instead, group relations in America emerged with a strong therapeutic orientation rather than the Tavistock Institute’s interdisciplinary focus with direct organizational application.

James Krantz, a senior fellow at the Wharton School, supported Sher's observation, noting "When aspects of the Tavistock tradition were brought across the Atlantic, the Conference work split off from what we might call the organizational, or socio-technical work." As a result, group relations conference work became "lodged in the AKRI, primarily composed of clinicians. The organizational, or socio-technical work was lodged in various management schools including UCLA, Wharton, York and others."⁶⁴⁶ This conference-consulting split illustrated an important institutional separation, underlying AKRI's formation as an organization.

As a result of this lack of application orientation, Sher noted that a virtual "group relations ladder" emerged within AKRI. Without any explicit purpose, other than the perpetuation of conferences, a competitive culture emerged encouraging people to climb within AKRI's power structure, rather than learn to apply the work outside to organizational life. Even if not financially lucrative, conference work was a ladder to power within AKRI, further exacerbating intra-organizational tensions. Sher emphasized, "I'm not in favor of developing group relations as a professional career. I mean once it becomes institutionalized and professionalized and socialized, one is going to get all of the problems that I think you are encountering in America. The politics, the internal politics of organizations."⁶⁴⁷

Klein contended that "the problem" with AKRI is that "a lot of people join it because all they want is to be consultants at conferences. That is only one small aspect of what you can use this knowledge for." Encouraging application, he emphasized one can use group relations skills to become "more effective as an executive coach," "organizational consultant," and in "administrative" and "management" roles.⁶⁴⁸

Although this drift away from Tavistock ethos, rooted in application, started over thirty years ago, it remains an undercurrent in AKRI today. Sher recalled that, when he was in the U.S. at an AKRI group relations event last year, "I didn't hear anything about people's work and it occurred to me that people do their work in other organizations. They don't do it at AKRI...All I heard was more and more rarefied comments about group phenomenon. But it was unrelated to bricks and mortar."⁶⁴⁹

Regional Centers

In addition to the exclusionary culture and lack of application orientation, another factor further exacerbating the intra-organizational tensions with AKRI has been the development of regional centers. As early as 1966, AKRI began emerging as an organization that attempted both to centralize and decentralize power through the creation of regional centers. Although on paper this may have seemed like a viable vision for the organization, in practice it further led to intra-organizational tensions and an easy means of organizational splitting.

The first AKRI center was the Washington-Baltimore Center, founded by Margaret Rioch, Roger Shapiro and Garrett O'Connor circa 1966; it remains in existence today. In 1969, three new centers were formed: The Topeka Center founded by Roy Menninger, which no longer exists; the Minnesota Center founded by William Hausman and dissolved in 1975; and the West-Coast Center Grex, Latin for group, founded by Lars

Lofgren, Arthur Colman, Lowell Cooper and Richard Shadoan, and is one of the eight centers still in existence today.⁶⁵⁰

In addition to Washington-Baltimore and Grex, there are six more centers—now called *affiliates*—in existence today: The Boston Center, named Center for the Study of Groups and Social Systems (CGSS) founded circa 1982 by Leigh Estabrook, Edward Shapiro, Sten Lofgren, and Mary Wright; the Chicago Center called Chicago Center for the Study of Groups and Organizations (CCSGO) founded circa 1990 by Solomon Cytrynbaum and Robert Lipgar; the Mid-West Center founded circa 1977 by Edward Klein; the New York Center founded circa 1982 by Harold Bernard, Ken Eisold, Leslie Freedman, Lawrence Jacobson, Avi Nutkevitch; the Philadelphia Center entitled the Philadelphia Center for Organizational Dynamics (PCOD) founded by Rose Miller circa 1994; and the Texas Center founded circa 1971 by Glenn Cambor and Manuel Ramirez.⁶⁵¹

Other AKRI centers no longer in existence include: The Yale-New Haven Center named the Center for the Education of Groups and Organizations (CEGO), founded by Jim Miller, Edward Klein and Nancy French; the North Central Center founded by William Hausman, Marian Hall, Jim Gustafson and John Maurel circa 1969, lasted until 1978; another west-coast center called Study Center for Organizational Leadership and Authority (SCOLA) established circa 1973, disbanded circa 1979 was founded by Garrett O'Connor, Lars Lofgren, K. West, Charla Hayden and Zoltan Gross; another New York Center entitled the Institute for the Applied Study of Social Systems (IASOSS), founded circa 1971 by Larry Gould, Jay Seaman and Dave Singer, lasted until circa 1978; and the Central States Center founder by Louesa Danks, Elizabeth Heimburger, Robert Baxter, and Tom Dolan circa 1974 and unincorporated in 1999.⁶⁵²

This “federated organization of centers, each one having a representative to a National Board of Directors”⁶⁵³ could have been borrowed from the early NTL organizational structure which also initially, and unsuccessfully, had separate centers.⁶⁵⁴ I have often wondered why Rice and then Miller, with all their experience in semi-autonomous working group structures, supported this structure for AKRI. Perhaps they did not support it, or because it mirrored the Tavistock Institute’s own organizational structure at the time, which included five strong, autonomous sub-units, they believed the use of centers to be a temporary way to organize the fledgling institute. If so, I wonder whether they meant for this structure to have remained in place so long. Regardless, the results were the same in both Tavistock and AKRI when a system designed to be federated with shared power between, became confederated silos.

Gould recalled how he, Rioch and Hausman developed this organizational structure, in part, as a response to group relations people moving away from the east coast. “A diaspora started to develop as people involved in group relations work took jobs in other parts of the country.” Then as “critical masses of people” emerged in “other parts of the country, they made application for center-hood.”⁶⁵⁵ The “rationale” for development of centers was “quite straightforward,” he noted. As “the ordinary centrifugal forces of career development” dispersed trained staff around the country, “several groups had already formed and were working independently. The federal structure had as its rationale, therefore, the development of a collaborative network of

local institutions—both to embrace those already formed, as well as providing for new ones to come into existence, and link up.”⁶⁵⁶

Although this diaspora may seem “straightforward,”⁶⁵⁷ facilitating development of regional centers, other group relations experts had different interpretations. For instance, supporting Sher’s observation of a group relations ladder, Klein recalled “One of the reasons for the centers was to give people work at local weekend conferences with the hope that they’d accrue enough hours so that they could be on the National staff, where the ‘big boys’ and ‘girls’ were.”⁶⁵⁸

White provided a different, more metaphorical interpretation, noting when “Margaret Rioch brought the work to the States, she formed what in effect was a kind of Church. And people who pray to this Church were from all over.” The purpose of “that original group of men and women, mostly men, around her was simply spreading the word.” They then developed centers “to make mama proud and she was proud,” bestowing on them “the greatest warmth and love and affection.” As a result, this “inner circle felt extremely special, like they were extremely special people, on a mission. On a kind of religious odyssey—they were in the business of conversion.”⁶⁵⁹

Ed Shapiro, like Gould, took a more pragmatic stance. “It is just too complicated, given people’s lives, to travel” to conferences. As a result, you can build the organization by developing local interests, supporting local conferences as a means to “expand the work.”⁶⁶⁰ Over time, it became clear that although the original intent may have been to create a “federated”⁶⁶¹ organizational system based on a strong centralized government, in reality the AKRI center structure emerged as a *confederate* system. In other words, a system based on a weak central government and powerful affiliated units.

CEGO

By the mid-1970s most of the group relations conference work in America was being conducted at the regional center level, while research and consulting were being accomplished via universities, leaving AKRI national in a relatively powerless position. An excellent example of this phenomenon can be found by examining the history of the *Center for the Education of Groups and Organizations* (CEGO), for a time AKRI’s Yale-New Haven Center.

The story of CEGO’s struggles and transformation can be used to illustrate the paradoxical nature of the relationship between AKRI national, its regional centers and universities—clearly illustrating the confederate nature of the AKRI structure. CEGO’s history can also be used as an example for more pragmatic reasons: Much has been written about it, its successful operations, its subsequent break with AKRI, and its transformation from AKRI center to self-sufficient organization. This proliferation of written records is unusual for AKRI.

CEGO was a very active and highly successful AKRI center. Klein, who was one of the founders of CEGO in 1969 as well as the Director of Group Training in the Yale Psychiatry Department between 1967 and 1975, estimated that in an average year during that time he directed twelve to fifteen weekend group relations conferences at Yale.⁶⁶²

The conferences were in high demand, in part, because many universities required psychiatry students to have substantial experience in group relations training as part of their residency programs. In addition to the psychiatry residents, Klein recalled how other graduate students from psychology, administrative sciences, epidemiology, public health, and other disciplines also attended his events.

CEGO was also very active in application of group relations perspectives to the wider social network. Calling it “the hay-day of the community mental health movement,”⁶⁶³ Klein described how he and his colleagues at Yale applied group relations in innovative new ways such as in drug dependency programs and mediation between Black Panthers and local police rookies in a community training program. After only a few years as an AKRI center, the highly successful CEGO began questioning the purpose of its affiliation with AKRI.

Solomon Cytrynbaum, a psychologist at Yale at the time, described his memory of the critical incidents leading to CEGO’s split from AKRI in the 1970’s. The causes were twofold. First, a victim of their own success, “Jim Miller and Nancy French, our representatives to the AKRI Board reported that AKRI was planning to impose a substantial tax on Centers that were involved in sponsoring residential conferences.” Second, CEGO members were unhappy about the patterns of exclusion that had become clear within Rioch’s leadership circle. And since CEGO had a large number of minority and female members, “the feeling was that AKRI was not taking our organizational and professional interests seriously” and “we were not fairly and appropriately represented on the AKRI Board.” As a result, “the battle cry ‘no taxation without representation’ was expressed” as CEGO seceded from AKRI to continue its successful group relations work on its own.⁶⁶⁴ Gender issues, racial issues

Other centers seemed to share similar concerns as CEGO. By the end of the 1970s, six centers had disbanded.⁶⁶⁵ Lowell Cooper, co-founder of Grex, provided some perspective, “California never took too warmly to AKRI dominance.” Instead, we decided to proceed “with independence from AKRI and Margaret’s control. It was somewhat mixed with rebellion, but seemed to me primarily a feeling that we were just going to do what we wanted and what fit our needs.” Although initially “satisfied with local conferences,” “by the 80s I had really lost interest in AKRI issues...I just felt that on several counts, the central organization was toxic.”⁶⁶⁶

12: AKRI's Organizational Fragmentation

A number of changes occurred within the A. K. Rice Institute (AKRI) in the 1980s, further exacerbating intra-organizational tensions and setting the stage for AKRI's organizational fragmentation in the 1990s. Some factors influencing these changes were external, others were internal, heightened by environmental influences. Yet, all worked in concert to undermine the organization's cohesion and affect its membership.

Externally, similar to Margaret Thatcher's influence in the UK, the political and economic climate ushered in by President Ronald Reagan resulted in a more fiscally conservative, less community-centered view of social responsibility and was accompanied by widespread economic recession with broad implications. Solomon Cytrynbaum remembered a rather mundane yet significant example of the consequences: "By the early 1980s the oil crisis and the dramatic increase in the cost of airfares essentially made residential conference work away from home with a significant number of imported staff impossible."⁶⁶⁷ Therefore, the significance of having a strong local support network was amplified, further strengthening the power and importance of regional centers.

Waning public interest in certain forms of political activism, social programs, community outreach—social and political movements of all kinds—resulted in a significant decline in support for group relations events. And as the ethos of the mental health field as a whole shifted away from group treatment methods toward more pharmacological solutions to psychological problems, interest in working experientially with groups diminished. Once a prominent feature in mental health training, group methods were now considered less relevant. As a result, the motivation to attend a group relations conference for a large part of AKRI's constituency—mental health professionals—effectively was eliminated. Cultural change

Cytrynbaum recalled, "In the mid to late 60's psychiatry was in a very activist mode with heavy social and community emphasis. As social and community psychiatry lacked a coherent theoretical or conceptual base, group and systems theory and research provided one theoretical viewpoint."⁶⁶⁸ This manifested itself in universities making a substantial commitment to group relations training and research. By the mid-1970s, "it became clear from psychiatry funding priorities at the national level and promotion patterns" within universities that "social and community psychiatry was losing its influence;" a number of talented psychologists failed to achieve promotion and tenure at universities.

Internally, AKRI experienced intra-organizational challenges similar to those NTL confronted around its 20-year anniversary, which led to NTL's organizational fragmentation. For instance, as American society emerged from the civil and women's rights era of the 1970s, people had expectations of greater inclusivity, forcing AKRI in turn to respond. By the 1980s, largely as a result of the successful outreach efforts of AKRI's regional centers, many "new faces" could now be seen at group relations events, demanding access to, and influence over, organizational power.

Inclusion of these new people from varied backgrounds ushered in a new era where previously unexplored questions, such as how to judge a staff member's competency to consult or to direct a conference, began to be raised. In prior years, the closed nature of the Princely group was fantasized to ensure competency. People new to group relations did not take these insinuations of incompetency lightly, claiming it was yet another not-so-subtle form of discrimination. Evangelina Holvino observed, questions about competency arise "when people who are not white and are not male begin to arrive in the organization...It's not just about competencies; it has this whole other layer of control. Of controlling who is in and who is out in a different way."⁶⁶⁹ Gender issues racial issues

Rioch Loses Presidency

Although there were ripples of dissent running through AKRI membership for years, the first clear indication of social resistance and impending organizational fragmentation became apparent in 1986 during the campaign for AKRI's new board president. Marvin H. Geller's presidency was concluding and Margaret Rioch, who had not yet held the post, decided to campaign. Initially, she ran unopposed.

Arthur Colman recalled he was contacted by a number of AKRI members who could not tolerate that the 79-year-old Rioch was running unopposed. "No one else would run against her," he said; so, he decided to accept the challenge. Colman recalled AKRI members were dissatisfied with current organizational leadership and "concerned with who would be their leader." Colman won the election and Rioch was infuriated. Yet, AKRI membership had made their preference clear.⁶⁷⁰ The next significant indication of unrest crystallized in 1990.

1990 AKRI National Conference

Although not all the details of the 1990 AKRI National Conference and its organizational after-shocks are clear or uncontested, one thing is apparent: deep and lasting reverberations were felt throughout AKRI at the time. The aftermath of this event has continued to haunt the organization even as it attempts to restructure with clearer educational priorities. Described as a *cataclysmic event* in AKRI's 1995 history video, it was a time of "painful transition from what some have characterized as charismatic leadership to a more collaborative organization."⁶⁷¹

The story begins in 1987 with the selection of Edward Shapiro, then an associate clinical professor of psychiatry at Harvard Medical School, as the AKRI National Conference Director for the usual three-year stint. He was selected through ordinary channels—by a vote of the AKRI board of directors.

Shapiro's resume of group relations experience was typical for someone with his credentials at the time. After attending two conferences as a member in the mid-1970s, Shapiro began working on staff in AKRI's Washington-Baltimore Center, directing local conferences and, in 1980, joined the staff of AKRI's National Conference. In 1988, Shapiro was the associate conference director under the tutelage of Earl T. Braxton as director, and in 1989 he directed his first AKRI National Conference. This conference went well and as a result, Shapiro "wanted to try something different in 1990."⁶⁷²

The 1990 AKRI National Conference differed from previous conferences in many subtle, yet influential, ways. These differences worked in conjunction with other influences both institutionally, within AKRI, and at the conference itself to create a watershed event.

First, the membership was divided into two groups, a “working conference” and a “training group.” Although this was a common format for Tavistock’s Leicester Conferences, this was the first AKRI National Conference to be structured in this manner since Rice’s 1966 conference. Shapiro recalled “I decided, after consultation with the Board of Directors, to have a training group” and invited Wesley Carr, who had directed the training group at Leicester, to come and “bring the design and work with me” to develop it. It was “innovation time” because “I had never directed a conference with a training group in it,” and “that also made me a bit more vulnerable.”⁶⁷³ The adoption of this unique conference structure with which most of the staff, including the director, had had little experience became an important dynamic within the conference because it provided a clear line of demarcation along which the conference staff and membership could split.

Second, the title of this conference was “Authority, Leadership, and Interdependence in Organizational Life” with the concept of *interdependence* added as an element to study for the first time at a National Conference. By introducing the concept of *interdependence* into the conference environment, the director and staff appeared to be encouraging an examination of the nature of mutually dependent relationships within organizations and, specifically in this case, conference life. Another important inference to be drawn from the interdependence label could be the directive to examine the relationship, or lack thereof, between authority and leadership. As it turns out, investigation of this relationship became an important dynamic as the conference unfolded.

Third, conference staff hailed from a diverse range of backgrounds and the roles staff members took up also differed significantly from previous AKRI National Conferences. For instance, Shapiro was “Conference Institution Director” as well as “Director of the Working Conference” and Wesley Carr was “Conference Associate Director” and “Director of the Training Group.” Although Carr had considerable conference experience, especially with the training group design, he was the first British person since Rice to serve in the National Conference directorate.⁶⁷⁴ Carr was assisted by Charla Hayden in the training group and the rest of the staff, who consulted to the working conference, included Marian D. Hall, Elizabeth B. Knight, James Krantz, John T. Lundgren, Janice E. Ruffin, and Leroy Wells Jr.

Fourth, in the 1990 National Conference brochure Robert F. Baxter was listed under both “Administrative Associate” and “Consultant Staff,” in addition to being noted as the current President of the AKRI Board of Directors.⁶⁷⁵ Although Baxter contended that the staff “were all quite clear about” these various roles, hoping to use the experience “to study” and teach “about authorization,” from a conference member’s perspective it may have communicated a lack of clarity, ironically foreshadowing later events.

Fifth, of the nine staff members, two-thirds were from health care professions, including the director, while the remainder was either from the clergy, organizational consulting or academia. The fact that the majority of staff came from so called “caring professions” became an important factor in conference dynamics.

These data are not inconsequential. One cannot begin to understand what happened systemically at the 1990 AKRI National Conference without understanding three key points: (a) the conference was structured uniquely; (b) a majority of the conference staff, including the director, hailed from healthcare backgrounds, taking up unique roles within the conference structure; and (c) the area of conference study was *interdependence*. One more point should be emphasized before analyzing the systemic impact of this watershed event. Although Shapiro was very experienced, he was under stress from outside influences. As he put it, “I was in the middle of a divorce and my life was in some disarray.”⁶⁷⁶

The nine-day AKRI National Conference began in the usual manner with conference members checking in on the morning of June 16, 1990. Over the following days, the working conference attended large and small study groups, inter-group, and institutional events, while the training group met separately in very small study groups and other training events. The training group and the working conference met together during plenaries throughout the institutional event and over the last few days of the conference, during review and application groups, where select training group members consulted, many for the first time, to working conference groups.

The Tavistock model group relations conference was designed to provide security for both staff and member alike—fostering an environment that can both contain participants’ anxiety as well as facilitate learning—by engaging four strictly enforced “boundary controls.” First, the external conference boundary should not be broken; second, each conference event has a primary task; third, each staff member has a designated role and is tasked to “stay in role,” and fourth, all conference events start and stop on time. How competently the staff enforce these four boundary controls becomes material for study and learning.

In the ensuing days a series of critical events occurred: First, the conference external boundary was damaged; second, a split emerged in the conference staff and membership; third, a conference member became over-stimulated; fourth, issues around competency to consult were brought to the forefront; and fifth, role boundaries were blurred. These critical incidents reverberated within the staff, the conference as a whole and AKRI as the sponsoring organization. To use Rice’s open systems terminology, these events worked in concert to damage both the internal and external boundary system of the conference. By the fifth day, when the institutional event took place, the boundary system was damaged so extensively that the conference structure appeared to have been compromised fundamentally.

Carr recalled “The conference, in my judgment, began to get out of hand” when the director finally confessed to “speaking across the boundary of the external.” Shapiro admitted having had personal conversations with someone outside the conference and injected that information back into the conference. Carr noted, as “the outer boundary was being broken quite regularly, the inner boundary” became “un-holdable.” Because people can’t “hold inner boundaries unless the outer boundary” remains “utterly secure.”⁶⁷⁷

“At some point in the institutional event,” it became clear to Carr that the situation had become untenable.⁶⁷⁸ “I had to say this boundary is so badly blown that we have a very dangerous conference on our hands. And somehow or other it has to be sealed.”⁶⁷⁹ Feeling responsible as Associate Director, Carr began to take matters into his

own hands as the week progressed. He confronted the Director with his concerns about the permeability of the conference boundary and asked Shapiro to stop these private conversations, which Shapiro declined to do. Meanwhile, the rest of the staff grew more concerned about Shapiro's behavior as well.

Carr felt few choices remained. "I couldn't then, with integrity, continue to be Associate Director because I was excluded from this cross-boundary activity. And I couldn't hold the total boundary of the conference without the Director." So, "I resigned as Associate Director but not as Director of the Training Group and, well, we just did the rest of the conference like that."⁶⁸⁰

Although Shapiro acknowledged his outside distractions and marital problems during the course of the conference, he remembered the "boundary management" issues differently. Because Carr and Shapiro recently had written a book together, and because Carr was more experienced with the training group design, Shapiro felt he "was dependent on him in the conference." As a result of this interdependence, "we were a kind of seamless pair, dynamically. So, I think one of the things on his mind was to interrupt that pair so that things could be more visible, so he stayed as Director of the training group." Yet, it "was very difficult" and "I was angry at his resigning." I even "contemplated firing him as director of the training group, but decided not to."⁶⁸¹

As sponsoring organization, AKRI's organizational dynamics no doubt permeated the conference boundary as well. In particular, attitudes about exclusion, competency and gender dynamics, played themselves out in conference dynamics. Shapiro recalled that "there were lots of difficult organizational dynamics around gender transition in leadership" occurring within the conference. "For example," early on "the female staff members had their own meeting, the data of which they wouldn't bring back into the conference and I couldn't get a hold of what the dynamic was, as Director."⁶⁸² As the conference progressed, complications around boundary management and access to critical information continued to be a significant issue within the staff group.

As a result of Carr's resignation, a split emerged within the conference staff and membership as the training group continued under Carr's leadership while Shapiro directed the working conference with the remainder of the staff. Carr recalled that "It was fairly divisive" for the staff. "The training group went its merry way, also divided. So, it was quite a splitting conference. And I suspect that some of the splitting went into the sponsoring institution" after the conference.⁶⁸³

Another event critical to understanding the dynamics of the conference, exemplifying the purpose of the boundary controls built into the group relations conference design by its founders, was that the over stimulated member continued to be used on behalf of the group-as-a-whole. Yet, curiously, this member was allowed to continue participating in conference events.

One theory supports that staff must *trust the group relations model* and if the environment has made someone upset, then like a temporarily shell-shocked soldier, the best way to facilitate recovery is to keep them tethered to their group and their role within it, as a way to help them get well. Central to this logic was Bion's notion that behavior displayed in a group was a problem of the group, *never* solely a problem of the individual. And like a shell-shock doctor, the group consultant in this situation must not single the member out with individual attention, but rather stay in role, projecting utter confidence that the member will regain composure completely in an expeditious manner.

Removing the individual from the stimulating environment only exacerbates their condition. Yet, as previously described, role boundaries within the conference had become blurred, affecting the system's ability to repair itself.

Training Group and Competency to Consult

Although a regular feature of Tavistock's Leicester Conference, the inclusion of a training group at an AKRI National Conference was unique. Carr recalled that "Training group members are both members and, at the end, acting consultants." It's a "very important role" yet also "a very difficult one. Nobody's ever pretended it's easy. But it is a very good way of learning about being a consultant, because you can't hide away as a consultant because you are always being dragged back as a member. You can't be a pure member because you are always being pushed away as a consultant. So, you get a very strong sense of being used."⁶⁸⁴

In addition to these challenges, questions surrounding *competency to consult*, which had been simmering within AKRI as an *idea organization*, bubbled to the surface at the 1990 conference, especially when training group consultants Carr and Charla Hayden were tasked to operationalize *competencies*, a concept previously only theoretically debated. These two consultants had to determine which training group members were competent to consult to conference application groups. At least two interpretations of competency were salient. One, voiced by Hayden, contended that competency was a way to standardize role requirements in order to be *more inclusive*, countering illusions of elitism and cronyism which had been prevalent during AKRI's early years. Competency was, in this view, an imperfect attempt at egalitarianism.⁶⁸⁵ The other position, to which Holvino adhered, argued that competency was a cover for discrimination, since it had never been an issue until a growing number of women and minorities became AKRI members and pushed for wider leadership roles within the organization.⁶⁸⁶ Of course these positions are not mutually exclusive and, for some people, both are held to be true.

Shapiro recalled that the debate about competency became injected into the 1990 conference. "What the staff decided to do was to institute something that had been a thorn in the side of the organization forever. And that was *public evaluation of competence*." As a result, the staff decided to "choose out of the training group, based on written criteria, who would consult." Yet, when "you hire people on the basis of public criteria as opposed to secret dynamics—people don't like that. People get hurt, they get angry, and it produced a very powerful dynamic in the conference."⁶⁸⁷

The debate about competency became public when two individuals from the training group were not chosen to consult to application groups in the final days of the conference. Carr described his role in this dilemma: The

Director of the training group has to commend to the director of the conference the trainees for acting consultant appointment. And Charla and I very sadly came to the conclusion that two of them simply couldn't get their heads and their feelings sufficiently around things to be recommended for this. So, we had a divisive division in the training group, which is fairly unusual in my experience...We had quite a stressful time and the trainees had a stressful time, far more stressful a time than they will ever have as consultants.⁶⁸⁸

Another confounding element that came to light as the conference unfolded was role confusion, particularly represented by Baxter, who was both AKRI Board President, and also served as Associate Administrator under AKRI's administrator, Kirkpatrick. Shapiro recalled that this was decided "after a lot of discussion with the National Board in part because we were trying to develop ourselves administratively, as an organization."

Shapiro developed this role because he “thought it would be useful for the president” also to have administrative experience while actively occupying the role as president. “And [Baxter] thought so too...But it turned out to be a terrible mistake. When things got tense, he got pushed into the role of president and not the role of administrator. And then...tension [developed] because a group of staff coalesced around him. And it was terrible.”⁶⁸⁹

Baxter remembered it slightly differently as an “experiment” designed to “demonstrate one’s ability to work specifically from role.” For instance, as AKRI President, Baxter was Shapiro’s and Kirkpatrick’s “boss” outside the conference, yet if Baxter could stay in conference role as administrator within the conference “it might be a valuable thing for people to learn from.”⁶⁹⁰ Yet, with just two days left in the conference, Baxter recalled, “Ed said, ‘I think I’m going to resign.’” In his role as Board President, Baxter advised Shapiro not to resign, but warned him that if he did resign, “the Board would decide” what happened next.

Despite role confusion, stress and turmoil amongst the staff and training group, Carr reported that “After the conference, it fell out into sort of 3 groups: the very, very young and new, who enjoyed it enormously and said ‘Wow we must do this again’; the middle group who said ‘we must hold everything together some way or another’; and the old group who said ‘these new people are not conforming to the model’.”⁶⁹¹ As a result, most participants learned a lot and found the environment invigorating. Carr concluded optimistically, “it was an interesting experiment, but I think maybe [there were] too many experiments in one conference.”⁶⁹²

After the Conference

What happened next was critical to AKRI’s development as an *idea organization*. As Shapiro pointed out, there had been difficult conferences before.⁶⁹³ Why had this conference become a watershed event?

After the conference, in response to letters of complaint, the “executive committee” felt compelled to conduct “an investigation,” polling staff and members about the conference and its aftermath.⁶⁹⁴ Shapiro recalled that in October 1990 he was “invited to come to the National Board Meeting for a conference review” and was told that it was going to be a performance assessment. Yet, in light of the board’s inquiry into conference events, Shapiro “decided not to go because it felt” too much “like a witch-hunt.” Baxter recalled that if Shapiro “had showed it would have been fine.” But instead, his not showing was “the last straw,” and the Board voted not to re-new Shapiro’s contract for the following year.⁶⁹⁵

Shapiro recalled, “There was a splintering of the organization, a number of the former directors wrote a petition suggesting that this was irrational and needed a setting to review it. I offered to meet with the Board with a consultant, but they didn’t want to have a consultant. So, they fired me” as conference director and “I didn’t have a third conference.”⁶⁹⁶

Although the events of 1990 provided a unique learning experience, no doubt an intriguing one that attracted some new AKRI members, the handling of the post-conference investigation and subsequent “firing” of Shapiro alienated others. For example, Laurence Gould, vocally resigned his AKRI membership in protest. Others, like

Kathleen White, claimed they simply lost interest in the organization and drifted away. Baxter noted, “By the early nineties, AKRI recognized it was a troubled organization and began searching for a clearer vision and more functional infrastructure.”⁶⁹⁷

Organizational Implications

1990 was a year of critical change for AKRI and group relations in America. What remains contested and unclear, even today, is how to interpret its significance. Some saw it as a change in models of leadership. For instance, Monroe observed that “organizationally...Ed Shapiro represented a certain kind of authority and a certain mode of directing that was overthrown.” After 1990, “you found a whole new generation of directors and people willing to take on the directing role that I think couldn’t when the directorship was seen as the work of some one that looked and acted like an Ed Shapiro.” For example, “I’m not sure that I would be directing today if some of those changes hadn’t happened”⁶⁹⁸

Gould agreed, yet offered another insight into the organizational implications of the 1990 events: Shapiro was at times “extremely arrogant, has been characterized as narcissistic, he is somewhat larger than life” and was “very powerful” within AKRI. As a result, “he wasn’t a beloved object in the Institution” and “that alone made him certainly a target.” Yet, for “all of his difficulties and arrogance” he was one of “the best and the brightest” of his generation.⁶⁹⁹

Gould theorized that Shapiro—who was, like most previous Princes, a white male, Jewish, psychiatrist—was used as a stand-in, a scapegoat, for the founding generation, which had fostered so much competition and envy amongst AKRI membership. “The organization can no longer get to Larry Gould, or to Ed Klein, or to Roger Shapiro, or to Garrett O’Connor, but because this man was younger and still actively involved, he essentially was the stand in for the founding generation. So, they could get to U.S.by killing him off, killing off the favorite son...The primal fathers had to be killed.”⁷⁰⁰

Edward Klein made similar comments, noting Shapiro can be “aggressive” and “impossible.” Yet “he lent himself to things” as a way to facilitate other people’s learning and as a result, “a lot got projected on to him” such as “people’s unconscious and maybe not so unconscious, feelings about their role in the organization.” Shapiro was “the flight/fight leader” and in that role became attacked as “other things in the larger organization got played out.”⁷⁰¹

Dynamics emerged in AKRI—dynamics inherent in all *idea organizations*—such as younger “people feeling they couldn’t move up enough,” Klein noted, “feeling frustrated and that the *rice crispies*—the senior people—were holding them down.”⁷⁰² Conversely, Klein contended, many of the older generation felt that their organization, which they had worked so hard developing, had become hijacked by an unworthy, irreverent new generation.

Gould contended Margaret Rioch “was incredibly incensed” by the events of 1990 and begged him “to start an alternate AKRI;” she was “very persistent.” This “went on for about a year,” he recalled. “She said she could not tolerate”⁷⁰³ what had happened to her organization and as a result Rioch, the mother of group relations in America, resigned her membership.⁷⁰⁴

Baxter recalled the events of 1990, in particular the letters of complaint, “jolted AKRI into being a real organization with real legal responsibilities.” It was the “first time the organization had to be accountable,” and the board realized that *they* “were ultimately accountable.” It was no longer “fun and games” within a “pseudo-organizational infrastructure,” AKRI had to grow-up and “take seriously what was going on” organizationally.⁷⁰⁵

Charla Hayden, former AKRI National Conference director, observed that 1990 represented the collision of two different “systems of authorization” within AKRI. The “older model” was represented by AKRI founders like Rioch, her Princes and their chosen followers like Shapiro, who were “smart,” “flashy,” “strong virile individuals,” “sexy” and “charismatic.” These people were chosen for staff roles and directorship because of their ability to “confront the larger system” through self-authorization and “individual acts of courage.” When Shapiro declined the invitation to attend the AKRI Board meeting in October 1990, he defied the authorization within the larger system, failing to be held accountable to the sponsoring organization. In this action, he personified a form of self-authorization, rather than authorization from the organization as a whole, which would no longer be tolerated.⁷⁰⁶

Monroe and White both noted the development of a generational split after 1990 and considered what it might represent within the organization. Monroe asked, “How do you take the best and learn the most from your elders—those who have gone before—without discounting their contributions?” How do you value “their contributions and yet move along?”⁷⁰⁷

White recalled, after 1990, AKRI went “into a kind of phobic mode” as it became managed by people from the “third, fourth and fifth generations;” the “people who have been excluded...So what they are doing is being extremely inclusive,” yet focused on getting “rid of the founders...the bad blood,” and the “elitist clubbiness” as “the primary task of the current leadership.” White noted, this “is not what you call leadership. This is some other form of elitism which is terrifying--because it harms people. Ed Shapiro was harmed by the events, his reputation was harmed.” What AKRI needs now, White contended, is “a center that holds. Currently the center, the heart of the organization doesn’t hold well. It did when Margaret was around, but it was its own kind of myth.”⁷⁰⁸ Therefore, it appears that the future challenge is clear for AKRI: transition from an organization once based on a charismatic leadership model to one of greater collaboration and inclusion—yet not at the expense of the traditions and reputations of its founders.

Coda

British Psychoanalytic Society historian Pearl King pondered “One might ask why there is so much unhappiness and even nastiness when professional and intellectual people are faced with issues which may involve changing or adjusting their previously held opinions or points of view?”⁷⁰⁹ As this history of group study and psychodynamic organizations has told, for “individuals whose skill and self-esteem is closely linked to their intellectual achievements,” any attack or criticism of their ideas often is “felt as a personal attack on themselves as people. In the case of psychoanalysts,” King noted, “this is even more apparent, as they have to draw on their whole psyche at a deep level to do their work well and creatively.”⁷¹⁰

Providing further support for King’s observation, we have seen a pattern in the history of *idea organizations* being studied: the innovation they require to survive frequently becomes the focus of attack and inter-group rivalries, creating a cycle that puts the organization itself at risk. As a result, the organizational restructuring and innovation, which *idea organizations* must accomplish to survive, often becomes a painful process for members.

Since ideas themselves are intimate products of our psyche, closely attached to the image we carry of ourselves, criticism of one’s ideas feels like criticism of one’s self. Consequently, people may respond to the requisites of change with resistance and hostility, further intensifying inter-group rivalry. Yet, if members of *idea organizations* can begin to understand and expect that restructuring and innovation must be regular features of the *idea organization* life cycle, members can better prepare emotionally, psychologically and financially for their changing role within the morphing *idea organization*.

More than forty years ago, Wilfred Bion noted how important it was to treat theoretical contributions as working hypotheses and not regard them as rigid formulations. Bion’s point was that *idea organizations* ought to conceptualize themselves as learning communities, groups of people involved in a common task, committed to a shared culture of learning process over ideological principle. In order for *idea organizations* to function as learning communities, they must operate as what Rice defined as an open system, insular enough to survive, permeable enough to innovate. The question of how much is enough, is a leadership question.

In its formative years, a charismatic core of leaders may help launch an *idea organization*. Donna Piazza, assistant professor in the department of psychiatry at Harvard Medical School and former AKRI member, pointed out that charismatic leaders possess a unique sense of personal power, instrumental in “securing the allegiance of large numbers of people. It is a special quality of leadership that involves the ability to capture the popular imagination and to inspire the unswerving allegiance and devotion of large groups.”⁷¹¹ Solomon Cytrynbaum agreed noting “Charismatic leadership may be crucial in terms of the development and maintenance of any innovative paradigm,” yet “it is a two-edged sword.” The dogmatism and orthodoxy, which “very often tends to

accompany such central charismatic leadership, may end up producing an exclusionary culture which deprives the movement of input from other critical sectors.”⁷¹²

To transition successfully beyond the initially required charismatic leadership model to a more mature form of authority, remains a significant leadership challenge in all *idea organizations*. This is because of the collusive nature of charismatic leadership, which functions “on developmentally less differentiated levels. The group members have been collusively existing in these ‘primitive’ spaces as well.”⁷¹³ In other words, once followers of the charismatic leader begin to realize their participation in this process, negative reactions often surface. “Followers become anxious about who has been in control, whether they have been manipulated, and what goals have been pursued.” When “full recognition of how much authority group members have abdicated (presumably against their wills) to charismatic leaders” becomes apparent, “previously docile and admiring group members” often display “intense reactions of envy and hatred.”⁷¹⁴ In order to break out of this cycle, the group must engage in an honest appraisal of its collusive past behavior so that it may then begin to function on more sensitive and sophisticated levels. Although this can be a painful process, “to move on to a more mature functioning requires both appreciation of, and separation from, the group’s past.”⁷¹⁵

Open systems are self-reflexive and predictably engage in programmatic evaluation designed to stimulate the *idea organization’s* growth and development. Such reflexivity ensures that already established operating principles or structural designs are sustained if, and only if, they continue to support the work of the organization. In other words, *idea organizations* must avoid defending principles or designs on ideological as opposed to pragmatic grounds.

Ironically, one of the best ways to ensure this is to stimulate the organization’s culture through the systematic inclusion of diverse groups. Yet, the mere inclusion of diverse groups cannot guarantee the organization’s growth unless inclusion is accompanied by a willingness to experiment with new ideas and issues, which new groups inevitably bring, as well as to resist the temptation simply to discard the past. To take full advantage of this opportunity, these organizations must find ways to acknowledge and then mitigate inter-group rivalry that inevitably arises when competing ideas are engaged.

In this regard, each of the *idea organizations* described—psychoanalytic *Societies*, Tavistock Institute, NTL and AKRI—has been presented with a critical opportunity for self-reflection, and a chance to allow innovation to thrive. Each shows evidence of positive transformation: psychoanalysis continues to find renewed purpose within an environment often more receptive to cheaper, less time consuming pharmacological treatment methods; the Tavistock Institute is in the process of hiring a director as part of a complete organizational restructuring; NTL hired a new president in 2003 in an effort to refocus on its “legacy of working for positive social change;”⁷¹⁶ and AKRI recently restructured in order to more clearly define “itself as an educational institute, returning to the original task defined in the 1975 Articles of Incorporation.”⁷¹⁷ How group study and psychodynamic organizations will be transformed by the sum total of all these changes is a question that can only be taken up in coming decades.

Index

A

A Pilot Project in Training Mental Health Counselors, 145
A. K. Rice Institute, 6, *See* AKRI
Abraham, 16, 20, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 71
academia, 107, 124, 149, 165
act of authorizing, 101
Adam, 58, 59, 65, 81
Adler, 15, 17, 18, 33
Advanced Organizational Consultation (AOC), 127
Advanced Training Group (ATG), 107, 114, 146
age of affluence, 129
aggression, 17, 45, 100
A-group, 32, 92
Ahmedabad Manufacturing and Calico Printing Company Limited, 85
AKRI, 19, 22, 111, 114, 115, 117, 132, 133, 136, 139, 141, 142, 143, 144, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 173, 174, 175
AKRI centers, 147
AKRI National Conference, 50, 115, 147, 149, 154, 163, 164, 165, 168, 171
Alexander, 26
alienation, 70, 75, 125
Allaway, 86, 109, 110, 146
AMD 11, 58
America, 16, 19, 21, 22, 31, 79, 80, 83, 89, 91, 107, 111, 113, 117, 123, 124, 129, 135, 137, 144, 145, 146, 147, 149, 150, 156, 159, 170, 171
Amherst College, 114, 147
analytical psychology, 18
Anna Freud, 22, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 65, 66, 67
Anna O, 12, 13, 132
anthropology, 71, 77, 84, 120, 123
anxiety, 7, 20, 26, 41, 46, 47, 48, 49, 82, 100, 101, 104, 105, 106, 166
application, 8, 9, 19, 36, 50, 51, 69, 75, 82, 88, 89, 90, 94, 97, 98, 99, 109, 119, 133, 137, 147, 149, 152, 154, 155, 156, 157, 160, 165, 168
applied psychology, 40
Argyris, 112, 138
Armstrong, 48, 49, 91, 92, 93, 96, 127
aspirations, 28, 48
attack, 10, 18, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 43, 45, 46, 48, 50, 52, 53, 67, 108, 144, 155, 173
Austen-Riggs Center, 50
Australia, 98, 121, 134
authority, 32, 37, 48, 62, 70, 75, 89, 91, 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 108, 112, 116, 117, 118, 119, 122, 126, 130, 133, 147, 150, 151, 152, 155, 164, 170, 174
act of authorizing, 101
authorization, 165, 171

B

Back, 132
Baez, Joan, 130
Bain, 45, 95
Bak, 22
Bales, 132
Bamforth, 83
Barkla, 91
Bartlett, 79
basic assumption, 38, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 49, 151
basic assumption of *dependence* (*baD*), 42
basic assumption of *fight-flight* (*baF*), 42
basic assumption of *grouping* (*baG*), 45
basic assumption of *me-ness* (*baM*), 45
basic assumption of *oneness* (*baO*), 44
basic assumption of *pairing* (*baP*), 42
Basic Skills Training Group, 132
Baxter, 149, 153, 158, 165, 169, 170, 171
Bazalgette, 96, 103, 128
Beard, 53
Beats, 129
because clause, 49, 105
Beckhard, 135
Belgium, 121
Benedek, 26
Benne, 79, 131, 132, 135
Bennis, 138
Benoit, 145
Berlin, 14, 25, 26, 27, 28, 34, 35, 66, 71
Berlin Psychoanalytic Society, 25, 26, 27
Bernard, 157
Bethel, 79, 86, 112, 132, 134, 135, 136
between the world wars, 39, 71
B-group, 32, 66, 67, 92
Bidwell, 59
Bion, 6, 7, 31, 34, 36, 38, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 57, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 74, 76, 77, 79, 80, 81, 84, 93, 96, 97, 98, 102, 111, 114, 115, 119, 123, 150, 151, 167, 173
Bishop, 110, 111, 146
boundaries, 16, 34, 49, 87, 94, 99, 107, 116, 139, 140, 151, 166, 167
boundary controls, 104, 166, 167
boundary management, 100, 106, 107, 166, 167
boundary region, 99, 100
Bowlby, 57, 76, 81, 93
Bradford, 79, 131, 132, 134, 135
Braxton, 117, 149, 164
breakdown, 55, 59, 77
Breuer, 12, 13, 14, 33, 53, 132, 185
Bridger, 6, 57, 64, 65, 66, 67, 76, 79, 81, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 91, 92, 94, 103, 107, 109, 135
Brierley, 31
Brill, 16
British Army, 42, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 67, 69

British Army 21 group, 68
British Psychoanalytic Society, 14, 22, 28, 29, 30, 31,
32, 33, 34, 66, 67, 92, 173
Brome, 20
Brücke, 12
Buber, 145
Budapest, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27
Bunker, 138
Burke, 138
Burma, 65, 120

C

Calico Mills, 82, 120
camaraderie, 30, 38, 73
Cambor, 153, 158
Canada, 16, 134
Cang, 91
Cano, 45
Carnegie Foundation, 134
Carr, 150, 151, 155, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169
Carroll, 65
CASR, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 114, 117, 122, 124
Cass-Beggs, 91
causalities, 54, 60, 123
CEGO, 158, 159, 160
Center for Applied Social Research (CASR), 93
Center for the Education of Groups and Organizations
(CEGO), 158, 159
Center for the Study of Groups and Social Systems
(CGSS), 157
Central States Center, 158
Centre for Applied Social Research, 94, 96, 142
change, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 22, 39, 46, 47, 51, 78, 93,
103, 117, 119, 122, 123, 124, 127, 133, 134, 142,
170, 173, 175
chaos, 59, 73
Charcot, 12, 13, 53
charisma, 18, 22, 37, 66, 85, 96, 121, 147, 153, 164,
171, 172, 173, 174
Chelmsford Cathedral, 110, 111
Chicago Center for the Study of Groups and
Organizations (CCSGO), 157
child analysis, 27, 29
children, 11, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 34, 70, 92, 130,
145
Chindits, 65
Christian Teamwork, 110, 111
Churchill, 110, 146
Civil Resettlement Units (CRUs), 7, 69, 83, 86
Civilization and its Discontents, 44, 47, 185
Clark University, 16, 38
class, 28, 54, 58, 59, 62, 70, 75, 129, 130
clergy, 107, 149, 165
clients, 22, 78, 97, 98, 122, 141, 146
closed, 50, 73, 117, 140, 163
closed system, 99
collaboration, 10, 13, 15, 18, 76, 79, 95, 113, 134, 172
collective psychotic swings, 42, 47
Colman, 149, 153, 157, 163
*Committee on Family Psychiatry and Community
Mental Health*, 93

community, 28, 63, 76, 78, 88, 126, 131, 133, 135,
142, 145, 160, 162
competency, 9, 16, 22, 33, 34, 118, 163, 166, 167, 168
competition, 16, 19, 21, 22, 37, 50, 108, 127, 129,
153, 170
conference design, 50, 87, 88, 97, 98, 101, 102, 103,
104, 107, 109, 113
conference director, 106, 107, 146, 164, 170
conflict, 11, 13, 27, 30, 32, 41, 53, 55, 93, 96, 101,
105, 122
confusion, 41, 46, 48, 149, 169
Connecticut Workshop in Human Relations, 40, 79,
131, 132
conscientious objector, 61, 73
consultant, 45, 48, 49, 69, 71, 87, 89, 90, 97, 98, 101,
103, 104, 105, 106, 109, 113, 122, 135, 136, 138,
140, 156, 167, 168, 169, 170
Cooper, 157, 160
cowardice, 55
Craiglockhart, 56
Crawford, 127
create, 19, 41, 54, 58, 59, 69, 131, 143, 148, 159, 164
Crichton-Miller, 71, 72
cultural ethos, 53
cultural island, 98, 132
culture change, 69, 75, 81, 89, 91, 115, 129, 138, 162
cycle, 9, 10, 30, 38, 47, 50, 86, 89, 134, 139, 173, 174
Cytrynbaum, 151, 157, 160, 162, 174

D

Danks, 158
Dartington, 49, 50, 86, 121, 122
David M. Rioch, 144, 146
D-Day, 65
de Mare, 62
death, 11, 24, 27, 28, 31, 35, 55, 59, 68, 78, 79, 97,
115, 117, 119, 120, 121, 123, 131, 144, 154, 155
defenses, 38, 41, 100, 102, 125
democracy, 6, 40, 69, 84, 90, 131, 134, 135
Denmark, 121
Department of Defense, 137
Department of Psychiatry, Yale University School of
Medicine, 146
dependency, 43, 45, 87, 100, 125, 160
depressive, 30, 41, 46, 151
depth psychology, 21, 77
desire, 14, 28, 41, 42, 45, 47, 48, 50, 71
destructive phantasies, 46, 48
Deutsch, 26, 66
Dicks, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77
discipline, 20, 55, 56, 60, 63, 146
Dolan, 158
Donner, 114
double-task method, 87
dream analysis, 37
Dumas, 116
Dylan, Bob, 130

E

Edelson, 147

Edward Klein, 114, 115, 147, 148, 153, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 170
Edward Shapiro, 50, 148, 153, 157, 159, 164, 166, 170, 172
ego, 26, 29, 32, 44, 45, 46, 100, 151
Eisold, 157
Eissler, 22
Eittington, 20, 23, 30
Electric shock treatment, 53
Elkes, 145
Elmgrant Trust, 77
Emery, 90, 91, 94, 98
emotions, 37, 41, 42, 45, 46, 47, 58, 100, 103
encounter groups, 113, 135, 137, 138, 147, 149, 155
England, 28, 60, 61, 68, 80, 84, 120, 123, 146, 150, 152
environment, 14, 19, 26, 28, 30, 39, 40, 60, 61, 69, 77, 81, 91, 94, 98, 99, 100, 101, 104, 116, 117, 128, 133, 139, 140, 164, 166, 167, 169, 175
envy, 8, 13, 14, 18, 19, 22, 27, 30, 50, 129, 153, 170, 174
Estabrook, 157
Evaluation, Development and Review Unit (EDRU), 127
Experiences in Groups, 42, 119, 150, 151
experiential learning, 36, 40, 68, 81, 86, 89, 98, 101, 102, 133

F

Fairbairn, 31
family, 10, 11, 12, 24, 25, 38, 47, 61, 70, 76, 78, 130, 142
fantasies, 49, 103, 105
Fayol, 39
fear, 21, 26, 37, 42, 46, 48, 58, 105, 117, 125
Ferenczi, 16, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 61
feuds and splits, 11, 17, 19, 86
Field, 40, 91
field theory, 40, 77
Finland, 121
First Northfield Experiment, 62, 64, 65, 67
Fitch, 111, 114
Fleiss, 13, 14, 15, 33
Flint, 115, 147, 154
Follett, 36, 39, 40
followers, 18, 19, 20, 31, 32, 38, 66, 80, 89, 91, 101, 122, 135, 144, 171, 174
Foster, 91
Foulkes, 66, 67
fragmentation, 70, 75, 82, 85, 86, 89, 92, 93, 154, 155, 162, 163
France, 37, 61, 65, 121
Frankfurt School, 66
Franklin, 116
free association, 12, 15, 26, 132
Freedman, 157
French, 36, 37
Freud, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 44, 45, 47, 53, 56, 61, 132, 145, 185
Freudian, 17, 18, 28, 32, 33, 35, 74

Fromm-Reichmann, 145
Frontiers in Group Dynamics, 78
Frost, 76, 81
frustration, 46, 47, 48, 62, 87
functional nervous disorders, 55

G

Gandhi, 72
Geller, 114, 115, 163
gender issues, 136, 138, 145, 148, 160, 163
General George S. Patton, 60
Germany, 23, 25, 31, 40, 78, 121
Gestalt, 40
Gibb, 135
Gibson, 114
Ginsberg, Allen, 130
Glacier Metal, 7, 82, 84, 85, 100
Glover, 26, 30, 31, 32, 33
Goldstein, 66
Gosling, 97, 109
Gould, 44, 45, 81, 89, 96, 115, 116, 117, 121, 147, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 158, 159, 170, 171
Granville Stanley Hall, 16
Great Britain, 15, 16, 26, 53, 54, 56, 57, 70, 71, 75, 83, 124, 125, 129, 150
Grex, 143, 157, 160
Gross, 158
Grosskurth, 23
group as a whole, 90, 92, 108
group life, 38, 40, 46, 100
group phantasies, 45, 46
Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego, 37, 38, 185
group relations, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 17, 19, 22, 23, 24, 27, 30, 34, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 45, 46, 49, 50, 51, 53, 61, 67, 68, 69, 70, 74, 75, 80, 82, 85, 86, 87, 89, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 107, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 119, 121, 122, 123, 124, 126, 131, 132, 133, 141, 142, 144, 145, 146, 147, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 162, 163, 164, 166, 167, 170, 171, 185
group relations conference, 17, 34, 40, 50, 80, 86, 87, 89, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 114, 115, 126, 130, 132, 133, 146, 153, 156, 159, 162, 166, 167
group relations ladder, 156, 159
Group Relations Programme, 6, 79, 88, 113, 115, 121, 155
group theory, 37, 38, 39, 60
group therapy, 50, 61, 65, 68, 69
group treatment, 15, 61, 62, 66, 75
group-as-a-whole, 9, 17, 36, 37, 39, 48, 80, 81, 123, 133, 167
Grubb Institute, 96, 111, 114, 128
guilt, 41, 46, 47
Gustafson, 158
Guy's hospital, 57

H

Hadfield, 71

Hall, 116, 158, 165
Hargreaves, 57, 58, 65, 66
Harrison, 37
Hartmann, 22
Harvard-Watts, 76
Hausman, 114, 115, 147, 154, 157, 158
Hawthorne experiments, 39
Hayden, 149, 158, 165, 168, 171
Heimann, 31, 32
Heimbürger, 158
Hemingway, 71
here and now, 40, 62, 80, 103, 105, 116, 133
Herrick, 110
Hewlings, 111, 114
Higgin, 91
Higgins, 91
Hill, 83, 84, 91, 94
Hobhouse, 71
holistic, 36, 59
Hollymoor Mental Hospital, 60
Holvino, 139, 140, 152, 163, 168
Holyoke Conference, 146, 147, 148, 154
hope, 28, 43, 48, 53, 73, 83, 95, 100, 114, 159
Horney, 26
Hornstein, 138
Horowitz, 135
hospital nurses, 82, 100
Hospital Wing, 60
Howard, 137
Huffington, 127
human interaction laboratory, 17, 40, 79, 80, 86, 102, 130, 132, 146
human laboratory, 98, 102
human potential movement, 137, 155
Human Relations, 75, 78, 84
Human Resources Centre (HRC), 93
Hungary, 23, 121
hypnosis, 12, 24
hysteria, 12, 13, 15, 24, 53

I

idea organization, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 50, 74, 82, 84, 85, 86, 89, 93, 95, 99, 121, 122, 124, 126, 127, 128, 130, 131, 132, 134, 136, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 154, 155, 168, 169, 171, 173, 174
idealization, 48
ideas, 10, 13, 14, 15, 19, 27, 32, 38, 53, 54, 61, 62, 66, 74, 77, 78, 85, 100, 102, 112, 113, 120, 123, 125, 132, 138, 139, 151, 152, 173, 174, 185
IGE, 88
immigrants, 30, 31
Imperial War Museum, 52
importing, converting, and exporting, 99
independent group, 32, 92
India, 61, 82, 85, 95, 120, 121
Industrial Welfare Society, 84
industry, 39, 69, 82, 85, 114, 124, 142, 150
inevitable psychological casualties, 60

innovation, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 21, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 36, 40, 49, 50, 53, 57, 60, 61, 66, 68, 69, 82, 83, 84, 86, 95, 99, 113, 117, 120, 121, 122, 123, 125, 128, 132, 134, 139, 141, 143, 160, 164, 173, 174
Institute for Operational Research (IOR), 93
Institute for the Applied Study of Social Systems (IASOSS), 158
Institute for Transitional Dynamics, 89
Institute of Group Analysis, 67
institutional event, 103, 116, 165, 166
intelligible field of study, 46, 50, 95, 108
interdependence, 40, 46, 164, 165, 167
interdisciplinary, 6, 36, 56, 58, 73, 76, 77, 149, 150, 156
inter-group, 10, 19, 20, 21, 30, 50, 82, 86, 87, 88, 93, 102, 103, 114, 134, 144, 147, 148, 165, 173, 174
inter-group event (IGE), 87, 88, 103
inter-group rivalries, 10, 19, 20, 30, 50, 82, 144, 173
International Foundation for Social Innovation, 128
International Psycho-Analytical Association, 18
International Zeitschrift für Ärztliche Psycho-Analyse, 18
Interpretations of Dreams, 24, 25
interrelatedness, 40, 84, 98
intolerance, 19, 20
intra-organizational feud, 33
intra-organizational rivalries, 11, 33
introjection, 29, 46
invisible college, 57, 66, 68, 74
irreverent, 64, 130, 171
Isaacs, 29, 31, 32
Isakower, 22
Israel, 121
Italy, 9, 60, 121

J

Jacobson, 22, 157
Jahrbuch für Psycho-Analytische und Psycho-Pathologische Forschungen, 18
Janet, 18, 53, 56
Janis, 146
Jaques, 6, 7, 34, 76, 79, 81, 82, 84, 85, 100
Jenson, 135
Jim Miller, 153, 158, 160
Johnson, 117
Jones, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 37, 66, 185
Joseph Rowntree Memorial Trust, 86
Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 138
Jung, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 33, 56

K

Kahane, 15
Kellner, 138
Kelnar, 57, 76
Kenya, 84
Kerouac, Jack, 130
Kikuyu, 84
King, 25, 81, 83, 173

Klein, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36,
41, 42, 45, 46, 47, 61, 62, 96, 148, 151, 154, 171
Kleinian, 7, 30, 32, 33, 77, 97, 151
Kleinian School, 30
Kleinians, 31, 33, 67
Knight, 165
Kolmer, 146, 147
Krantz, 156, 165
Kraskovic, 37
Kris, 22

L

laboratory, 80, 97, 100, 102, 132, 133, 134, 156
laboratory method, 80, 132
large group, 36, 44, 115, 123, 147
large study group, 50, 88, 103, 106, 109
Lawrence, 45, 49, 95, 115, 122, 123, 126
lay analyst, 16, 21, 22, 28, 33, 145
Le Bon, 36, 37, 38, 40
leader, 22, 37, 38, 43, 49, 55, 59, 60, 85, 91, 96, 101,
108, 115, 116, 126, 131, 135, 147, 148, 151, 153,
154, 155, 163, 171, 173, 174
Leaderless Group, 37, 58, 59, 86
leadership, 9, 32, 38, 42, 43, 49, 55, 56, 59, 61, 62, 64,
70, 75, 78, 82, 84, 87, 89, 91, 93, 96, 99, 100, 101,
102, 105, 115, 116, 117, 119, 121, 122, 126, 128,
130, 135, 138, 144, 147, 148, 149, 151, 152, 153,
155, 156, 160, 163, 164, 167, 168, 170, 172, 173,
174
learning, 9, 10, 24, 26, 45, 50, 75, 87, 97, 102, 104,
105, 106, 109, 114, 116, 117, 119, 123, 131, 132,
133, 139, 140, 155, 156, 166, 168, 170, 171, 173
Learning for Leadership, 85, 97, 120
lectures, 14, 40, 77, 88
Leicester Conference, 7, 44, 49, 80, 86, 87, 88, 93, 97,
102, 103, 110, 114, 117, 120, 121, 122, 123, 126,
135, 145, 147, 149, 155, 168
Lesser, 95
Levine, 147
Lewin, 36, 40, 78, 79, 80, 86, 98, 100, 102, 130, 131,
132, 135, 137
links, 39, 46, 48, 71, 78, 81, 91, 94, 97, 154, 158
Lipgar, 157
Lippitt, 79, 131, 132, 135
Lisl Klein, 89
Loewenstein, 22
Lofgren, 153, 157, 158
London, 6, 7, 8, 12, 20, 22, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 52,
53, 54, 62, 66, 67, 71, 72, 73, 76, 79, 83, 84, 85,
92, 96, 98, 117, 124, 128, 142, 146, 152
London Institute of Psychoanalysis, 77
Low, 29, 31
Lundgren, 165

M

madness, 55
Maghull Military Hospital, 56
Mahler, 22
Main, 57, 64, 66, 67, 79
malingering, 55

manpower, 54, 56, 59, 62
Marek, 91
Marshall Plan funding, 134
Marx, 39
masculinity, 17, 54, 57
Maslow, 135
Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, 135
Maudesley Hospital, 83
Maurel, 158
Mayo, 36, 39, 40
McDougall, 36, 37, 38, 40
McGregor, 135
mechanisms to defend against anxiety, 82, 100
medical, 12, 13, 15, 21, 22, 24, 25, 54, 55, 56, 58, 60,
61, 62, 64, 65, 68, 69, 71, 76, 77, 90, 93, 112, 114,
124, 144, 145
medical misfits, 60, 64, 65
Medical Research Council grant, 77
medical screening, 54
Melanie Klein, 7, 22, 23, 24, 31, 33
Melitta, 24, 27, 31, 32
Menninger, 157
Menzies Lyth, Isabel, 6, 7, 8, 23, 48, 76, 77, 79, 80,
81, 82, 87, 91, 92, 94, 96, 100, 123, 124, 152
Mexico, 121
Michael, 66, 114
Michell, 110, 146
Michigan, 78, 80
Mid-West Center, 157
military psychiatric, 65, 77
Military Training and Rehabilitation Wing, 60
Miller, 6, 36, 40, 79, 80, 84, 85, 86, 90, 92, 94, 96, 97,
98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 104, 110, 115, 117, 119,
120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 149, 153,
154, 158
Minnesota Center, 157
Monroe, 151, 170, 171
Morris, 57, 76, 77, 145
Morton Deutsch, 132
Mott, 54
Mount Holyoke College, 115, 146
mourning, 46
movement, 19, 21, 22, 28, 36, 48, 84, 96, 117, 120,
124, 129, 130, 131, 135, 137, 141, 151, 160, 174
Murray, 90, 91, 92, 94, 135
Myers, 54, 55, 68

N

Nancy French, 158, 160
narcissism, 45
National Education Association (NEA), 132, 134
National Health Service (NHS), 74, 75
National Institute of Mental Health, 110, 145
National Training Laboratories, 6, 10, 17, 79, 130
needs, 43, 50, 59, 65, 82, 101, 122, 124, 125, 145,
160, 172
Netherlands, 121
neurasthenia, 53, 55
neurosis, 56, 63
New Army, 58, 59, 142
New York, 16, 21, 22, 111

New York Center, 157
New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute, 21
Newman, 147
next generation, 102, 120, 148, 153, 155
non-verbal exercises, 137
North Africa, 68
Northfield Military Hospital, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66,
69, 77, 111
Norway, 121
NTL, 19, 79, 80, 81, 86, 87, 88, 89, 98, 102, 107, 112,
113, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138,
139, 140, 141, 142, 146, 147, 148, 149, 154, 155,
158, 162, 174, 175
Nunberg, 22
Nutkevitch, 9, 157

O

O'Connor, 114, 115, 153, 154, 157, 158, 170
Obholzer, 127
object relations theory, 41, 42
objects, 29, 41, 46, 47, 48, 100
oceanic feeling, 44
OD, 135, 136, 138, 139, 141
oedipal, 17, 27, 47
OFEK, 9
Office of Naval Research and the National Education
Association (NEA), 132
Officer Selection, 37, 58
Old Army, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60
Old Dominion Foundation, 86
Old Dominion Trust of America, 85
omnipotent force, 44, 45
On the History of the Psycho-Analytic Movement, 19
oneness, 44, 45
open system, 98, 99, 116, 117, 173
Open systems, 99, 174
Operation Phoenix, 74
oral tradition, 143
Order of the British Empire (OBE), 83
Organisational Change and Technological Innovation
(OCTI), 127
organizational chaos, 64
organizational consulting, 68, 165
organizational development, 42, 68, 134
organizational life, 6, 39, 50, 89, 90, 94, 108, 123,
149, 151, 156
organizations, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 18, 27, 39, 57, 68, 69,
70, 73, 75, 78, 79, 82, 90, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101,
102, 107, 122, 125, 127, 128, 134, 135, 136, 137,
139, 140, 142, 143, 148, 156, 157, 164, 173, 174,
175
Oshry, 139

P

pain, 42, 45, 46, 57
Palmer, 103
paranoid schizoid, 151
paranoid-schizoid, 29, 41, 42, 46, 48
Parloff, 110, 111, 145
Parloft, 112

part-objects, 100
Pearce, 64
Pearson, 71
permeable boundary region, 99
persecutory anxiety, 46, 48
personal growth, 50, 137
phantasy, 8, 48
Philadelphia Center for Organizational Dynamics
(PCOD), 157
Phillipson, 57, 76
Pines, 42
Pitlochry, 31
play technique, 26
Pollock, 91
Porter, 136, 137, 140
post-war restructuring, 75
Potts, 71
power, 18, 21, 33, 69, 91, 105, 107, 115, 116, 117,
125, 126, 127, 129, 143, 150, 156, 157, 158, 162,
163, 173
powerlessness, 70, 75
Pratt, 38
praxis event, 49
Price, 95
primary task, 42, 49, 87, 90, 101, 102, 103, 104, 116,
117, 147, 149, 166, 172
primary work group, 98
primitive feelings, 100
primitive phantasies, 42, 47
Princes, 22, 152, 153, 170, 171
Princess, 153
prison system, 107, 110, 111, 113, 114, 149
prisoners of war, 68, 83
productivity, 11, 39, 77, 81, 82, 83, 90, 94, 125, 134
Productivity & Social Organisation: The Ahmedabad
Experiment, 85
Progressive Matrices, 58
projection, 29, 34, 41, 46, 102, 105, 106, 108, 152,
167
projective identification, 41, 48
psychiatric training, 71
psychiatry, 24, 56, 61, 64, 67, 68, 69, 73, 74, 76, 77,
112, 160, 162, 164, 173
psychoanalysis, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22,
23, 24, 26, 27, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 50, 56, 57, 62,
77, 80, 85, 90, 91, 94, 106, 107, 151, 175
Psychoanalytic Congress, 15, 23, 33
Psycho-analytic Training of staff, 77
psychodynamics of organizations, 8
psychodynamics within *idea organizations*, 11
psychological origin paradigm, 55
psychology, 16, 21, 38, 39, 40, 42, 44, 71, 77, 79, 83,
92, 93, 112, 115, 127, 144, 150, 151, 155, 160
psychosis, 123
psycho-sociological influences, 40
psychotherapy, 38, 42, 56, 69, 71, 80, 144, 145
public school ethos, 53, 54
Puerto Rico, 134

Q

Quaker, 61

question authority, 130

R

racial issues, 116, 117, 131, 136, 138, 152, 160, 163
Radó, 19, 25, 26
Rafferty, 119
Ramirez, 158
Rank, 20, 23
Rationing, 69
Redlich, 111, 112, 146, 147
Reed, 103, 110, 114
Rees, 57, 58, 65, 71
Regeneration, 56
Regimental Nomination, 59
regional centers, 155, 157, 159, 162, 163
regression, 38
Reich, 22
Reicken, 132
Reik, 26
Reitler, 15
reparation, 41, 47, 143
research, 7, 12, 13, 16, 17, 24, 25, 55, 59, 73, 75, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 90, 93, 94, 95, 100, 107, 110, 111, 112, 113, 119, 120, 122, 124, 128, 131, 134, 136, 138, 139, 140, 142, 143, 144, 145, 151, 159, 162
Research Center for Group Dynamics, 78, 80, 131
resiliency, 13, 27
responsibility, 31, 47, 49, 64, 67, 109, 115, 116, 117, 162
restructuring, 6, 10, 11, 74, 91, 95, 126, 128, 138, 139, 173, 175
retaliation, 46, 48
review and application groups, 104
Rice, 6, 10, 34, 36, 43, 47, 79, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 126, 146, 147, 149, 154, 155, 158, 164, 165, 166, 173
Richardson, 110, 146
Rickman, 31, 32, 57, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 84
Rioch, 19, 22, 81, 110, 111, 114, 115, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 152, 153, 154, 155, 157, 158, 159, 160, 163, 171
rivalry, 19, 20, 22, 27, 30, 118, 134, 148, 173, 174
Rivers, 56, 61
Riviere, 28, 31, 32
Robinson, 116, 148
Rockefeller Foundation, 76, 77
Rodger, 57
Roger Shapiro, 114, 115, 147, 153, 157, 170
Rogers, 111, 115, 135, 137, 149, 154
role, 8, 9, 21, 24, 30, 49, 55, 56, 58, 62, 67, 73, 74, 83, 87, 93, 96, 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 111, 112, 117, 120, 121, 123, 138, 146, 148, 151, 153, 155, 156, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 173
role confusion, 169
Rorschach test, 144
Rose Miller, 117, 157

Rosenfeld, 31, 32
Rowntree Memorial Trust grant, 109
Royal Air Force, 57
Royal Army Medical Corps (RAMC), 54
Royal Navy, 57
Ruffin, 117, 165
Russia, 61

S

Sach, 26
Sachs, 20, 23
safety, 31, 43, 46
Salpêtrière Hospital, 12
Sanderstead, 68
Sassoon, 56
satisfaction, 39, 47, 48, 85, 101
Saywell, 71
scapegoat, 19, 48, 170
Schacter, 132
Schmideberg, 31
Science, 78, 96
screening, 56, 58, 59
Seaman, 158
Seashore, 138
Second Northfield Experiment, 65
secret society, 20, 21, 22, 25
security, 43, 46, 48, 69, 104, 107, 144, 166
Segal, 31
selection, 58, 59, 68, 78, 86, 97, 164
self as an instrument, 105
self-study groups, 78
semi-autonomous work groups, 83, 85, 91
sensitivity training, 133, 137
Shadoan, 157
Sharpe, 29, 31
Sheats, 132
shell-shock, 54, 55, 56, 59, 167
shell-shocked soldier, 26, 54, 55, 56, 60, 67, 111, 167
Sher, 6, 9, 97, 121, 155, 156, 157, 159
Simmel, 23, 26
Simpson, 95
Singer, 158
small groups, 20, 37, 81, 103, 114, 133, 147, 151
small study group, 17, 84, 93, 103, 124, 133, 165
social dreaming, 49
social island, 80, 88
social problems, 74, 75, 82, 142
social psychiatry, 74, 75
social science research, 50, 126, 127, 134, 142
social sciences, 36, 40, 68, 71, 74, 78, 83, 94, 127
social system, 36, 70
social taboos, 70, 137
Societe Internationale des Conseillers de Synthese in Paris, 128
Societies, 10, 11, 15, 86, 174
socio-metrics, 77
socio-technical, 66, 79, 82, 83, 85, 93, 98, 100, 135, 156
Sofer, 80, 92, 145
soldiers, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 62, 65, 67, 69, 72, 77, 129

Solomon, 148
sophisticated group, 42
 South Africa, 121
 Spain, 121
 Spencer, 92
 split, 22, 33, 44, 46, 81, 86, 89, 92, 100, 103, 105, 106,
 107, 108, 115, 156, 160, 164, 166, 167, 171
 splitting, 29, 41, 46, 48, 122, 157, 167
 St. George's Hospital, 57
 Stekel, 14, 15, 17, 18, 33
 Stephen, 31
 Stokes, 64, 127
 Strachey, 26, 28, 29
 stress, 28, 55, 59, 165, 169
Studies on Hysteria, 13
 Study Center for Organizational Leadership and
 Authority (SCOLA), 158
 Study Group, 88
 subgroups, 40, 81, 103, 127
 succession, 20, 21, 155
 Sullivan, 145
 surprise, 21, 27, 48, 72, 112
 survive, 30, 45, 50, 55, 69, 95, 101, 126, 134, 136,
 138, 139, 143, 173
 Sutherland, 6, 57, 59, 76, 81, 84, 146, 147
 Suzuki, 145
 Sweden, 121
 Swoboda, 14
 systemic analysis, 22

T

talking cure, 12
 Tank Corps, 61
 Tausk, 18
Tavistock and Portman NHS Trust, 71
 Tavistock Clinic, 42, 57, 64, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76,
 84, 90, 94, 109, 110, 123, 127, 146
 Tavistock Consultancy Service, 48, 127
 Tavistock Institute, 6, 7, 8, 9, 17, 40, 42, 44, 49, 57,
 70, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84,
 85, 86, 88, 89, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 102, 106,
 107, 109, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 118, 120, 121,
 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 130, 131, 135,
 141, 142, 145, 146, 150, 152, 155, 156, 158, 174
 Tavistock model, 9, 53, 68, 69, 75, 98, 104, 112, 122,
 124, 130, 133, 145, 147, 150, 152, 166
 Tavistock Publications Ltd., 78
 Tavistock Square, 71, 72
*Tavistock Square Clinic for Functional Nervous
 Disorders*, 71, 72
 Taylor, 39
 temporary organization, 98, 99, 101, 108
 temporary psychosis, 42
 ten-year cycle, 128
 testing, 58, 108
 Texas Center, 157
 T-group, 17, 86, 89, 132, 133, 135, 140
 Thatcher, 69, 125, 162
Thatcher Revolution, 125, 126
The Giving of Orders, 39
The Interpretation of Dreams, 15, 17

The Psycho-Analysis of Children, 29
The Social Engagement of Social Science, 92
Theory X and Theory Y, 135
 therapeutic community, 60, 61, 62, 65, 67, 68, 77, 86,
 97, 98, 142, 145
 Thomas, 57, 66, 116
 Thompson, 91
 Thorner, 30, 34
 Tibble, 110, 146
 tolerance, 48, 71
 Topeka Center, 157
 Towndrow, 110, 146
 training, 7, 12, 21, 25, 26, 30, 32, 33, 34, 58, 59, 60,
 62, 63, 66, 71, 73, 77, 78, 80, 84, 86, 88, 89, 93,
 95, 96, 97, 104, 107, 108, 109, 111, 113, 114, 119,
 120, 124, 126, 128, 131, 132, 133, 135, 136, 137,
 139, 140, 142, 145, 160, 162, 164, 165, 167, 168,
 169
 training committee, 32, 33, 34
training group, 84, 104, 108, 109, 120, 164, 165, 167,
 168, 169
 Training Wing, 60, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66
 transference, 89, 150, 152
 treatment, 12, 15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 26, 34, 53, 55,
 56, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 74, 76,
 77, 78, 112, 162, 175
 trench warfare, 54, 55, 59
 Trist, 6, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 64, 68, 69, 71, 74, 76, 78,
 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93,
 94, 97, 122, 130
 Trussell, 114
 Tucker, 71
 Turquet, 6, 44, 45, 49, 50, 81, 94, 97, 103, 105, 109,
 110, 111, 123, 146, 147

U

U.S., 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 40, 60, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 83,
 111, 112, 120, 121, 124, 129, 130, 134, 138, 140,
 142, 145, 146, 149, 150
 UK, 16, 69, 74, 78, 79, 121, 142, 150, 162
 unconscious, 13, 15, 17, 26, 38, 41, 42, 45, 48, 49,
 101, 108, 133, 150, 152, 171
 unconscious sense of guilt, 47
 Unilever, 83
 University of Leicester, 7, 86, 107, 109, 110, 114
 unorganized groups, 36, 37

V

Vaill, 138
 van Beinum, 91
 Vienna, 11, 12, 14, 24, 26, 53, 66
 Vietnam war, 112
 von Bertalanffy, 98

W

W group, 42, 47, 48, 49
 Walter Reed Army Institute of Research (WRAIR),
 112

war neurosis, 23, 55, 56, 59, 60
War Office Committee of Enquiry into 'Shell-Shock',
56
War Office Selection Board, 7, 64, 66, 83
Washington School of Psychiatry, 110, 117, 146
Washington-Baltimore Center, 157, 164
Watts, 145
Weber, 39
Wednesday Psychological Society, 15, 17
Weiler, 113
Weininger, 14
Weisbord, 139
Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine, 23
Wellcome Library, 23, 33
Wells, 117, 165
West, 157, 158
Wharnccliffe Hospital, 61
Wharnccliffe Memorandum, 61, 62, 64, 65, 67
White, 81, 151, 152, 153, 155, 159, 170, 171
whole object, 46
Williams, 114
Wilson, 6, 57, 76, 77, 78, 81, 83, 84, 90, 91, 144
Wiltshire, 55
Winnicott, 31, 32
Wishlade, 92, 94
Woodhouse, 93
Woodstock, 130
work, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 23, 24, 26,
27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 39, 42, 44, 45,

48, 49, 50, 53, 57, 65, 69, 70, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80,
81, 83, 84, 85, 88, 89, 92, 93, 94, 95, 98, 99, 100,
101, 103, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 117, 119, 121,
122, 123, 126, 127, 131, 134, 138, 139, 144, 148,
151, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 162, 164, 169,
170, 173, 174, 185
work group, 42, 48, 49
work mode, 43, 46, 48
working-class, 54, 59, 70
workplace, 8, 39, 83, 124
World War I, 21, 23, 26, 27, 40, 54, 56, 57, 58, 61, 62,
65, 71, 72
World War II, 7, 16, 37, 42, 53, 56, 58, 61, 69, 71, 73,
84, 120, 125, 129, 131, 142, 145
Wright, 157
Wynne, 147

Y

year of the half-colonels, 77
Yellowlees, 57

Z

Zander, 135
Zen Buddhism, 145
Zentralblatt, 17, 18

Endnotes

¹ Miller, 1989, p. 7.

² Other Institute members, such as *Associates* Karen Izod and Angela Eden along with *Advanced Organisational Consultation* faculty Richard Holti, Jean Neumann and Sue Whittle, were actively working with group relations techniques, yet were not full-time Tavistock Institute employees.

³ See appendix A.

⁴ I. Menzies Lyth, personal communication, November 17, 2003.

⁵ Cassandra was a mythological character who was given the gift of prophetic power by a smitten admirer named Apollo. When Cassandra rejected Apollo's advances, he retaliated by decreeing that although she would have vision and prophesies no one would believe her.

⁶ A *UK and Ireland Group Relations Development Forum*, first initiated by Mannie Sher in 2000, occurs approximately every six months to "provide an informal space for discussion of current issues and work in progress" as a way to "foster collaboration between organizations," Karen Izod noted. This was one way the application of psychodynamic thinking in organizational life and group relations theories and methods continue to be discussed at the Tavistock Institute. In addition, a website, www.grouprelations.com, was established "as a vehicle for organizations to market their conferences and enter into debate" (K. Izod, personal communication, June 3, 2004.)

⁷ Nutkevitch & Sher, forthcoming, p. 6.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

¹¹ Freud did, however, publish several books that touched on group, organizational and social issues. Notably, *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* (1922), *Totem and Taboo* (1913), and *Civilization and its Discontents* (1946).

¹² Hypnosis had first become popular in the 1760s when Anton Mesmer, an Austrian medical student, used a magnet to "draw-out" convulsions and cure paralysis, *mesmerizing* patients by passing his hands before their eyes. By the mid-1800s others, such as French doctor A. A. Liebault and English surgeon James Braid, were using *mesmerism* to treat patient's hysteria, paralysis and tics by telling them under hypnosis that their symptoms will disappear (Sievers, 1955).

¹³ Jones, 1953.

¹⁴ The term hysteria is based on the Greek word *hysteron* or womb (Sievers, 1955, p. 23).

¹⁵ Brill, 1949, p. 6.

¹⁶ Brill, 1949.

¹⁷ Hale, 1971, p. 7.

¹⁸ Jones, 1953, p. 249.

¹⁹ Storr, 1989.

²⁰ Brill, 1949, p. 7.

²¹ Bernheimer and Kahane, 1985, p. 8.

²² Jones, 1953.

²³ Charcot grouped hysterical symptoms into four stages of seizures based on the extent of the patient's visual, sensory and/or motor disturbances (Jones, 1953, p. 252).

²⁴ Interestingly, only 800 copies were first printed in 1895 and by 1908 only 625 had been sold (Breuer and Freud, 1937).

²⁵ Breuer and Freud, 1937.

²⁶ Sievers, 1955, p. 27.

²⁷ Storr, 1989, p.8.

²⁸ Brome, 1984, p. 4; Jones, 1953, p. 345.

²⁹ Brome, 1984; Jones, 1953.

³⁰ Weininger published these ideas in *Geschlecht und Charakter*, 1903.

³¹ Jones, 1953, p. 350.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 339.

³³ Brome, 1984, p. 38.

-
- ³⁴ Burrows, 1991, p. 35.
- ³⁵ Jones, 1959, p. 155.
- ³⁶ This group would reorganize and become the *Psychoanalytic Society of Vienna* in 1908 (Gellner, 1985, p. 7).
- ³⁷ Brome, 1984; Jones, 1953.
- ³⁸ Jones, 1959, p. 159; Gellner, 1985, p. 8.
- ³⁹ Jones, 1959.
- ⁴⁰ Hale, 1971, p. 3.
- ⁴¹ Hale, 1971.
- ⁴² Freud, 1957, p. 50.
- ⁴³ Ibid, p. 4.
- ⁴⁴ Brome, 1984; Jones, 1955.
- ⁴⁵ Roazen, 1975, p. 226.
- ⁴⁶ Freud, 1957, p. 47; Jones, 1955, p. 154; Ibid, p. 229.
- ⁴⁷ Freud, 1957, p. 46; Jones, 1955, p. 160.
- ⁴⁸ Gellner, 1985, p. 8; Roazen, 1975, p. 235.
- ⁴⁹ Evans, 1964, p. 35.
- ⁵⁰ Freud, 1957, p. 4; Gellner, 1985, p. 8; Jones, 1955, p. 169; Roazen, 1975, p. 235.
- ⁵¹ Storr, 1989, p.123.
- ⁵² Roazen and Swerdloff, 1995, p. 53.
- ⁵³ Ibid.
- ⁵⁴ Ibid.
- ⁵⁵ *On the History of the Psycho-Analytic Movement*, Freud, 1957, p. 25.
- ⁵⁶ Freud, 1957, p. 25.
- ⁵⁷ Ibid, p. 39.
- ⁵⁸ Ibid.
- ⁵⁹ Ibid.
- ⁶⁰ Brome, 1984, p.154.
- ⁶¹ Hughes, 1989, pp. 1-2.
- ⁶² Jones, 1955, p. 175.
- ⁶³ Ibid, p. 174.
- ⁶⁴ Brome, 1984, p. 160.
- ⁶⁵ Ibid, p. 161.
- ⁶⁶ As cases in point for Freud's argument, lay analysts such as Siegfried Bernfeld, J.C. Flugel, Anna Freud, Hermine Hug-Hellmuth, Melanie Klein, Barbara Low, Otto Rank, Theodore Reik, Joan Riviere, Ella Sharpe, James and Alix Strachey and Baron von-Winterstein made significant contributions to the field. Bernfeld proposed the organization of an association of lay analysts in 1919 to maintain a loose affiliation with the Vienna Psycho-Analytic Society. Freud was so excited by this idea that he donated eleven thousand kronen to the project but it soon folded (Hale, 1971).
- ⁶⁷ This debate was most likely exacerbated by the number of American lay analysts traveling to Vienna to take advantage of the lax licensing requirements, then returning to set-up practice after barely six weeks of analysis. Of course, the *New York Societies* arguments are ironic because many early analysts although medical doctors, had *no* analysis experience themselves. As a result, many lay analysts had significantly more analytical experience than *Society* psychiatrists (Hale, 1971; Kirsner, 2000).
- ⁶⁸ It was not until 1938, after an intense period of debate, they finally agreed to accept European lay analysts (Hale, 1971; Kirsner, 2000).
- ⁶⁹ Kramer, 1996, p. xv.
- ⁷⁰ Grosskurth, 1985, p. 71.
- ⁷¹ Melanie Klein Trust, Wellcome Library archives.
- ⁷² Interestingly, this was one of the only times Freud actually *read* a paper, *Lines of Advance in Psycho-Analytic Therapy*, rather than simply talking extemporaneously (Grosskurth, 1985).
- ⁷³ R. Wollheim, BBC broadcast transcript, undated, Wellcome Library archives.
- ⁷⁴ Grosskurth, 1985.

-
- ⁷⁵ Ferenczi was known to have encouraged other women in this manner, such as Ada Schott and Ana Freud. It is unclear whether he felt Klein had a gift for understanding children or simply believed this to be an undeveloped area in which women analysts could naturally excel (Grosskurth, 1985, p. 74).
- ⁷⁶ Stanton, 1991, pp. 9-11.
- ⁷⁷ Grosskurth, 1985, p. 70.
- ⁷⁸ Stanton, 1991, p. 14.
- ⁷⁹ Grosskurth, 1985, p. 155.
- ⁸⁰ Jones, 1955, p. 178; 1959, p. 200.
- ⁸¹ Roazen and Swerdloff, 1995, pp. 33-34.
- ⁸² Abraham opened this clinic with Eitington on Potsdamerstrasse, in Berlin.
- ⁸³ Grosskurth, 1985, p. 93.
- ⁸⁴ Grosskurth, 1985.
- ⁸⁵ *Ibid*, p. 102
- ⁸⁶ Of course, Freud unabashedly analyzed his daughter Anna and Abraham was known to have analyzed his daughter, as well.
- ⁸⁷ R. Wollheim, BBC broadcast transcript, undated, Wellcome Library archives. P. 4.
- ⁸⁸ *Ibid*.
- ⁸⁹ M. Klein unpublished autobiography, Melanie Klein Trust, Wellcome Library archives.
- ⁹⁰ Mitchell, 1986, p. 10.
- ⁹¹ J. Riviere to M. Klein, personal communication, April 27, 1926, Melanie Klein Trust, Wellcome Library archives.
- ⁹² Grosskurth, 1985, p. 197.
- ⁹³ J. Riviere to M. Klein, personal communication, April 27, 1926, Melanie Klein Trust, Wellcome Library archives.
- ⁹⁴ J. Riviere to M. Klein, personal communication, April 27, 1926, Melanie Klein Trust, Wellcome Library archives.
- ⁹⁵ M. Klein to E. Jones, personal communication, October 24, 1926, Melanie Klein Trust, Wellcome Library archives.
- ⁹⁶ *Ibid*.
- ⁹⁷ S. Freud to E. Jones, personal communication, circa May 1927, Melanie Klein Trust, Wellcome Library archives.
- ⁹⁸ E. Jones to S. Freud, personal communication, September 30, 1927, Melanie Klein Trust, Wellcome Library.
- ⁹⁹ *Ibid*.
- ¹⁰⁰ Grosskurth, 1985, p. 195.
- ¹⁰¹ H. A. Thorner, personal communication, February 1982, Melanie Klein Trust, Wellcome Library archives.
- ¹⁰² Grosskurth, 1985, p. 239.
- ¹⁰³ After much political string pulling, Freud and his family were allowed to leave Vienna for London in 1938. Asked to sign a document confirming that he had been treated with respect by the German Reich, in particular, the Gestapo. Jones recalled that Freud had to affirm that he had been allowed to “live and work in full freedom,” that he could “pursue my activities in every way desired” with full support from all concerned and he had “not the slightest reason for any complaint” (Jones, 1957, p. 241). Of course, Freud signed this document so that he would be able to safely leave the Austria. Yet, he asked to if he might be allowed to include his own statement which was, “I can heartily recommend the Gestapo to anyone” (Jones, 1957, p. 241).
- ¹⁰⁴ Grosskurth, 1985, p. 241; Hughes, 1989, p. 21.
- ¹⁰⁵ Grosskurth, 1985, p. 238.
- ¹⁰⁶ *Ibid*, p. 256.
- ¹⁰⁷ *Ibid*, p. 298.
- ¹⁰⁸ Unpublished review, Wellcome Library archives, circa 1950.
- ¹⁰⁹ H. Thorner in R. Wollheim, BBC broadcast transcript, undated, Melanie Klein Trust, Wellcome Library archives.

-
- ¹¹⁰ Ibid.
- ¹¹¹ Ibid.
- ¹¹² Ibid.
- ¹¹³ Ibid.
- ¹¹⁴ I. Menzies Lyth, personal communication, November 17, 2003.
- ¹¹⁵ H. A. Thorner, personal communication, February 1982, Melanie Klein Trust, Wellcome Library archives.
- ¹¹⁶ E. Jaques in R. Wollheim, BBC broadcast transcript, undated, Wellcome Library archives.
- ¹¹⁷ H. A. Thorner, personal communication, February 1982, Melanie Klein Trust, Wellcome Library archives.
- ¹¹⁸ Grosskurt, 1985, p. 456.
- ¹¹⁹ Hayden & Molenkamp, forthcoming.
- ¹²⁰ Le Bon, 1896, p. 33.
- ¹²¹ Freud, 1922, p. 8.
- ¹²² Ibid, p. 14.
- ¹²³ Harrison, 2000, p. 28.
- ¹²⁴ Anthony, 1972, p. 3.
- ¹²⁵ See chapter five for more information about *Leaderless Groups* and *Officer Selection*.
- ¹²⁶ Jones, 1955, p. 55.
- ¹²⁷ Anthony, 1972, p. 4.
- ¹²⁸ Bion, 1961.
- ¹²⁹ Rosenbaum, 1976.
- ¹³⁰ Bion, 1961, p. 187.
- ¹³¹ Freud, 1922, p. 49.
- ¹³² Ibid.
- ¹³³ Gabriel, 1999, p. 117.
- ¹³⁴ Bion, 1961, p. 177.
- ¹³⁵ Armstrong, 1997.
- ¹³⁶ Freud, 1922, p. 4.
- ¹³⁷ First presented in 1925 before a Bureau of Personnel Administration conference.
- ¹³⁸ Follett, 1996, p. 58.
- ¹³⁹ Shafritz and Ott, 1996, p. 150-151.
- ¹⁴⁰ Mayo, 1933, p. 1.
- ¹⁴¹ Hirsch, 1987.
- ¹⁴² Lewin, 1948, p. vii.
- ¹⁴³ Lewin, 1947, p. 8.
- ¹⁴⁴ Miller, 1993, p. 5.
- ¹⁴⁵ This topic will be discussed in greater detail in chapter ten.
- ¹⁴⁶ Klein, 1946.
- ¹⁴⁷ Klein hypothesizes that this begins to occur in the fifth or sixth month of the infant's life.
- ¹⁴⁸ Klein, 1955, p. 310.
- ¹⁴⁹ Klein, 1985, p. 12.
- ¹⁵⁰ Ibid, p. 15.
- ¹⁵¹ Gould, 1988, p. 114.
- ¹⁵² Melanie Klein was Bion's second analyst. Bion's first analysis was conducted by John Rickman.
- ¹⁵³ For example, see Jaques, (1952), Rice (1958; 1963; 1965), Menzies (1959), Miller and Rice (1967), Lawrence (1979), Miller (1979; 1993; 1999), Pines (1983), Smith and Berg (1987), Hirschhorn (1988, 1997), Trist and Murray (1990), Shapiro and Carr (1991), Kahn (1992), Moylan (1994); Obholzer and Roberts (1994), Gillette and McCollom (1995), Armstrong (1997), Gould (1997), Klein, Gabelnick, and Herr (1998), French and Vince (1999), Gabriel (1999), Arrow, McGrath, and Berdahl (2000), Gould, Stapley, and Stein (2001), Diamond and Allcorn (2003), and Fraher (2004a, 2004b).
- ¹⁵⁴ Pines, 1985, p. xi.
- ¹⁵⁵ Gabriel, 1999, p. 118.

-
- ¹⁵⁶ Lawrence, Bain and Gould, 1996, p. 3.
- ¹⁵⁷ Providing an early theoretical foundation for *baD*, Freud (1913) noted a similar phenomenon between a king and his subjects in *Totem and Taboo*. He observed how a king was “worshipped as a god one day” and then “killed as a criminal the next” (p. 51). As Freud explained, “If their king is their god, he is or should be also their preserver; and if he will not preserve them, he must make room for another who will” (p. 52).
- ¹⁵⁸ Bion, 1961, p. 74, 82, 99.
- ¹⁵⁹ A recent study conducted by Shelley E. Taylor, Laura Cousino Klein, Brian P. Lewis, Tara L. Gruenewald, Regan A. R. Gurung, and John A. Updegraff (2000) at the University of California in Los Angeles shed new light on *baF*. It noted that *fight/flight*, the generally accepted prototypical human reaction to stress, was first introduced by Walter Cannon in 1932. Yet, one “little-known fact” is that most research “exploring its parameters has been conducted on males, especially on male rats” (p. 412). Addressing this empirical gap, Taylor et. al. seized the opportunity to “build theory,” hypothesizing that since females have typically borne the greater responsibility for care of offspring they have a propensity to *tend*, that is, to quiet and care for offspring and self by blending into the environment as a way to address external threats. In addition, affiliating with a social group and creating networks, or *befriending*, also provided resources and protection from external threats and stress for the female and her offspring. More research into the possibilities of a new basic assumption based on the *tend-befriend* paradigm might provide interesting data for the field of group relations and help expand our understanding of the complexity of group behavior.
- ¹⁶⁰ Bion, 1961, pp. 63, 65.
- ¹⁶¹ Slater, 1966.
- ¹⁶² W. Carr, personal communication, September 27, 2003.
- ¹⁶³ Rice, 1965, p. 12.
- ¹⁶⁴ Bion, 1961, p. 165-166.
- ¹⁶⁵ Gould 1997, Turquet, 1974.
- ¹⁶⁶ Gould, 1997, p. 20.
- ¹⁶⁷ Turquet, 1974, p. 367
- ¹⁶⁸ *Inter-Personal and Inter-Group Relations*” Brochure, 1964, p. 2. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ¹⁶⁹ *Inter-Personal and Inter-Group Relations*” Brochure, 1964, p. 3. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ¹⁷⁰ Turquet, 1974, p. 350, 357, 360.
- ¹⁷¹ Freud, 1946, p. 11-12.
- ¹⁷² *Ibid*, p. 19.
- ¹⁷³ *Ibid*.
- ¹⁷⁴ Klein, 1985, p. 6.
- ¹⁷⁵ Despite such parallel observations, Turquet never referenced Freud’s or Klein’s writing in this regard.
- ¹⁷⁶ Lawrence, Bain, and Gould, 1996, p. 4.
- ¹⁷⁷ *Ibid*, p. 6.
- ¹⁷⁸ *Ibid*, p. 12.
- ¹⁷⁹ Cano, 1998, p. 86-92.
- ¹⁸⁰ Klein, 1952, p. 199.
- ¹⁸¹ Klein’s use of the word depressive may lead to misunderstanding since she does not mean that the infant is in a state of depression. Rather, she is referring to a reintegration phase where the split parts can once again be made whole but which simultaneously generates fear that the good parts may disappear, and leads to feelings of guilt and remorse.
- ¹⁸² Bion, 1961, p. 163.
- ¹⁸³ *Ibid*, p. 165.
- ¹⁸⁴ Rice, 1965, p. 13.
- ¹⁸⁵ *Ibid*, p. 85.
- ¹⁸⁶ *Ibid*, p. 84.
- ¹⁸⁷ Bion, 1961, p.53.
- ¹⁸⁸ *Ibid*.
- ¹⁸⁹ *Ibid*, p.54.
- ¹⁹⁰ Identified by one of the various *bas* discussed previously.

-
- ¹⁹¹ I. Menzie Lyth, personal communication, February 20, 2004.
- ¹⁹² Armstrong, 2003, p. 14.
- ¹⁹³ Ibid.
- ¹⁹⁴ Turquet, 1974, p. 366.
- ¹⁹⁵ Bion, 1961, p. 135.
- ¹⁹⁶ Turquet, 1974, p. 363.
- ¹⁹⁷ For instance, the commercial aviation industry seeks to mobilize *baD* in order to have well-behaved passengers and the military seeks to mobilize the *fight* side of *baF* to have courageous soldiers.
- ¹⁹⁸ Turquet, 1974, pp. 364-7.
- ¹⁹⁹ T. Dartington, personal communication, June 9, 2004.
- ²⁰⁰ T. Dartington, personal communication, December 10, 2004.
- ²⁰¹ Shepard, 2000, p. 9.
- ²⁰² Ibid, p. 19.
- ²⁰³ It was not until 1917 that a standardized procedure for medical evaluation was established (Shepard, 2000, p. 26).
- ²⁰⁴ Approximately 9% of the officers and 4% of the enlisted ranks had broken down as a result of the fighting near the Flemish town of Ypres in December 1914 (Shepard, 2000, p. 21).
- ²⁰⁵ Ibid, p. 30.
- ²⁰⁶ Harrison, 2000, p. 79.
- ²⁰⁷ Although statistics were not monitored, one estimate concluded that 10% relapsed and 3% relapsed more than once.
- ²⁰⁸ Shepard, 2000, p. 60.
- ²⁰⁹ Ibid, p. 81.
- ²¹⁰ Ibid, p. 110.
- ²¹¹ Ibid, p. 168.
- ²¹² Harrison, 2000, p. 84.
- ²¹³ Harrison, 2000; Trist, 1985.
- ²¹⁴ Shepard, 2000, p. 231.
- ²¹⁵ Trist, 1985, p. 6.
- ²¹⁶ Bidwell, 1973, p. 116.
- ²¹⁷ Trist, 1985, p. 13.
- ²¹⁸ Bidwell, 1973, p. 118.
- ²¹⁹ Shepard, 2000, p. 219.
- ²²⁰ Dicks, 1970, p. 107.
- ²²¹ Shepard, 2000, p. 257.
- ²²² Bridger, 1985, p. 94.
- ²²³ Trist, 1985.
- ²²⁴ Ibid, p. 6.
- ²²⁵ de Mare, 1985, p. 111.
- ²²⁶ Harison, 2000, pp. 32-33.
- ²²⁷ Harrison, 2000; Trist 1985.
- ²²⁸ F. Bion, 1982.
- ²²⁹ Pines, 1985, p. 387.
- ²³⁰ F. Bion, 1982, p. 6.
- ²³¹ de Mare, 1985, p. 111.
- ²³² Ibid, p. 112.
- ²³³ Trist, 1985, p. 14.
- ²³⁴ Harrison, 2000; Trist, 1985.
- ²³⁵ Cited in Trist, 1985, pp. 15-16.
- ²³⁶ Bion & Rickman, 1943, p. 678.
- ²³⁷ Ibid.
- ²³⁸ Ibid.
- ²³⁹ Ibid, p. 680.

-
- ²⁴⁰ Harrison, 2000, p. 191.
²⁴¹ Bridger, 1985, p. 96.
²⁴² Stokes, 1989, p. 9.
²⁴³ Harrison, 2000.
²⁴⁴ Trist, 1985, p. 18.
²⁴⁵ Shepard, 2000, p. 261.
²⁴⁶ Harrison, 2000, p. 199.
²⁴⁷ Bridger, 1985, p. 90.
²⁴⁸ Ibid, p. 91.
²⁴⁹ Ibid, p. 98.
²⁵⁰ King & Steiner, 1991, p. xi; Harrison, 2000.
²⁵¹ Shepard, 2000, p. 263.
²⁵² Ibid.
²⁵³ Ibid.
²⁵⁴ Ibid.
²⁵⁵ Ibid.
²⁵⁶ Ibid.
²⁵⁷ Bridger, 1985, p. 100.
²⁵⁸ Trist, 1985, p. 19.
²⁵⁹ Ibid.
²⁶⁰ Ibid, p. 22.
²⁶¹ Hennessy, 1993, p. 10.
²⁶² Hennessy, 1993; Veldman, 1994.
²⁶³ Dicks, 1970, p. 14.
²⁶⁴ Trist & Murray, 1990, p. 2.
²⁶⁵ Klein, 1978; Trist & Murray, 1989.
²⁶⁶ Dicks, 1970, p. 14.
²⁶⁷ Ibid, p. 94.
²⁶⁸ Ibid, p. 119.
²⁶⁹ Ibid, p. 120.
²⁷⁰ Trist & Murray, 1990.
²⁷¹ Trist, 1985, p. 28
²⁷² Dicks, 1970.
²⁷³ Trist, 1985, p. 29
²⁷⁴ Dicks, 1970, p. 134.
²⁷⁵ Ibid, p. 136.
²⁷⁶ Veldman, 1994.
²⁷⁷ Dicks, 1970, p. 133.
²⁷⁸ Gray, 1970, p. 206.
²⁷⁹ Wilson “In memoriam” brochure, December 7, 1978, pp. 2, 4. Tavistock Institute archives.
²⁸⁰ Ibid, p. 2-3.
²⁸¹ Ibid, p. 3-4.
²⁸² Ibid, p. 7-8.
²⁸³ Wilson, 1950, p. 1. Tavistock Institute archives.
²⁸⁴ Ibid, p. 15.
²⁸⁵ Wilson “In memoriam” brochure, December 7, 1978, p. 5. Tavistock Institute archives.
²⁸⁶ Wilson, 1950, p. 5.
²⁸⁷ Dicks, 1970, p. 133.
²⁸⁸ Wilson, 1950, p. 36.
²⁸⁹ I. Menzies Lyth, personal communication, November 17, 2003. B. S. Morris comments at in-memoriam for A. T. M. Wilson, December, 7, 1978. Tavistock Institute archives.
²⁹⁰ I. Menzies Lyth, personal communication, November 17, 2003.
²⁹¹ Wilson, 1950, p. 8.

-
- ²⁹² I. Menzies-Lyth, personal communication, November 17, 2003.
- ²⁹³ Wilson, 1950, p. 13.
- ²⁹⁴ Trist, unpublished autobiography, Tavistock Institute archives.
- ²⁹⁵ Ibid.
- ²⁹⁶ Miller, 1993, p. 5.
- ²⁹⁷ I. Menzies Lyth, personal communication, January 12, 2002; Freedman, 1999.
- ²⁹⁸ E. L. Trist, *The institute in retrospect and prospect*, June 21, 1957, p.8. An unpublished address on the occasion of the annual general meeting of the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ²⁹⁹ E. Miller, personal communication, September 30, 2001.
- ³⁰⁰ Trist & Sofer, 1959, p. 5.
- ³⁰¹ Miller, 1989, p. 2
- ³⁰² This reference is to Kurt Lewin's *Research Center in Group Dynamics* at the University of Michigan and most likely included Ronald Lippitt, Kenneth Benne and Leland Bradford.
- ³⁰³ I. Menzies Lyth, personal communication, January 12, 2002.
- ³⁰⁴ I. Menzies Lyth, personal communication, January 12, 2002.
- ³⁰⁵ I. Menzies Lyth, personal communication, January 12, 2002.
- ³⁰⁶ The nature of this connection and the subsequent exportation of the Tavistock model to America will be discussed in more detail in the chapters ten, eleven and twelve.
- ³⁰⁷ Dicks, 1970.
- ³⁰⁸ Wilson, 1950, p. 15.
- ³⁰⁹ Rice, 1965, p. 12.
- ³¹⁰ Turquet, 1974, pp. 349-350.
- ³¹¹ Dick, 1970, p. 292.
- ³¹² Although Jaques has since redefined his perspective, in 1952 his research at Glacier Metal Company was foundational to social system studies at the Tavistock Institute.
- ³¹³ F. Heller, personal communication, November 11, 2003; I. Menzies Lyth, personal communication, November 17th, 2003; H. Murray, personal communication, December 10, 2003.
- ³¹⁴ The Order of the British Empire (OBE) is an "Order of Chivalry," a kind of Knighthood, created during the First World War by George V to recognize important contributions to the war effort. The OBE marked the first-time women were recognized by a British Order of Chivalry. After the war, OBE criteria were widened to recognize all forms of valuable service to the United Kingdom and its people. Today, there are more than 100,000 living members of the Order throughout the world. (www.royal.gov.uk)
- ³¹⁵ Trist & Bamforth, 1951.
- ³¹⁶ Rice, 1958, p. 3.
- ³¹⁷ Obituary: *The Times*, June 18, 1993; *The Independent*, June 14, 1993. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ³¹⁸ Miller, 1976, p. x.
- ³¹⁹ Ibid, p. xi.
- ³²⁰ Rice, Hill, & Trist, 1950; Rice, Jaques, & Hill, 1951a; Rice, Jaques, & Hill, 1951b; Rice, Jaques, & Hill, 1951c; Rice, Jaques, and Hill, 1952a; Rice & Trist, 1952b.
- ³²¹ Miller, 1993, p. xii.
- ³²² Rice, 1958, p. 6.
- ³²³ Miller, 1993.
- ³²⁴ Rice, 1958, p. XIII.
- ³²⁵ Ibid.
- ³²⁶ Although there is reference to Trist & Sofer, 1959.
- ³²⁷ T. Dartington, personal communication, December 10, 2003.
- ³²⁸ Tavistock Institute annual report, 1956-60, p. 11. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ³²⁹ Trist and Sofer, 1959, p. 11.
- ³³⁰ Miller, 1989, p. 3.
- ³³¹ Bridger, 1985, p. 88.
- ³³² "Inter-Personal and Inter-Group Relations" brochure, 1963, p. 2. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ³³³ I. Menzies Lyth, personal communication, November 17, 2003.

-
- ³³⁴ K. Rice, internal memorandum, May 8, 1961, p. 1. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ³³⁵ Ibid.
- ³³⁶ H. Bridger, internal memorandum, May 25, 1961, p. 2. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ³³⁷ K. Rice, internal memorandum, May 8, 1961, p. 1. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ³³⁸ “Inter-Personal and Inter-Group Relations” brochure, 1963, p. 2-3. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ³³⁹ “Inter-Personal and Inter-Group Relations” information sheet, 1962, p. 2. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ³⁴⁰ Ibid.
- ³⁴¹ L. Gould, personal communication, January 7, 2002.
- ³⁴² L. Klein, personal communication, October 28, 2003.
- ³⁴³ Ambrose, 1989, p. 145.
- ³⁴⁴ Trist & Murray, 1990, p. 16.
- ³⁴⁵ Ibid, p. 17.
- ³⁴⁶ F. Emery, internal memorandum, May 27, 1960, p. 1.
- ³⁴⁷ F. Emery, internal memorandum, May 27, 1960, p. 9.
- ³⁴⁸ Miller, 1976, p. xii.
- ³⁴⁹ Ibid.
- ³⁵⁰ I. Menzies Lyth, personal communication, November 17, 2003.
- ³⁵¹ Trist and Murray, 1990, p. 16.
- ³⁵² Ibid.
- ³⁵³ Trist and Murray, 1990, p. 16.
- ³⁵⁴ D. Armstrong, personal communication, February 9, 2004.
- ³⁵⁵ Tavistock Institute’s annual report, 1963-64, p. 2. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ³⁵⁶ I. Menzies Lyth, personal communication, November 17, 2003.
- ³⁵⁷ D. Armstrong, personal communication, February 9, 2004.
- ³⁵⁸ Ibid.
- ³⁵⁹ I. Menzies Lyth, personal communication, November 17, 2003.
- ³⁶⁰ H. Murray, personal communication, December 11, 2003.
- ³⁶¹ Ibid.
- ³⁶² D. Armstrong, personal communication, June 3, 2004.
- ³⁶³ D. Armstrong, personal communication, February 9, 2004.
- ³⁶⁴ Ibid.
- ³⁶⁵ Ibid.
- ³⁶⁶ D. Armstrong, personal communication, June 3, 2004.
- ³⁶⁷ Tavistock Institute’s annual report, 1964-65, p. 3. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ³⁶⁸ Trist & Murray, 1990, p. 18.
- ³⁶⁹ D. Armstrong, personal communication, February 9, 2004; I. Menzies Lyth, personal communication, November 17, 2003.
- ³⁷⁰ Trist & Murray, 1990, p. 18-19.
- ³⁷¹ Ibid.
- ³⁷² Ibid.
- ³⁷³ Ibid.
- ³⁷⁴ Tavistock Institute’s annual report, 1964-65, p. 11. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ³⁷⁵ Ibid.
- ³⁷⁶ Tavistock Institute Annual Report, 1965-66, p. 14; Tavistock Institute Annual Report, 1966-67, p. 11. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ³⁷⁷ Miller, 1976, p. xii.
- ³⁷⁸ I. Menzies Lyth, personal communication, November 17, 2003.
- ³⁷⁹ J. Bazalgette, personal communication, November 7, 2003.
- ³⁸⁰ D. Armstrong, personal communication, February 9, 2004.
- ³⁸¹ Ibid.
- ³⁸² J. Bazalgette, personal communication, November 7, 2003.
- ³⁸³ D. Armstrong, personal communication, February 9, 2004.
- ³⁸⁴ J. Bazalgette, personal communication, November 7, 2003.

-
- ³⁸⁵ L. Gould, personal communication, January 7, 2002.
- ³⁸⁶ Although, Bion did attend an A. K. Rice Institute conference in America in 1969.
- ³⁸⁷ Miller, 1989, p. 7.
- ³⁸⁸ Rice, 1965, p. xi.
- ³⁸⁹ Miller, 1989, p. 5.
- ³⁹⁰ M. Sher, personal communication, January 15, 2002.
- ³⁹¹ von Bertalanffy, 1950.
- ³⁹² Trist and Murray, 1993, p. 30.
- ³⁹³ Miller, 1993, p. 8.
- ³⁹⁴ Ibid.
- ³⁹⁵ cited in Miller, 1993, p. 10.
- ³⁹⁶ Miller, 1993, p. 11.
- ³⁹⁷ Ibid.
- ³⁹⁸ www.leicester2003.com.
- ³⁹⁹ Rice, 1965, p. 11.
- ⁴⁰⁰ Miller, 1993, p. 16.
- ⁴⁰¹ Rice, 1965, p. 11.
- ⁴⁰² Miller, 1993, p. 19.
- ⁴⁰³ Rice, 1965, p. 11.
- ⁴⁰⁴ Ibid, p. 17.
- ⁴⁰⁵ Ibid, p. 18.
- ⁴⁰⁶ Ibid.
- ⁴⁰⁷ Ibid, p. 5.
- ⁴⁰⁸ Ibid.
- ⁴⁰⁹ Miller, 1993, p. 21.
- ⁴¹⁰ Leicester Conference Brochure, 2004, p. 3. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ⁴¹¹ Rice, 1965, p. 25.
- ⁴¹² Ibid. pp. 24-5.
- ⁴¹³ Miller, 1989, p. 1.
- ⁴¹⁴ The years 1962 to 2004, excluding 1988 and 1989 which were not available.
- ⁴¹⁵ E. J. Miller, personal communication, October 29, 2001; Leicester Conference Brochure, 1964.
- ⁴¹⁶ Rice, 1965.
- ⁴¹⁷ Leicester Conference Brochure, 1970, p. 4. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ⁴¹⁸ Authority and Organisation brochure, 1969, p. 3. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ⁴¹⁹ For example, the “A” sub-conference, the “B” sub-conference and the Training Group might have separate inter-group events but might all participate in a joint institutional event.
- ⁴²⁰ Miller, 1993, p. 22.
- ⁴²¹ Rice, 1965, p. 43.
- ⁴²² Although reports of participant’s conference behavior should never be used for punitive purposes, this does not preclude the use of conference events for research and evaluative purposes.
- ⁴²³ Rice, 1965, p. 25.
- ⁴²⁴ Ibid., p. 26.
- ⁴²⁵ Ibid., p. 170.
- ⁴²⁶ Ibid., p. 26.
- ⁴²⁷ Turquet, 1974, p. 366.
- ⁴²⁸ Rice, 1965, p. 27.
- ⁴²⁹ Ibid, p. 150.
- ⁴³⁰ Ibid, p. 151.
- ⁴³¹ Ibid, p. 149.
- ⁴³² Ibid, p. 148.
- ⁴³³ Ibid, p. 149.
- ⁴³⁴ Ibid.
- ⁴³⁵ Ibid.

-
- ⁴³⁶ Ibid, p. 150.
- ⁴³⁷ Ibid, p. 151.
- ⁴³⁸ Ibid, p. 164.
- ⁴³⁹ Ibid, p. 165.
- ⁴⁴⁰ Ibid, p. 166.
- ⁴⁴¹ Ibid, p. 167-8.
- ⁴⁴² Ibid.
- ⁴⁴³ Ibid, p. 166; 172.
- ⁴⁴⁴ Ibid, p. 169.
- ⁴⁴⁵ A. K. Rice, personal communication, circa 1962. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ⁴⁴⁶ An internal Tavistock Institute memo dated May 29, 1961. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ⁴⁴⁷ An internal Tavistock Institute memo dated May 29, 1961. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ⁴⁴⁸ Authority, Leadership and Organisation brochure, 2004, p. 14. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ⁴⁴⁹ Tavistock Institute's annual report, 1964-65, p. 13. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ⁴⁵⁰ P. Turquet to E. Miller, personal communication, March 23, 1964. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ⁴⁵¹ Ibid.
- ⁴⁵² E. Miller to P. Turquet, personal communication, March 31, 1964. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ⁴⁵³ Interestingly, approximately forty years later Pernille Solvik, Tavistock Institute researcher, and Mannie Sher, director of the group relations programme, conducted a telephone interview of twenty Leicester Conference participants in August 2002 and then again in 2004, "mapping the market for the Leicester Conference." More of a "marketing exercise" than social science research, it was nevertheless one of the only attempts to communicate with conference participants about their experience after the fact (P. Solvik, unpublished Tavistock Institute report, August 2002).
- ⁴⁵⁴ Miller, 1989, p.26.
- ⁴⁵⁵ A. K. Rice, *field notes*, October 10, 1963. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ⁴⁵⁶ Ibid.
- ⁴⁵⁷ Ibid.
- ⁴⁵⁸ Ibid.
- ⁴⁵⁹ Ibid.
- ⁴⁶⁰ Ibid.
- ⁴⁶¹ Ibid.
- ⁴⁶² Ibid.
- ⁴⁶³ Ibid.
- ⁴⁶⁴ A. K. Rice to T. G. Weiler, personal communication, June 2, 1966. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ⁴⁶⁵ Ibid.
- ⁴⁶⁶ Interestingly, the following year membership dropped 42% to 414 participants, of which 42% were from the medical, social, and professional fields. This drop in enrollment and change in demographics could be attributed to Rice's death late in 1969 and the subsequent turnover in leadership of the Leicester Conference and the CASR.
- ⁴⁶⁷ Group Relations Brochure, 1969, p. 8. A. K. Rice Institute archives.
- ⁴⁶⁸ Rioch, 1993, p. 233.
- ⁴⁶⁹ Rice had participated in small groups with Bion at the Tavistock Institute in the post-war 1940s in London.
- ⁴⁷⁰ W. G. Lawrence, personal communication, January 15, 2002.
- ⁴⁷¹ Ibid.
- ⁴⁷² Ibid.
- ⁴⁷³ E. Klein, personal communication, February 16, 2002.
- ⁴⁷⁴ Ibid.
- ⁴⁷⁵ Gould, 2000, p. 44.
- ⁴⁷⁶ Group Relations Brochure, 1969, p. 7. A. K. Rice Institute archives.
- ⁴⁷⁷ Group Relations Brochure, 1969, p. 1. A. K. Rice Institute archives.
- ⁴⁷⁸ Gould, 2000, p. 45.
- ⁴⁷⁹ Ibid.

-
- 480 Ibid.
- 481 Ibid.
- 482 Ibid.
- 483 Ibid.
- 484 Ibid, p. 46.
- 485 Miller, 1976, p. xii.
- 486 Ibid.
- 487 Wesley Carr, Miller “In Memoriam” video, June 8, 2002, Tavistock Institute archives.
- 488 Mira Erlich-Ginor, Miller “In Memoriam” video, June 8, 2002, Tavistock Institute archives.
- 489 Anton Obholzer, Miller “In Memoriam” video, June 8, 2002, Tavistock Institute archives.
- 490 E. Miller, personal correspondence, September 10, 2001.
- 491 Ibid.
- 492 Obituary, *Human Relations*, 2002.
- 493 E. Miller, personal communication, December 8, 1969.
- 494 Laurence Gould, Miller “In Memoriam” video, June 8, 2002, Tavistock Institute archives.
- 495 Hayden & Molenkamp, 2004, p. 28; Obituary, www.news.telegraph.co.uk.
- 496 Miller directed in 1969, 1970, 1971, 1974, 1976, 1979, 1980, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1988, 1990, 1992 and in 1996, his last Leicester Conference. He was associate director in 1977, 1981, 1986 and 1993, and served in a staff role in 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1972, 1978 and 1987. He did not attend in 1973, 1975, 1991, 1994 or 1995. No data was available for 1988 or 1989 (Conference brochures, Tavistock Institute and Grubb Institute archives.)
- 497 Miller “In Memoriam” video, June 8, 2002, Tavistock Institute archives.
- 498 Ibid.
- 499 Laurence Gould, Miller “In Memoriam” video, June 8, 2002, Tavistock Institute archives.
- 500 T. Dartington, personal communication, December 10, 2003.
- 501 Human Resources Centre (HRC), Center for Applied Social Research (CASR), Institute for Operational Research (IOR), The Family Discussion Bureau, and the Committee on Family Psychiatry and Community Mental Health.
- 502 T. Dartington, personal communication, December 10, 2003.
- 503 Tavistock Institute Annual Report, 1969-70, p. 4-5. Tavistock Institute archives.
- 504 Ibid.
- 505 Ibid.
- 506 Ibid.
- 507 W. G. Lawrence, personal communication, January 15, 2002.
- 508 E. Miller, personal communication, January 12, 2002.
- 509 Ibid.
- 510 In 1972, 1973, and 1975.
- 511 In 1976 Lawrence joined the rotation, first directing the Leicester Conference in 1978, then alternating with Miller until Lawrence’s resignation from the Tavistock Institute in 1982.
- 512 W, Carr, W. G. Lawrence; I. Menzies Lyth, E. Miller.
- 513 W. G. Lawrence, personal communication, January 15, 2002.
- 514 I. Menzies Lyth, personal communication, January 12, 2002.
- 515 W. G. Lawrence, personal communication, January 15, 2002.
- 516 Tavistock Institute annual report, 1968-69, p. 12. Tavistock Institute archives.
- 517 Tavistock Institute Annual Report, 1970-71, p. 4. Tavistock Institute archives.
- 518 Ibid, p. 5.
- 519 Tavistock Institute annual report, 1973-74, p. 3. Tavistock Institute archives.
- 520 Ibid, p. 1.
- 521 Ibid, p. 2.
- 522 Ibid, p. 1.
- 523 Miller, 1986, p. 258.
- 524 Ibid.
- 525 Ibid, p. 267.

-
- ⁵²⁶ Between October 1977 and September 1978. Tavistock Institute annual report, 1977-78, p. 38. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ⁵²⁷ Tavistock Institute annual report, 1979-80, p. 55. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ⁵²⁸ £2,482.
- ⁵²⁹ Tavistock Institute annual report, 1980-81, p. 26. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ⁵³⁰ Ibid.
- ⁵³¹ Ibid, p. 5.
- ⁵³² This idea was further elaborated upon by John Kelleher at the Tavistock Institute away-day, May 2004.
- ⁵³³ Tavistock Institute annual report, 1990, p. 2. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ⁵³⁴ Ibid.
- ⁵³⁵ D. Armstrong, personal communication, June 3, 2004.
- ⁵³⁶ Tavistock Consultancy Service brochure.
- ⁵³⁷ D. Armstrong, personal communication, February 9, 2004.
- ⁵³⁸ Tavistock Institute annual report, 1982-83, p. 6. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ⁵³⁹ J. Bazalgette, personal communication, May 19, 2004.
- ⁵⁴⁰ Tavistock Institute annual report, 1993-94, p. 3. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ⁵⁴¹ Roszak, 1995.
- ⁵⁴² Gitlin, 1987, p. 13.
- ⁵⁴³ Roszak, 1995, p. xvi.
- ⁵⁴⁴ Gitlin, 1987, p. 47.
- ⁵⁴⁵ cited in Freedman, 1996, p. 343.
- ⁵⁴⁶ Freedman, 1996.
- ⁵⁴⁷ Bradford, Gibb, & Benne, 1964; Freedman, 1996.
- ⁵⁴⁸ Back, 1972; Freedman, 1996, p. 344; Lakin, 1976; NTL Institute Website.
- ⁵⁴⁹ Back, 1972; Bradford, Gibb, & Benne, 1964; Freedman, 1996.
- ⁵⁵⁰ Back, 1972; NTL Institute Website.
- ⁵⁵¹ Hirsch, 1987, p. 15-16
- ⁵⁵² www.ntl.org
- ⁵⁵³ Bradford, 1967, p. 138.
- ⁵⁵⁴ Freedman, 1999, p. 127-8.
- ⁵⁵⁵ Bradford, 1967, p. 141.
- ⁵⁵⁶ Bradford, Gibb, and Benne, 1964, p. vii.
- ⁵⁵⁷ Klein and Astrachan, 1971, pp. 660-5.
- ⁵⁵⁸ Klein and Astrachan, 1971; Neumann, Holvino & Braxton, 2000.
- ⁵⁵⁹ Hirsch, 1987, p. 37
- ⁵⁶⁰ Bradford, 1967, p. 141.
- ⁵⁶¹ Hirsch, 1987, p. 36.
- ⁵⁶² Ibid, p. 45.
- ⁵⁶³ Freedman, 1999.
- ⁵⁶⁴ Ibid.
- ⁵⁶⁵ Hirsch, 1987, p. 47
- ⁵⁶⁶ Ibid, pp. 53, 57.
- ⁵⁶⁷ Ibid, p. 133.
- ⁵⁶⁸ D. Porter, personal communication, February 15, 2002.
- ⁵⁶⁹ Ibid.
- ⁵⁷⁰ Ibid.
- ⁵⁷¹ Howard, 1970; Rogers, 1970.
- ⁵⁷² Freedman, 1999, p. 135.
- ⁵⁷³ Ibid.
- ⁵⁷⁴ Ibid, p. 136.
- ⁵⁷⁵ Ibid, p. 137
- ⁵⁷⁶ E. Holvino, personal communication, February 11, 2002.
- ⁵⁷⁷ Ibid.

-
- ⁵⁷⁸ D. Porter, personal communication, February 15, 2002.
- ⁵⁷⁹ Ibid.
- ⁵⁸⁰ Freedman, 1999, p. 138.
- ⁵⁸¹ Tavistock Centre, Belsize Lane, London NW3 5BA; 56-60 Hallam Street, London W1N 5LH; 4 Copthall House, Station Square, Coventry CV1 2PP; and 56 Albany Street, Edinburgh EH1 3QR.
- ⁵⁸² Tavistock Institute Annual Report, 1973-74, pp. 84-87. Tavistock Institute archives.
- ⁵⁸³ There was an attempt made during AKRI's early years to publish a journal. Entitled *Journal of Personality and Social Systems*, it quickly faded away. More recently, the Organisation for Promoting Understanding in Society's (OPUS) journal *Organisational & Social Dynamics* is available for subscription to interested AKRI members.
- ⁵⁸⁴ Three journal articles: Gould, 2000; Klein, 1978; Rioch, 1986; and the proceedings of the ninth scientific meeting: Hugg, Carson, & Lipgar, 1993.
- ⁵⁸⁵ Idea developed through conversations with Mary Rafferty and Marian Uriquella.
- ⁵⁸⁶ Vansina, 1961, p. 5.
- ⁵⁸⁷ Informants whose interviews were taped, were provided with an opportunity to review and modify their interview transcripts. Quotations not obtained via transcribed interviews were provided to informants for their review before publication.
- ⁵⁸⁸ W. Carr, personal communication, January 14, 2002, L. Gould, personal communication, January 7, 2002; E. Miller, personal communication, January 12, 2002. E. Shapiro, personal communication, February 12, 2002; K. White, personal communication, January 6, 2002.
- ⁵⁸⁹ Rioch, 1996, p. 5.
- ⁵⁹⁰ Rioch, 1996; www.continents.com.
- ⁵⁹¹ Rioch, 1996, p. 7.
- ⁵⁹² Ibid.
- ⁵⁹³ Rioch, 1996; www.continents.com.
- ⁵⁹⁴ Rioch, 1996, p. 8.
- ⁵⁹⁵ Ibid.; www.continents.com.
- ⁵⁹⁶ Rioch, 1996, p. 10.
- ⁵⁹⁷ AKRI History video, 1995.
- ⁵⁹⁸ Rioch, 1996, p. 11.
- ⁵⁹⁹ Ibid. p. 12.
- ⁶⁰⁰ Group Relations Brochure, 1966-1969; Rice, 1965. A. K. Rice Institute archives.
- ⁶⁰¹ L. Gould, personal communication, January 7, 2002; E. Klein, personal communication, February 16, 2002.
- ⁶⁰² L. Gould, personal communication, January 7, 2002.
- ⁶⁰³ Ibid.
- ⁶⁰⁴ E. Klein, personal communication, February 16, 2002.
- ⁶⁰⁵ E. Shapiro, personal communication, February 12, 2002.
- ⁶⁰⁶ E. Klein, personal communication, February 16, 2002.
- ⁶⁰⁷ Although women may have found expanded opportunities at the regional center level, this data was not available.
- ⁶⁰⁸ Although Ruth G. Newman (1966 and 1967) and Jane Donner (1969) served on staff at the Amherst conference.
- ⁶⁰⁹ E. Klein, personal communication, February 16, 2002.
- ⁶¹⁰ E. T. Braxton, personal correspondence, June 17, 2002.
- ⁶¹¹ Ibid.
- ⁶¹² R. Baxter, personal communication, May 30, 2004.
- ⁶¹³ Ibid.
- ⁶¹⁴ A. Colman, personal communication, April 21, 2004.
- ⁶¹⁵ W. Carr, personal communication, January 14, 2002.
- ⁶¹⁶ Ibid.
- ⁶¹⁷ Ibid.
- ⁶¹⁸ L. Gould, personal communication, January 7, 2002.

-
- ⁶¹⁹ Ibid.
- ⁶²⁰ Cytrynbaum, 1993, p. 41.
- ⁶²¹ T. Monroe, personal communication, January 3, 2002.
- ⁶²² K. White, personal communication, January 6, 2002.
- ⁶²³ E. Holvino, personal communication, February 11, 2002.
- ⁶²⁴ I. Menzies Lyth, personal communication, January 12, 2002.
- ⁶²⁵ L. Gould, personal communication, January 7, 2002.
- ⁶²⁶ E. J. Miller, personal correspondence, February 11, 2002.
- ⁶²⁷ E. Klein, personal communication, February 16, 2002.
- ⁶²⁸ R. Baxter, personal communication, January 12, 2004.
- ⁶²⁹ L. Gould, personal communication, January 7, 2002.
- ⁶³⁰ E. Klein, personal communication, February 16, 2002.
- ⁶³¹ A. Colman, personal communication, June 8, 2004.
- ⁶³² A. Colman, personal communication, April 21, 2004.
- ⁶³³ E. Shapiro, personal communication, February 12, 2002.
- ⁶³⁴ K. White, personal communication, January 6, 2002.
- ⁶³⁵ Rioch, 1993, p. 233.
- ⁶³⁶ Group Relations brochure, 1970, p. 1. A. K. Rice Institute archives.
- ⁶³⁷ Rioch, 1993, p. 234.
- ⁶³⁸ L. Gould, personal communication, January 7, 2002.
- ⁶³⁹ Rioch, 1993, p. 234.
- ⁶⁴⁰ L. Gould, personal communication, January 7, 2002.
- ⁶⁴¹ W. Carr, personal communication, January 14, 2002.
- ⁶⁴² K. White, personal communication, January 6, 2002.
- ⁶⁴³ E. Braxton, personal conversation, June 26, 2002; E. Miller, personal communication, January 12, 2002; K. White, personal communication, January 6, 2002.
- ⁶⁴⁴ M. Sher, personal communication, January 15, 2002.
- ⁶⁴⁵ Ibid.
- ⁶⁴⁶ Krantz, 1993, p. 239.
- ⁶⁴⁷ M. Sher, personal communication, January 15, 2002.
- ⁶⁴⁸ E. Klein, personal communication, February 16, 2002.
- ⁶⁴⁹ M. Sher, personal communication, January 15, 2002.
- ⁶⁵⁰ AKRI history video, 1995; A. Kirkpatrick, personal communication, circa January 2002.
- ⁶⁵¹ Ibid.
- ⁶⁵² Group Relations Brochure, 1975-1979;1984;1991; 1995; AKRI history video, 1995.
- ⁶⁵³ L. Gould, personal communication, January 7, 2002.
- ⁶⁵⁴ The NTL retained this structure until the mid-seventies when they dissolved the centers into one nationally run organization in order to stream line expenses, and has continued with a centralized structure to this day.
- ⁶⁵⁵ L. Gould, personal communication, January 7, 2002.
- ⁶⁵⁶ Gould, 2000, p. 50.
- ⁶⁵⁷ Ibid.
- ⁶⁵⁸ E. Klein, personal communication, February 16, 2002.
- ⁶⁵⁹ K. White, personal communication, January 6, 2002.
- ⁶⁶⁰ E. Shapiro, personal communication, February 12, 2002.
- ⁶⁶¹⁶⁶¹ Gould, 2000, p. 50.
- ⁶⁶² E. Klein, personal communication, February 16, 2002.
- ⁶⁶³ Ibid.
- ⁶⁶⁴ Cytrynbaum, 1993, p. 33.
- ⁶⁶⁵ Topeka Center, Minnesota Center, Center for the Education of Groups and Organizations (CEGO), Institute for the Applied Study of Social Systems (IASOSS), Study Center for Organizational Leadership and Authority (SCOLA), and the North Central Center.
- ⁶⁶⁶ L. Cooper, personal communication, May 2, 2004.

-
- ⁶⁶⁷ Cytrynbaum, 1993, p. 39.
- ⁶⁶⁸ Ibid, p. 33.
- ⁶⁶⁹ E. Holvino, personal communication, February 11, 2002.
- ⁶⁷⁰ A. Colman, personal communication, April 21, 2004.
- ⁶⁷¹ AKRI History video, 1995.
- ⁶⁷² R. Baxter, personal communication, January 12, 2004.
- ⁶⁷³ E. Shapiro, personal communication, February 12, 2002.
- ⁶⁷⁴ Eric Miller had served in a staff role in 1969, 1970, 1971, 1973, 1974, and 1975 but he never served as director or associate director at the AKRI National Conference.
- ⁶⁷⁵ AKRI Group Relations brochure, 1990, p. 8-11. AKRI archives.
- ⁶⁷⁶ E. Shapiro, personal communication, February 12, 2002.
- ⁶⁷⁷ W. Carr, personal communication, January 14, 2002.
- ⁶⁷⁸ Ibid.
- ⁶⁷⁹ Ibid.
- ⁶⁸⁰ Ibid.
- ⁶⁸¹ E. Shapiro, personal communication, February 12, 2002.
- ⁶⁸² Ibid.
- ⁶⁸³ W. Carr, personal communication, January 14, 2002. This notion of the conference splitting and its effects reverberating in the sponsoring institution is an important point which will be explored later.
- ⁶⁸⁴ W. Carr, personal communication, January 14, 2002.
- ⁶⁸⁵ C. Hayden, personal communication, May 6, 2004.
- ⁶⁸⁶ E. Holvino, personal communication, February 11, 2002.
- ⁶⁸⁷ E. Shapiro, personal communication, February 12, 2002.
- ⁶⁸⁸ W. Carr, personal communication, January 14, 2002.
- ⁶⁸⁹ E. Shapiro, personal communication, February 12, 2002.
- ⁶⁹⁰ R. Baxter, personal communication, January 12, 2004.
- ⁶⁹¹ W. Carr, personal communication, January 14, 2002.
- ⁶⁹² Ibid.
- ⁶⁹³ E. Shapiro, personal communication, February 12, 2002.
- ⁶⁹⁴ R. Baxter, personal communication, January 12, 2004.
- ⁶⁹⁵ Ibid.
- ⁶⁹⁶ E. Shapiro, personal communication, February 12, 2002.
- ⁶⁹⁷ R. Baxter, personal communication, May 30, 2004.
- ⁶⁹⁸ T. Monroe, personal communication, January 3, 2002.
- ⁶⁹⁹ L. Gould, personal communication, January 7, 2002.
- ⁷⁰⁰ Ibid.
- ⁷⁰¹ E. Klein, personal communication, February 16, 2002.
- ⁷⁰² Ibid.
- ⁷⁰³ L. Gould, personal communication, January 7, 2002.
- ⁷⁰⁴ It should be noted that Rioch did rejoin AKRI in 1992, maintaining membership until her death in 1996. Baxter noted, "Upon her death she generously bequeathed a significant portion of her estate to the A. K. Rice Institute, in a sense 'authorizing,' and certainly supporting, the organizational revitalization that was underway" (personal communication, May 30, 2004).
- ⁷⁰⁵ R. Baxter, personal communication, January 12, 2004.
- ⁷⁰⁶ C. Hayden, personal communication, May 6, 2004.
- ⁷⁰⁷ T. Monroe, personal communication, January 3, 2002.
- ⁷⁰⁸ K. White, personal communication, January 6, 2002.
- ⁷⁰⁹ King & Steiner, 1991, p. 2.
- ⁷¹⁰ Ibid.
- ⁷¹¹ Piazza, 1995, p. 1.
- ⁷¹² Cytrynbaum, 1993, p. 40-41.
- ⁷¹³ Lofgren, 1993, p. 142.
- ⁷¹⁴ Piazza, 1995, p. 8.

⁷¹⁵ Ibid, p. 9.

⁷¹⁶ <http://www.ntl.org/about-message.html>

⁷¹⁷ R. Baxter, personal communication, May 30, 2004.