1998 AG Lab O

3/30 OK
OK - as ed 3/30

Trigant Burrow and The Laboratory of the 'T

Alfreda Sill Galt

CHAPTERS I II III IV V
OF BOOK UNFINISHED

The Lifwynn Foundation
1771 Post Road East, Box 314
Westport, CT 06880
(203) 254-0599
Fax: (203) 254-8663

August 1997

1998 AG LabI

Trigant Burrow and The Laboratory of the 'I'

Alfreda Sill Galt

The Lifwynn Foundation
1771 Post Road East, Box 314
Westport, CT 06880
(203) 254-0599
Fax: (203) 254-8663

August 1997

Chapter 1

The Practice of Social Self-Inquiry: An Introduction

In my early teens, I had the opportunity to take part in a totally unprecedented experiment: It was a two-month summer session at an isolated camp in the Adirondacks where a group of people were to come together to investigate their own interaction. An assumption of the study was that society itself, though basically unitary in consciousness and feeling, suffers from a vast and prevalent "social neurosis." This neurosis-this pandemic disorderwas regarded as the source of the widespread dissociation and imbalance we see expressed in crime, ethnic conflict, environmental exploitation and war. It was further postulated that the small group at Lifwynn Camp, as a tiny crosssection of the larger society, embodied the disorder in themselves; and that it could be detected by the participants in their own behavior and feeling.

As I will describe in Chapter 3, this investigation grew out of a mutual analysis instituted by the early American psychoanalyst, Trigant Burrow, M.D., Ph.D., and a student assistant, Clarence Shields. My mother, Alfreda P. Sill, a teacher, was one of a number of people-lay and professional-who were interested in this innovative study. She was among some twenty-four who applied for the summer session at Lifwynn Camp in 1926, and it was arranged for her to bring me and my older sister, Margaret, with her.This was not the first group approach: Joseph H. Pratt, a Boston internist, and Edward Lazell, a physician in Washington, D.C., had earlier brought together groups of tubercular and shell-shocked patients respectively for lectures and discussions about the conditions that afflicted them. (*Group Psychotherapy and Group Function,* 3-5, Rosenbaum and Berger). And Jacob L. Moreno, who arrived in the United States in 1925, contributed the tools of sociometry and psychodrama to group work. But Burrow's group analysis, initiated in 1923, was the first attempt to extend Freudian principles to the social arena and to do so primarily for investigative purposes. It was in fact the first group analysis and a forerunner of the group therapies that were to follow.

For me, that summer established an association with an endeavor and with the group involved that, over the years, grew steadily more central in my life. Eventually, as part of The Lifwynn Foundation which was established to provide the social setting for this approach, I began to write papers about Trigant Burrow and the sweeping findings of his research. He himself claimed that they placed the study of human conflict in the realm of the biophysical sciences (1949, 147). But his approach to what constitutes scientific study had a distinct phenomenological flavor in keeping with today's questioning of scientific objectivism. Thus, group analysis or social self-inquiry, as we call it now, combines a distinctive form of group

work with a somatic approach. This is the research method that I and a few co-workers are trying to advance and which I would like this book to embody.

Social self-inquiry is carried out by a peer group; that means a group that is thoroughly egalitarian, one in which the impulses and feelings of all participants are regarded as common and equal, and there is no need to keep feelings secret. We want to find out as a group how the sensations associated with prejudice and affect-projection feel, affect being defined as feeling that has become attached or projected onto ideas and symbols, such as "my mother," "my money," "my political views," "African American, Native American, White American," etc. We ask ourselves, "What are the sensations associated with making other people and outside events responsible for our feelings?" (i.e., "She makes me mad;" "I'm upset because my train was late," etc.)?

There seem to be issues of leadership in most groups but in social selfinquiry, aspirations to leadership (and followership) are openly acknowledged and consciously questioned along with other feelings and motivations. A basic assumption of the study continues to be that if the widespread signs of alienation and dissociation that can be seen in families, communities, and nations are indeed the expressions of a vast societal disorder, then the disorder is incorporated in every member of society. In other words, we can look for evidences of this prevalent malfunction, and the native capacities to deal with it, within the processes of the smallest segments of society--within the individual, his or her family, the experimental group. For instance, in our group, I frequently become aware of my dependence on my image of Burrow and Shields, being pleased when their work is appreciated, as though they somehow belong to me. Other biases, particularly those the group shares, such as a predilection for sentimental gestures, attitudes toward authority, etc., do not come to attention as readily. But fellow workers can feel free to point these behavioral discrepancies out in each other.

Social self-inquiry involves an altered frame of reference in which you examine your own reactions and those of your fellows not as "mine" and "theirs" but as examples of the disorder of humankind. Our standards of behavior-our ideas of "right" and "wrong"are necessarily derived, imparted to us in infancy by seemingly infallible parents. So in social self-inquiry we question all of our reactions, the seemingly altruistic and caring along with socalled negative emotions-rage, anxiety, jealousy, etc. In other words, social self-inquiry can be described as a study of social mood; of the prevailing feeling-tone embodied in society, and reflected in the investigators. It addresses our problems as members of the community rather than as separate individuals; and it does so by investigating the entity we each feel and experience as "I." Even before group analysis was started by Burrow and Shields, they recognized that each of them occupied an identically autocratic and self-justifying position toward the other. And this position seemed quite clearly related to the sense of self and its rightness-maintaining face, for instance, or protecting one's turf. And paradoxically this sense of oneself which makes us feel special and distinctive is actually the common lot, something we share with our fellows.

So far, the premises of social self-inquiry might sound similar to many dialogue groups which developed in recent years out of the work of David Bohm and Patrick deMare. In the dialogue group with which I have been associated for the past ten years, there is occasional reference to our behavior being representative of the larger community, but there is not the same commitment to the generic mode as in social self-inquiry. And most dialogue groups probably do not think of themselves as research bodies, although they may be experimenting with new forms of relationships among their members. But the most important distinction between the two approaches is that social self-inquiry is not simply a talking technique of observation; it is not merely a discussion about the ways in which the social neurosis restricts our freedom and

creativity, though analysis certainly has a place in it. Rather, it involves an internal physiological shift. It involves proprioception or awareness of sensations and tensions arising within the body. (Lifwynn Correspondence, 4.2) Burrow expressed it as a shift of attention from our ordinary way of relating with its outward focus, to an inward-centered mode of attention in which the total muscular configuration of the human organism enters, and remains in, awareness. This attentional shift--this heightening of proprioception--can be activated in solitude, in groups organized to study the social neurosis, and in the course of ordinary give-and-take. But, as I have indicated, it requires a generic frame of reference in which the tensions in question are not regarded as "my" tensions in the sense of being a personal problem (such as I might take to a psychiatrist) but rather as an example of a societal problem of deadly seriousness which is common to the community. So that when I notice my dependence on my proprietary image of Burrow and Shields, or find myself defensive about them or about myself or one of my children; or discover that I am projecting blame on others or guilt on myself, etc., it is my responsibility to wrest my attention away from what seems to be the external cause of my feeling, and instead, turning inward, let attention rest lightly on sensations, particularly those around the eyes, in the face, and brow. This is the area of the organism most involved in symbolic interchange and as we shall see later, it is through the function of symbol and language that human beings seem to have become dissociated from organic moorings.

This is a rough characterization of a procedure that developed in the course of Burrow's group analysis. His own descriptions of this practice, which grew serendipitously out of direct experience, are contained in a number of his writings (ref.). Burrow spent hours of the day and night in what he occasionally called the "drill" of letting affect-images and ruminations go, and permitting the background sensations of the total organism to enter more and more fully into awareness. (It is this aspect of his work that has been compared to meditation.) And others who have experimented with this proprioceptive shift have given their own reports (ref. to Gilden, Roche, Rosen, Syz). The purpose of our experimentation is to develop ways to neutralize or eliminate the influence in human affairs generally of the false sense of `I' to which we have become accustomed, so the unitary feeling resources of the total species organism resident in each of us become available for societal healing and transformation.

I think I should add, however, that in my experience, the crucial shift of awareness is "not for profit;" the desire to "get somewhere"-to stop being angry, say, or to feel "connected," etc.-may interfere with the process. Perhaps such a desire serves to objectivate my need and thus separates "my" feeling from my fellows' as special and distinctive. But internal sensation is always there and it will enter awareness if given an opportunity. And when I shift from projection ("me" in the world) to the inner constellation, I find that precisely the sensations associated with wanting to "get somewhere," can provide a take-off point for inner observations. This internal realization of the trend to projection and its somatic underpinnings can also help to "ground"verbal communication so that it is less concerned than usual with the speaker's self-image and can issue out of his/her immediate situation.

Nevertheless, the field of social self-inquiry may seem to fly in the face of some accustomed ways of thinking: Many people have found it difficult to understand, and those who have written about this research, including Burrow and myself, have inadvertently presented it at times in a dense and cerebral manner. We have, of course, been writing against the inertia of the generalized social neurosis as it occurs within ourselves, and this is a constant impediment to communication. Nevertheless, I will ask my readers to open their ears if the message seems new and anti-intuitive. It isn't the words that are difficult, I believe, or even the ideas but the generic/somatic orientation, the view of humankind as a physiologically intra-active unit (ref). And I should add that this perspective does not imply a lessening of individual uniqueness but

rather the opposite-we are at present subject to numerous self-defensive, "I"enhancing rigidities that inhibit our free and spontaneous interaction.

Burrow found few words ready-made for articulating these novel insightsspecies itself may carry the implication of a biological whole but, as he points out (ref.), it has no adjective form. So with the help of his associates, he developed his own vocabulary: He coined the term phylobiology for the field of study he introduced. The prefix, phylo- is from the Greek word meaning race or tribe, and he used it in various combinations phyloanalysis, phyloorganism, even the phylosoma.

However, times have changed greatly since Burrow began writing—partly because Burrow began writing—and I believe today's readers may be far more receptive to his message than those of two generations ago. Certainly in my view the timeliness of his observations has increased in the decades since he first presented them. I see human beings as desperately in need of the kind of research he and his associates engaged in and which, as I have indicated, a small group at The Lifwynn Foundation is experimenting with at present. The need for social reinvigoration is widely recognized, not just among specialists but by ordinary men and women trying to cope with the difficulties and imbalance so common today in home and workplace.

In a later chapter we will consider some of the trends that signal a worldwide movement toward transformation. Burrow's was one of the first scientific endeavors in this direction, even though in the course of its development he tended to redefine the word science. His early formulation of the solidarity of the species (date) helped set the stage for the many who have written since then about our connectedness as a phylum. He believed that organic continuity of feeling—though side-tracked in the course of evolution—is still capable of mature expression as a motivating force in human affairs-not in the form of a "higher" state of consciousness to be striven for, but as inherently accessible to every human.

The tensions to which we are subject at present are social as well as somatic; they have to do with our view of ourselves in a world of viewers. Social self-inquiry is of necessity a group study. But this does not imply that we must always be with other people to carry it out. We are social animals and even in solitary confinement, our groupness remains. Neither Burrow nor I could have pursued the proprioceptive observations described had we not been functioning as a member of a group that is actively involved in this process. In my case, my co-workers are regularly monitoring the evidences of the social neurosis within themselves as it can be experienced against the background of the organism as a whole. In addition, I will have the support and assistance of a number of them in preparing this book-not that we attempt to speak with one voice, but that from practice in recognizing their own biases, my associates can help me sense when private assumptions begin to influence my writing unduly.

This false sense of identity which Burrow called the 'I'-persona is not native to us as human beings. Through a process to be described in this book, it comes to feel real, but it is socially induced and socially projected on every hand. Its persistence, even among those who have attempted to study itsramifications, is not surprising-for centuries, it has dominated human affairs. Indeed, the task of challenging the "I"-persona is colossal, and will remain so unless or until many more people become involved. It is a task that has been symbolized in art, myth, and religion for thousands of years, but now the time has come to develop a concrete, practical, and concerted approach to our own self-destructive trends. It has become a matter of life and death. Unless it is seriously undertaken soon, the future health, even the survival, of our species may be seriously compromised.

This book tells the story of a group attempt to approach our worldwide dissociation as a problem in public health and to bring to society-at-large some realization of the epidemic proportions of its own disorder. In the coming chapters, I will describe the background of the two men who initiated this study and the steps by which they came gradually to an altered frame of reference.

1998 AG Lab II

Chapter II

Trigant Burrow: Becoming and Being a Psychoanalyst

At this point a change of voice is needed so that I can succinctly convey the facts of Burrow's early life, his studies with Jung, and the trend of his writings during his years as a practicing psychoanalyst. The latter lead rather directly to the development of group analysis or social self-inquiry which is the subject of this book.

Trigant Burrow was born in Norfolk, Virginia, in 1875. That same year, William James taught the first psychology course in an American university (Harvard); and Wilhelm Wundt at the University of Leipzig established the first laboratory of psychology on the continent. Sigmund Freud was still a student of medicine at the University of Vienna, while Burrow's future teacher, Carl Jung, was two months old when his pupil came into the world. In St. Petersburg Ivan Pavlov graduated from the University and took the first steps toward his studies of conditioned reflexes which in turn set the stage for the behaviorist approach of the American, John B. Watson, born in 1878. Thus the players were assembling for the great thrusts, including behaviorism andpsychoanalysis, that were to establish psychology as a central social force of the twentieth century.

Trigant was the fourth child of John W. and Anastasia Devereux Burrow. On the evening of his birth, his mother scribbled a letter to a girlhood friend asking her and her husband to stand God-parents to the baby and to "select a pretty and uncommon name." Thus it was that he was christened Trigant, a name consistently mangled throughout his life: it is French; and since the surname is accented on the second syllable, his name when pronounced correctly, is often unrecognized. Trigant's older brothers were Devereux and Alan Giles. He was especially devoted to his only sister, Inez, and her death from tuberculosis when Trigant was a boy of twelve was the first great sorrow of his life.

Burrow's mother was a cultured woman of keen intelligence and indomitable will. Subject to moods of silent withdrawal, her devotion to the Catholic faith was a guiding force in her life. She seems to have taken a more active part in rearing the children than her husband. Certainly she occupied a central role in the upbringing of her youngest son.

In marked contrast were the interests of her husband, John W. Burrow, a wholesale druggist widely read in scientific fields. He was said to be the first Anastasia's relationship with her husband was quite different, however. A painful rift developed between them and, as the boy grew into adolescence, the conflict became more pronounced. Although for the sake of appearance the family continued to live under one roof, the breach was never healed.

Following his graduation from Fordham in 1895 at the age of twenty, Trigant spent a year in Norfolk pursuing pre-medical studies. His father's health had begun to fail, and he died in October of the following year. That same fall Trigant entered the Medical School of the University of Virginia, where he remained as a demonstrator in biology for a year following graduation. General medicine did not appeal to him, however, and after a year of postgraduate work abroad, which included courses with Wagner von Jauregg and Krafft-Ebing, he opted for doctoral study in the Psychology Department at Johns Hopkins University where he also served as assistant. There, in a philosophy seminar, Professor James Mark Baldwin remarked that no

one had as yet ignited the spark needed to understand the basic cause of mental disease. Burrow decided at once to devote his life to this effort (1949, 78).

At this time a growing number of laboratories of experimental psychology were being established in the United States by men who had studied with Wundt in Leipzig. "Attention" was a focal point of interest of the new science both because of the emphasis on this topic in Wundt's laboratory and because it was the first of the "higher" mental processes to be subjected to experimental study. Working under Dr. George M. Stratton, Burrow selected a problem in this field, "The Determination of the Position of a Momentary Impression in the Temporal Course of a Moving Visual Impression." By this time he was living outside Baltimore with his wife, the former Emily Bryan, nicknamed Brownie. He had met her at a dance at the Medical School at Johns Hopkins, where she was a student nurse, the daughter of a country parson/doctor of Cambridge, Maryland. She and Trigant were married in 1904 and lived for a while at her mother's home where their son, John Devereux, was born. Their daughter, also Emily, was born in 1909. The following year, Burrow was awarded his Ph.D. and immediately began working under Adolf Meyer at the New York State Psychiatric Institute on Ward's Island, New York City.

The new field of psychoanalysis was commanding more and more attention and Meyer, a Swiss, was impressed by seminars conducted by Carl Jung, a fellow Zuricher. Both Jung and Freud were in New York that fall on their way to deliver the famous Clark lectures in Worcester, Massachusetts, and Burrow was introduced to them by A. A. Brill, oddly enough between the acts at a vaudeville theatre, Hammerstein's Roof Garden. It was immediately arranged that Burrow would study with Jung that fall, in spite of the difficulties involved in transferring the small family to Switzerland. The venture also entailed an expenditure far beyond the Burrows' slender means. But by selling some real estate inherited from his father and borrowing from a generous mother, Burrow was able to take advantage of what seemed to him a golden opportunity. He and his family sailed within a month of the meeting at the theatre.

Max Rosenbaum has speculated about the reason that Jung and not Freud was chosen as Burrow's teacher (Rosenbaum, Max, 1986, p. 168, "A Pioneer Revisited," Group Analysis, Vol. Issue) (ref.). Whatever other reasons were included, Meyer's enthusiasm must have played a prominent part; in a letter to Jung in 1937, Burrow mentions Meyer and says, "It was he, you will recall, who...directed me to you and your very vital seminars at Kusnacht" (Galt, W., 1958, 331). In 1909, Jung was still Freud's "heir apparent," even though the seeds of their coming rift had already been planted. But Rosenbaum sees the decision to work with Jung as a fateful one for Burrow: "I am of the opinion," he writes, "that Freud's resentment toward Jung [later] rubbed off on Burrow" (1986, 169).

Nevertheless, the choice seemed at the time to be felicitous. In a series of letters to his mother, Burrow expresses his pleasure in his teacher and his new field of study:

> And now what is all the time uppermost! I am perfectly delighted with Jung. My journey to Zurich is more than vindicated! Now listen!
>
> You must have felt these many years of your loving hope for me, that there has been a talent, an interest, an aptitude-what you will-a tendency to penetrate into certain types of character ....You must have felt how apart this strange keen interest has been from conventional medical standards. You must have felt my own pain and disappointment and embarrassment when at every turn, no matter what heart and enthusiasm I brought to each new direction or endeavor, I was ever confronted with the same old uninspiring, unimaginative mechanical physical tools and physical problems ....But a new day has dawned and I have found my work. With every word from Jung-I realize the fellow-spirit behind them! At times it is as if it were I and not he who speaks, so identical is the process of reasoning with my own…

Later Burrow learned, from a letter to Brownie written by Meyer's wife that Jung "had taken quite a fancy" to Burrow in their brief meeting and promised Meyer to provide an "interesting course" for him.

In view of the sympathy between them at this time, the strength of Burrow's rejection of Jung's later views may be surprising. Yet many times in the course of his subsequent career, Burrow made it clear that his primary allegiance was to Freud's observations. (In 1914 he arranged to study with Freud as well, a plan blocked by the advent of World War I.) And we do not know how far, at that early season, Jung's broader perspectives were making themselves felt.

The seminars, which involved what Burrow called "a quartet of disciples," including August Hoch (FN), seem to have been not only stimulating, but w conducted with attractive informality, in contrast to what he evidently would have encountered, had he chosen Freud for his teacher (ref). Burrow describes seminar sessions in a cafe, or sailing across the lake of Zurich while Jung "descanted on the psychology of the various psychoses." He and Brownie were invited to call on the Jungs whose young children were about the same age as the Burrows'. There were trips to the opera, visits with new acquaintances introduced by American friends, and excursions with the children.

But in October Burrow writes Anastasia of "our first misfortune" involving a misunderstanding with a landlady which entailed the loss of $10.00 from their meagre resources and meant for him "days of unrelenting depression." Recognizing the inappropriateness of his reaction, Burrow went to Jung who

> said immediately that the trouble lay deeper and agreed with me and recommended treatment. So I am going to his office an hour each day and hope to be greatly benefitted after his analysis and psychotherapy. He said, as Dr. Barker (FN) said, that my own neurosis would be the greatest assistance to me in handling others, and he also said a thing that delighted and encouraged me very much-that he had early recognized in me a readiness to grasp his psychology, that my questions showed my aptitude for this method and teaching. (FN re training analyses) (Galt, W. 1958-SMS)

The letter continues with financial details:

> [Jung] is not charging me a cent for all the months of teaching and training ....He knew I was under much expense in being here and he wanted to be as considerate as possible. His usual charge [for analysis] he said was $4.00 an hour, but that he would gladly charge me but half this amount or if that was too much, even less. But I hastened to tell him that I would gladly pay half and appreciated his kindness in letting me do so. You know he is a terribly busy man, seeing patient after patient in the intervals of his scientific investigations and this is really most kind of him and I feel that if he sets me straight and gets me out of my miserable depressions, feelings of inadequacy and all the rest...that the money is well spent... I think you will feel as I do and will let me have the extra amount. (Date--FN explaining dated letters are in Burrow collection at Yale.)

Jung of course was well acquainted with neurotic trends within his own life. (Stern, pp. and) Like Burrow, he was the product of a troubled home although, in contrast to Jung's lonely and isolated childhood (Ref.Stern), Burrow's seems to have been rather happy, with the companionship of brothers, cousins, and friends. Both men at the time were thirty-four years old. Jung was a large sturdy man, strong enough to lift Freud and carry him across the room when the latter fainted in Bremen the day before they sailed for America earlier that year (Rosenzweig, 1992, 53). Burrow, on the other hand, was five feet seven, of slight build, with small hands and feet, and a trim slenderness that he kept throughout his life. Jung had already had nine years dealing with patients at the Burgholzli Institute and in private practice while Burrow's psychotherapeutic work at Ward's Island had started only months before he left for Switzerland. In fact an American lady in Zurich became his first psychoanalytic patient (2/6/

10). In addition, early in 1910 he began clinical work at the Burgholzli (12 / 28 / 09)-Eugen Bueuler still headed this noted hospital for psychotic, largely schizophrenic [?], patients.

Although both Carl and Emma Jung were conversant with English, the seminars were presumably conducted in German. At one point, Burrow wrote his mother of the "enormous" amount of reading he had to do, "all in German" (FN). On the other hand, the daily seminars were engrossing and the afternoon hour spent in analysis with Jung was "the best possible way of learning his methods" (10/27/09). Besides, it was effective: 'The analysis goes slowly forward and, I feel, surely...," he wrote in December, "Improvement is gradual but sound" (1/20/10).

In a recent conversation, Max Rosenbaum speculated about the effect that Jung's generosity with regard to his fees might have had on his analysis of Burrow. May his kindness have inhibited the expression of the negative feelings toward the analyst which are ordinarily present in the course of analysis, and could this have been related to the vehemence with which Burrow rejected Jung's later views? And what about Jung's counter transference to Burrow-did he see in his gifted pupil, with his solid grounding in psychology and biology and his closeness to Adolf Meyer, a possible ally for the development of Jung's own ideas in America? These are questions which can well be considered with respect to the relationship between the two men.

But in the spring of 1910 as Burrow's work with Jung neared its close, he was beginning to write about his new field of endeavor. He discovered a small library, where he worked daily writing the first of a number of papers on psychoanalysis-he wanted to identify himself early with the field and so bring his name before the profession and the public. ("In frank, but confidenttal terms, I'm advertising," he wrote his mother 2/23/ 10). He looked forward eagerly to starting his work in the fall--"as soon as I have patients it will be such a stimulus to interest. The field is practically empty for psychoanalysis--I am the first man of American birth to take up this work...I don't mention Hoch because he does institutional work." (Ref. SMS)

"Freud's Psychology in Relation to the Neuroses," written in Zurich and published the following year (1911 a) is a straightforward presentation of Freudian psychoanalysis at that time that pays tribute to Jung's work with word association, and his extension (with Honegger) of psychoanalysis to psychotic patients. In this paper, Burrow speaks of the remarkable analogy between "the apparently incoherent fantasies of a catatonic patient and the obsolete, metaphysical constructions of ancient mythology," the first stirrings of Jung's later theory of archetypes. "From the gist of this study," Burrow adds, "we may infer something of the proportions to which psychoanalysis is destined to expand." Before leaving Zurich, Burrow read this paper to his teacher and reported the latter "much pleased with it."

It is difficult to assess how Jung's teaching may have influenced Burrow in this year of 1909-10. Jung's "declaration of independence" from Freud was not written until 1911 and published in 1912. But presumably the ideas expressed in this book, Wandlungen und Symbole der Libido (1912) (later translated as Psychology of the Unconscious, 1916), were already forming in his mind and they may have helped set a direction for Burrow that was significant. At the same time, Burrow had written, as we have seen (p.-), "At times it is as if it were I and not he who speaks, so identical is the process of reasoning with my own." (P.) So perhaps "affinity" is a more appropriate word than "influence" at this point. In his foreword to the revised version of Wandlungen... (Symbols of Transformation, 1956), Jung describes Freud's narrow "personalistic bias," as a product of "nineteenth century individualism," and this was something that both the younger men moved away from in the later development of their own special contributions to psychoanalysis.

Before leaving Zurich Burrow enlisted his mother's help in tracking down a suitable house for him and his family to occupy on their return:

> You must rid yourself of the idea that you are in quest of a house for that timid, neurotic, doubting youth who left America last September. That poor fellow is no more-"his faults lie lightly on him"-but instead the vigorous, confident self-possessed man who has come into his right and means to make his mark-win at last his deferred laurelsl Watch me! All the neurotically suppressed ambition and aggression clamor for an outlet-they shall have it. (4/24/10)

Later he wrote, "This has been such a beautiful and such a rich experience for [Brownie and me)-I can never have done with my thanksgiving for having spent this year in Europe."

After a brief sojourn in Italy, the Burrows landed in New York on August 22, 1910. [check?]

On his return from abroad, Burrow once more took up work with Adolf Meyer, but this time as a member of the staff that Meyer was assembling as the newly appointed Professor of Psychiatry at the Henry Phipps Psychiatric Clinic of the Johns Hopkins Medical School. Burrow also served as Assistant in Psychiatry at the University School of Medicine and developed his own private practice.

Psychoanalysis was burgeoning in the years from 1910 to 1920 when Burrow was practicing in Baltimore, and he was at the center of its development in this country. In 1911 he joined with eight others to found the American Psychoanalytic Association and served as one of its first councilors.(Ref) His practice was highly successful-patients followed him even to Lake Chateaugay in the Adirondack Mountains of upper New York State when he and Mrs. Burrow purchased Lifwynn Camp (FN on narre Lifwynn) there. A launch made rounds to pick up patients for their appointments from various lodges around the lake; one patient even built a home nearby.

Between 1911 and 1918, Burrow also published eighteen papers. "Some Psychological Phases of Medicine," (1911 a) followed shortly after "Freud's Psychology..." and was the vehicle for introducing a somewhat distinctive approach to neurosis: "Hysteria" Burrow wrote, "is...more a dilemma than a disease ....It is the protest of nature's inherent truth against the mendacity of convention" (1911b). And, 'The neurosis then is a biologically moral integration for it contains the assertion of the organism's innermost verity ....the very presence of this inherent, moral element bespeaks a characterological trend that may become an economic asset of the utmost importance for the bodysocial" (1914a, P.).

In acknowledging this paper Jung wrote, December 16, 1911:

> The article, you sent me, has met my full approval. You are very cautious in introducing the matter to a layman's mind. I would have wished that our whole movement in America would have been brought forward in this way ....
>
> I must say, that your view of hysteria being rather a dilemma than a disease, perfectly agrees with my own conviction I always maintain...
>
> If you always are simple and straightforward with your patients and-last not least, with yourself-success will come to you! My best compliments to Mrs. Burrow!

In the "Psychoanalyst and the Community" (1914b), Burrow took the next logical step in the development of his views by suggesting that the standards of "normality" are themselves questionable, [the first in his profession to do so?]

> After all we are of one tissue ... Society is hysterical, too. Society, too, has its elaborate system of defense mechanisms ... its infantile makeshifts and illusions. The difference is that society's counterfeits possess the advantage of universal currency, and so the record of its frailties is set down under the name of custom rather than pathology. (FN: Reprints of the full text of the papers I am quoting are available from The Lifwynn Foundation.)

This early emphasis of Burrow's on social elements in neurosis differed distinctly from the social concerns of what Rubinstein calls The Marxist Psychoanalysts (date) (Reich, Ferenczi and Rank.)

Burrow was also developing another, related theme that remained significant throughout his lifetime: the influence persistent influence in adult life of the organism's earliest moments of sentient experience (1913a). Some years later he described his initial recognition of this element:

> In the midst of my psychoanalytic work I suddenly came upon what appeared to me a phase of organic sensation and awareness that antedated the infant's earliest objective appreciation of its surroundings. (I remember so well the moment, and the patient--a teacher, by the way, and a highly subjective woman.) I called it the organism's primary subjective phase and spoke of the infant's primary identification with the other. This was the inception of a direction of thought and investigation with me of which all my work has been the fuller development.
>
> There was no doubt with me that there existed between the infant and maternal organism a tensional rapport (I did not call it that at the time)-a total physiological continuity in sensation and reaction that underlay the entire developmental life of the organism and that was quite different from the tensional modifications brought about with the infant's adaptation to its environment and to its mother through the process of outer objective awareness (Galt, W., 1958, 312).
>
> Footnote: In this description, Burrow uses the word infant to designate both the late prenatal and early postnatal existence. In today's parlance the word fetus would perhaps be used to differentiate between these two phases of development.

Burrow described this preconscious mode (before consciousness) as the "original, simple, unitary, homogeneous matrix of organic consciousness ... Here is presented a phase of development in which the psychic organism is at one with its surrounding medium. Here consciousness is in a state of perfect poise-of stable equilibrium. Here a t its biological source within the maternal envelope this organic consciousness is so harmoniously adapted to its environment as to constitute a perfect continuum with it" (1913). In this connection he refers to Ferenczi's "brilliant essay concerning the unconscious influence of the prenatal and early infantile experience." (Ferenczi, 1913)

But with birth all this changes, the infant enters a world of stubborn solidarity, and it is only when the baby nourishes at the mother's breast that he or she experiences a semblance of the original organic unity, completion and satisfaction. Burrow postulated that this original precognitive subjective awareness precedes the Oedipal conflict that Freud observed in his patients and remains as a unitary background to all the individual's subsequent experience.

Burrow referred to this factor as the "principle of primary identification" and in later writings broadened his consideration of it as a powerful social force (1937, 1964)--the prototype on the individual level of the solidarity inherent in the human species and capable of maturation if interferences do not occur. But to start with he focused on its relation to psychoanalytic problems. In "The Genesis and Meaning of Homosexuality" (1917a) he rejects then current explanations of homosexuality and instead suggests a heightened persistence of the original subjective mode in which the child's consciousness is an extension of the mother's. Just as the mother sees the child's body as her principal loveobject, the child, seeing as though with the mother's eyes, views his own person and others like it, as his or her own object of love.

In 'The Origin of the Incest Awe" Burrow proposes that as the demands of outer reality advance, the cognitive, objectivating mode of consciousness begins to encroach more and more on the primary, homogeneous subjective mode. And this process becomes traumatic when cognition turns upon and attempts to objectify the basic unity itself. Incest taboo is an

expression of organic protest against this encroachment, symbolized in the story of the Garden of Eden. For in contrast to the primal mode of being, cognitive knowledge implies division, duality, separation, and sex. "Incest is not forbidden," he wrote, "it forbids itself' (1918, 248, 250. See also D.H. Lawrence, 1921, 21-25).

In recent years, following up on the work of Melanie Klein, Winnicott (1992) and others have also written of this original mode of human awareness, but at the time Burrow's formulations evidently had the ring of novelty: They were cited by the historian, Clarence Oberndorf, as a principal contribution by American psychoanalysts before 1920 (1953). And John MacCurdy devoted a chapter to Burrow's preconscious mode in his Problems in Dynamic Psychology in which he writes:

> Freud has said little or nothing about the development of narcissism. This problem has, however, received most enlightening treatment from Burrow, who traces the steps by which selfconsciousness and self-love grow out of the 'primary subjective state' and a primary identification of self with mother. It is peculiarly significant that this, the most original and important contribution to psychoanalysis of recent years, has received no attention from Freud and his immediate followers (John T. MacCurdy, Problems in Dynamic Psychology, P., 1922, 188-205).

As Joseph Wagenseller expressed it (cite personal communication, 7/26/96), "these early years in psychoanalysis marked a period of rich ferment such as occurs at the beginning of a new movement whether in medicine, art, or philosophy." In addition to Freud and Jung-and Burrow-there were Adler, Rank, Ferenzci, Abraham, and others, all producing new and original contributions to psychoanalytic theory.

Jung's seminal work, Wandlungen und Symbole der Libido was of course among the most significant of these. As indicated above, it appeared in 1912 in the Yearbook for Psychoanalytical and Psychopathological Researches which, though under the direction of Freud and Bleuler, was edited by Jung. In developing his theory of archetypes in this work, and in defning "Two Kinds of Thinking" in the opening chapter, Jung undertook to expand Freud's concept of the unconscious in ways that were not acceptable to Freud. For instance, Jung believed that Freud over-emphasized sexual repression, while Freud felt that Jung was thus trivializing his thesis to make it acceptable to a wider audience. In what must have been one of the first responses to "Tuvo Kinds of Thinking," (which later became Jung's theory of psychological types-1920. `Burrow published in April 1912 a resume of this first chapter of Wandlungen und Symbole...under the title of "Conscious and Unconscious Mentation from the Psychoanalytic Viewpoint") (1912). He did not draw attention in this review to Jung's divergences from Freud but by 1917, the break between the two men had become so marked that Burrow evidently felt constrained to write his own comments on the situation. In "Notes with Reference to Freud, Jung and Adler" (1917), he expresses the view that Jung's and Adler's positions are less "disagreements" with Freud than "differences." In fact, he suggests that their innovations actually complement and supplement Freud's observations regarding the assertion of sex as disclosed in the symbolic disguises of the unconscious.

Burrow then goes on to discuss Jung's formulations regarding a presexual mode and to differentiate it from Burrow's own theory of the preconscious.

> In positing a presexual mode of consciousness, I am heartily in accord with Jung. The whole significance of the sexual phase of consciousness and of the unconscious is inconceivable to me in the absence of the conception of this presexual phase ....I call this phase the preconscious, but in this term as I use it there is implied, as the narre indicates, no such distinction as Jung's "vital energy," but a distinction that is based solely on a developmental difference…

> For if the primary, cognitive phase of consciousness (what is known in adult life as the repressed unconscious) is sexual, then the preconscious--the phase which precedes this sexual or desire phase and out of which the sexual evolves with the onset of cognition-is surely also presexual. If I have made my position clear, this conception of a genetic presexual mode to which the trend of my investigations leads me, entails no dissent whatsoever from Freud and the unconcious envisaged by him ....In my view it is only after clearing away the interpolations of sex as represented in the antisocial demands belonging to the furtive unconscious mode, that the native presexual mode becomes assimiliable with adult social aims. But when Jung advances the hypothesis of unconscious trends aiming directly toward constructive social goals, it seems to me we are carried along by an over-hasty optimism that leaves us quite breathless and dismayed. Here, too, Jung's assumptions are made at the cost of Freud's objective observations. Again it is Jung's manner of approach that seems to me mistaken.
>
> My position is that it is sheer blindness not to recognize that Freud has held faithfully to deliberate observation in reporting the exclusive assertion of sex as disclosed in the symbolic disguises of the unconscious ....But it is unfortunate that...the temperamental quality in Jung, coupled with his natural impatience of dogmatic prescription, should have driven him to exceed the bounds of moderation and have led him to challenge the actuality of Freud's untempered observations. I shall not believe that the breach is an irreparable one. It would indeed be a calamity if Jung's genial perspectives have mislead his splendid genius into an irrevocable disagreement with the clear, steadfast, disinterested observations of Freud.

Now I would like to interrupt the "story" that I have been telling in order to put the reader in touch with some of the considerations that have guided me in wrtitng it. The customary role of biographer is to do what I have done here: to pbjectify the "characters," in this case Burrow, Jung, and others, to set them at a distance separated in some way from the common tissue of reader, writer, and subject. I do not know how to correct fot that tendency to objectify, to fragment, except by alerting the reader to the concerns and biases that prompted the writer. Although these are usually taken for granted, it seems to e that in a book devoted to social self-inquiry, it is only fair to mention them. When I began writing this chapter I found myself subject to anxiety dreams and defensive concerns. A friend who read the article on which this book is based (FN) challenged my assertion that Burrow had been trained in Freudian analysis during his 1909-10 studies with Jung. "Surely some of Jung's viewponts must have rubbed off on Burrow," he wrote. I was not well aquainted with Jung's theories and did not know how far his formulations had advanced at the early dates when Burrow was working with him. But I clearly wanted Burrow to have arrived at his insights independently. In addition I was concerned about opening Burrow to criticism by revealin information that had not been published before, for instance regarding the depressions that he mentions in his letters to his mother. These anxieties have gradually faded as I proceeded with the chapter and checked it with scholars well versed in Jung's writings and the history of psychoanalysis. Still my conclusion that there was more of an affinity between Jung and Burrow than an influence may be the result of prior bias.

Why does it seem worth reporting these consideration? As I say, they are taken for granted in most writings and ordinarily pass unnoticed. Certainly they should not be declared for confessional reasons -in my experience mea culpa inevitably issues from the defensive, self-aggradizing `I'-persona. This tendency to hold a private or secretly biased position has significance only as general or societal trend. If it marks our customary mode of communication then perhaps it is worthwhile to bring it to light and question its validity, And this I shall attempt to do throughout this book.

I notice that the editors of A Search For Man's Sanity ...(1959) who drafted the biographical notes before my connection with the volume protected Burow from certain criticism. For

instance, they did not reveal that he had accepted money from his mother for his studies with Jung. And there is no reference in the book to hls depressions.

But to return to the question of being open and inclusive with the readers I want to raise with all of you the question about whether such disclosures of "personal biases" and dependencies is social self-inquiry. Shields speaks of having "no secrets" from one another, but what does that mean? Does it m ean? Does it mean disclosing every oppositional thought and feeling? I am beginning to sense that this research is not concerned with what you or I as individuals are feeling at a given moment, but with group trends that we embody. There is certainly a group (societal) trend to keep secrets. I look at you and see your face distorted with forced smiling and I smile back--it is our secret. And if I do point point out that you are grimacing, rather than smiling to make contact with the grimace on my own face and the internal tensions that accompany it. When I get in touch with the latter, then I can share with you the results of my observations, presuming that I can trust you not to feel that I am ppointing out an inadequacy in you rather than an inadequacy in social interaction. I wonder if this is what Mr. Shields meant by having no secrets.

FN positioned on P. 18

Most of the letters from Burrow to his mother, Anastasia, that are quoted in this chapter can be found in A Search for Man's Sanity--The Selected Letters of Trigant Burrow with Biographical Notes, William E. Galt, et al, Ed. Where unpublished letters are quoted I have given the date only-they are included in the Trigant Burrow Papers, Group 1370, Department of Manuscripts and (Archives, Yale University Library.

Chapter III

Clarence Shields and The Beginning of Group Analysis

In the preface to his first book, *The Social Basis of Consciousness*, (1927, xv-xviii), Burrow describes the event that changed the course of his life and work. "Having years ago been 'analyzed' in preparation for my work in psychopathology, I had been for years duly 'analyzing' others. It unexpectedly happened, one day, however, that while I was interpreting a dream of a student-assistant, he made bold to challenge the honesty of my analytic position." (footnote regarding paraphrasing of Burrow material.) This young man suggested that Burrow's sincerity could only be proved if the two changed places. Burrow, his pride piqued by the challenge, decided to humor for a time the "waywardness of inexperience." However:

> Not many weeks after I had taken the patient's chair and yielded him mine I realized that a situation to which I had agreed with more or less levity had assumed an aspect of profoundest seriousness. My "resistances" to my self-appointed analyst, far from being negligible, were plainly insuperable but there was now no turning back. The analysis proceeded on its course from day to day and with it my resistances took tighter hold upon me...Whatever empirical interest the situation may have held for me at the outset was now wholly subordinated to the indignation and pain of the position to which I had been brought.
>
> It is possible to indicate only in the broadest lines the progressive events of these trying months...[t]he growing sense of self-limitation and defeat that went hand in hand with this daily advancing personal challenge, nor the corresponding efforts of concealment in unconscious

> symbolizations and distortions on my part. What calls for more vital emphasis, however, is the fact that along with the deepening, if reluctant, realization of my intolerance of self-defeat, there came gradually to me the realization that my analyst, in changing places with me, had merely shifted to the authoritarian vantage-ground I had myself relinquished and that the situation had remained essentially unaltered still.
>
> This was significant. It marked at once the opening of wholly new vistas of experience...I began to sense for the first time what had all along underlain my own analysis and what, as I now see it, really underlies every analysis. I began to see that the student before me, notwithstanding his undoubted sincerity of purpose, presented a no less personal and proprietary attitude toward me than I had held toward him and that all that had been needed was the authoritarian background to bring this attitude to expression. With the consciousness of this condition I saw what has been for me the crucial revelation of the many years of my analytic work—that, in its individualistic application, the attitude of the psychoanalyst and the attitude of the authoritarian are inseparable.
>
> As from day to day this realization came more closely home to me, and with it the growing acceptance of the limitation and one-sidedness of the personalistic critique in psychoanalysis, my personal self-vindication and resistances began in the same measure to abate. At the same time the analyst too, Mr. Clarence Shields, came at last into a position to sense the personalism and resistance that had unconsciously all along actuated his own reaction. From now forward the direction of the inquiry was completely altered.

The analysis henceforth consisted in the reciprocal effort of each of us to recognize within himself his attitude of authoritarianism and autocracy toward the other. With this automatic relinquishment of the personalistic or private basis and its replacement by a more inclusive attitude toward the problems of human consciousness, there has been not alone for myself but also for students and patients, a gradual clearing of our entire analytic horizon.

Other early psychoanalysts, notably Ferenczi, engaged in mutual analysis, but I believe that the specific focus brought by Shields and Burrow to the question of their own "authoritarianism and autocracy" is unique in the study of human behavior. For the individualistic critique had now become the material for analysis. And the two men approached this task from an inclusive, egalitarian position; they were in impasse, yet somehow sensed the common factors in their opposed positions. This is the altered frame of reference that characterized all their subsequent studies and that we have tried to maintain at The Lifwynn Foundation, a frame of reference which says that regardless of the content of opposing positions, the emotional posture of each "side" is identical.(ref) In other words, the study became a social study, perhaps even an anthropological one, involving not two individuals but one common attitude. It is this unique research position that has been so difficult for the psychiatric community to understand and accept. And, as Burrow writes, it was not arrived at through processes of logic, but was the "outgrowth of events that were prior to and independent of any conceptual formulation of them." (1927, xviii).

Clarence Shields' background was in marked contrast to that of Burrow. He was born Clarence Desh Scheetz in Doylestown, Pennsylvania, in 1885 and changed his name by court order in 1918 (footnote of explanation). He was the

third of four sons whose mother died while he was still a boy and he grew up in what was then a Pennsylvania farming community. When he was twelve his father remarried and brought into their home a woman who recognized Clarence's unusual capacities and with whom he enjoyed a relationship of mutual love and respect. In 1908 he graduated from Franklin and Marshall College in Lancaster where he was a member of the Goethean Literary Society, and because of his love of the outdoors he became a surveyor. He might have spent his life in this field and married the young woman to whom he was engaged at the time but her death from influenza brought home to Clarence a profound emotional insecurity. He gave up his work and after a period of drifting became a companion to a psychiatric patient whose family happened to be intimate friends of the Burrow's. They were impressed by Shields' innate authority and intuitive wisdom and passed on to him Burrow's writings about the "principle of primary identification." These papers appealed greatly to Shields and eventually their mutual friends arranged for the two men to meet.

In describing his own impression on their first meeting, Burrow later wrote:

> I had not before met anyone with whom I could not enter readily into the customary social give-and-take exchange. I had not before known a man or woman who was not socially accessible in the ordinary sense and yet who was sane....Here was a man whom I could not bring to think either with me or in opposition to me on the accustomed basis of interchange....I wanted to understand an expression of behavior that defied the behavioral categories. (Galt, W., 1958, 43)

Clarence Shields was indeed an unusual human being. Six feet tall with hazel (?) eyes rimmed by thick black lashes, he was a handsome man whose good looks were less important than the dignity and poise of his bearing. There was a feeling of his being at one, integrated in his movements and posture, in touch with his surroundings, yet, as Burrow says, uninvolved in customary, social give-and-take. Burrow's innovative formulations with their implications for a unitary background of feeling in human relations attracted him greatly. In the fall of 1918, a couple of years after first meeting Burrow [Check], Shields left New York where he had been living, and moved to Baltimore to accept a position as Burrow's secretary and assistant.

In 1947 Shields described his early work with Burrow—this is a condensation of his report as president for the twentieth year of The Lifwynn Foundation:

> The present research began when Dr. Burrow and I first met and shortly thereafter realized our common behavioral interests. This interest in human motivation had been outstanding for both us. With me it took the form of persistent search without knowing what I was searching for; with Dr. Burrow, such orderly form as culminated in his early brilliant papers that were based upon his "principle of primary identification" thesis.
>
> If, then, in meeting Dr. Burrow, I considered myself most fortunate, it is hardly likely that anyone else would have had a less grateful reaction in the same situation. In view of the persistent drive within me to understand human motivation, this opportunity to work with and be associated with anyone of Dr. Burrow's background, experience and consistent scientific interests was manifestly nothing less than an idyllic opportunity for me.

It was also during this very early period that Miss Holljes and I met--an association that continued through the years. No doubt, a literary artist, confronted with such a picture, could hardly resist the temptation to build up a romantic tale. Romantic? Well, yes. But not in a sense that permitted the romantic element to overshadow and dominate even the very early undefined search and much less the later, clearly defined primary objective of the mutual research in human behavior that arose out of my association with Dr. Burrow. Whatever may be said of my relationship with Miss Holljes and its inadequacies, the major concern for us both lay at all times in the progress of this study of our mutual behavior as part of the research setting.

...[I]n the association of Dr. Burrow and myself, the common behavioral interest, and the study it provoked, consistently topped every other interest. From the very beginning we were committed to a program of mutual analysis. And this study did not at any time present easy going. But, when we came actually to work together in the same office, then little by little, the unexpected began to happen. Neither could brook the observations of the other. Our relation became strained. The tempo of the strain increased and turned to mutual pain. There was now rudely thrust upon us a hitherto unsuspected behavioral element. The indomitable "rightness" of each had intruded itself and we were wholly unprepared to meet it.

There was, too, the increasing, the impelling desire to withdraw, to flee. And yet, through it all we managed somehow to stand by. It was this standing by in face of behavioral disaster that constituted the core of our early association. It was this very early relationship—a relationship that should have cracked up but did not—that embodied the core of both the insurmountable problem and the consistent achievement.

It was not Dr. Burrow's study of me or my study of Dr. Burrow. It was not a study of the behavior of two individuals by two individuals. It was a circumstance--a nuclear, social behavioral circumstance. And this nuclear circumstance was characterized by the interest of not one but of two organisms. It could have been any two organisms. There was, for instance, the study undertaken by Miss Holljes and myself. But the number was immaterial. The sole innovation, the sole requirement was that the two, the three or the thirty-three stand by, when the hell of their own—of man's—affect-behavior was laid bare and each was overpoweringly impelled to withdraw.

> In this nuclear event, the behavior of each was equal and common. The opposing rightness of each, the opposing wrongness of each was equal and common. In this equality and commonness lay the essence of wholeness and health, the foundation of growth, the reassertion of man as a living organism. But it was only a beginning (Galt, W., 1958, 349-52).

The development of this new research position, entailed profound effects, particularly for Burrow. The realization that "in its individualistic application, the attitude of the psychoanalyst and the attitude of the authoritarian are inseparable," (p. _) had vast implications for his work. This was the field to which he had devoted his life for ten years, which supported his family, and provided him with an enviable position in the community. Yet it appeared to him now to be based on false premises. In a 1921 letter to Adolf Meyer, he described the "basic occasion of the failure of analysis--the emphasis of the personal to the utter neglect of inherent social factors." (Galt, W., 1958, 51-52). The strength of this conviction is evidenced by the sacrifices he felt were demanded of him if he were to honor the insights that emerged from his study with Shields.

In December 1920, Burrow made a decision which, as he wrote Meyer a month later, seemed to him at first "quite desperate, if inevitable": he closed his office and gave up his psychoanalytic practice.

The turmoil of this period is hard to imagine. There was the shock and concern of Burrow's family, the dismay of colleagues and the consternation of

patients. Some of the more experienced patients already had some warning (FN), however, for during their mutual analysis, Shields and Burrow tried to keep them in touch with the insights that were developing; they encouraged these patients to write down their thoughts, dreams, and fantasies and share them with the two men. This collection of revelations remains in Burrow's papers as "The Student File" (Ref. to Yale Collection)—gradually their status was changing from that of patient and, together with members of Burrow's family and a few colleagues, they were beginning to form into the analytic group that provided such staunch support for Burrow's studies throughout the years.

(FN above) [When Shields and Burrow first encountered the impasse between them, they turned to an elderly patient, Mrs. Miriam Murray, a woman of rare sensitivity and insight. The two men asked her for help but she replied that she could not give it: "I have just come from a bitter quarrel with my own family!" she explained.]

In a letter to James Harvey Robinson in 1923 Burrow speaks of the "uncertainty and trepidation" of this transition period. And adds, "After somewhat more than a year I went back again to my work—in the same place, amid the same conditions, with much the same people. The externals were unchanged and yet something had been definitely altered" (Galt, W. 1958, 73-74). And in explaining his return to work to Adolf Meyer, Burrow says, "I find

that what I have aimed at I can after all only work towards and that whatever the limitations it is time now to return to my place and offer what I can." (Galt, W. 1958). What he was working towards was the extension of Freudian principles to the sociological scene.

The year 1922 brought contact for Burrow with two young men who, though seeking treatment at the time, were destined to become close co-workers and associates: Hans Syz, M.D., and William E. Galt. Syz was a Swiss psychiatrist who had trained with Bleuler at the Burgholzli in Zurich. He came to the United States in 1921 and joined Adolf Meyer's staff at the Phipps Clinic. Five years earlier at the age of twenty-one, he had experienced "a sudden insight into the total relativity of all existence, especially of all forms emanating from man...While before I had seen a substance in man—an 'I' which I had tried to bring into ever greater awareness within myself...—I now suddenly realized that there is no such 'I' at all; this too is only a concept, a form, which comes to be taken for granted by us through habituation" (Ref. 1972, 1981). But in spite of the similarities to some of Burrow's conclusions, the notes in which Syz recorded this profound existential shift of consciousness were put aside by him and never shared with anyone until some twenty years after Burrow's death.

Syz did not meet Burrow through their association with the Phipps Clinic—rather Syz was recommended to seek Burrow's assistance for depression. He had consulted Smith Ely Jelliffe, a prominent psychoanalyst in New York City,

and it was Jelliffe who suggested that he look up Burrow and put himself under his care. This he did by entering into analysis with Burrow with weekly sessions beginning in the fall of 1922, in the course of which he kept a journal. A few excerpts from this diary will indicate some of the special emphases that Burrow was introducing at that time, even in his individual analyses.

Trigant Burrow (excerpted from Hans Syz' journal entries, 12/16/22 to 5/28/23):

> Neurosis wants separation, that is its meaning. The cure is: Realizing that there is everywhere the same, in all the people the same insanity...Of course there are different characters, each reacts in a different way. But the insane principle is in everybody, self-admiration, self- importance...We are only looking for self corroboration.
>
> This fact is universal...
>
> One has to analyze the self-projection, this tendency to see oneself in the other's opinion, or in his own writings, or in phantasies [of] what one could be. One has to look so long at those delusional pictures until they begin to fade. It is already one step if one knows that one always sees these projections. One has to live that out...
>
> You do what everybody else does. But you cannot help, [it] you have to be sincere. You just cannot lie. And other sincere people need you, they want to be corroborated in their sincerity. You can only reach sincerity in cooperation with other people of the same tendency. Alone you cannot overcome the social suggestions. You do not have to be on good terms with insincere people. Do not go into a situation where you have to lie. You have an absolute desire to be sincere, you have to go this way. (*Lifwynn Correspondence*, Vol. 4, No. 1, 1995)

Syz later became one of Burrow's most trusted and supportive associates.

This was true also of William E. Galt, who in 1922 was an eighteen-year old student in Selma, Alabama. William came to Baltimore suffering from a breakdown which was baffling to both him and his family. The nature of Burrow's approach to such problems is indicated by his first letter to the young man's mother written January 24, 1922:

> ...
>
> The situation with your son appeals to me so much more as a result of faulty education than as a condition of disease that it is not possible for me to indicate his mental attitude from a conventional medical viewpoint.
>
> I do not mean that his education has been inadequate in any scholastic sense but with regard to the constructive needs of the growing organism generally, William has had views thrust upon him that are not his views nor, I think, the views of any wholesome boy. I mean by this views that are a response to emotional bias and that are without warrant in fact, such as a morbid conviction of sin with its accompanying oppression of spontaneous impulse in creative activities.
>
> William has in general done well so far. I do not like the condition of his environment. He should have some pursuit, schooling or occupational interest of some kind. If he should come to accept with me the mistakenness of his outlook and so should be enabled to resume the normal course of his life, it is urgent that he take up his activities away from home with its associations of unconscious dependencies and regressive moods.
>
> ...
>
> Your son is an earnest, intelligent boy and it has been a pleasure to know him. (ref.)

In March, Burrow wrote William himself after the latter interrupted his therapy in order to return to Selma to graduate with his class.

> You are doubtless hard at work again at your studies by this time and are looking forward to your graduation in June.

> I have thought of your comment at our last talk—that it did not seem to you possible that there should exist so complete a unity between any two people as the unity that exists in the common function of one's two hands. Your skepticism is most natural under the circumstances but I think you and I have pretty definitely agreed that the "circumstances" are very far from natural, owing to the habituations that have come to play so significant a part in human life as it is now understood. It is, I think, to these circumstances which are now a part of the system about and within us that is due our skepticism.
>
> As a part of the system we favor the system. We doubt the simplicity that underlies life because we are already caught up in its complexity. Because of the system of competitiveness about us our doubt is really prompted by our prior self-interest. But you have probably thought it out for yourself before now.
>
> I know you were glad to get back to your school athletics again. (Galt, W. 1958, P. 66)

Syz and Galt, however, were not yet active in group analysis, nor were they among the fourteen or so patients and students whom Burrow called together in late spring 1923 at his family home in Ruxton, Maryland. There he suggested that they spend the summer at the Burrows' summer place, Lifwynn Camp in the Adirondacks, for concentrated study of the problems they were trying to address.

Charles B. Thompson, M.D., who had worked with Burrow at the Phipps Clinic and who was now Medical Director of the Mental Hygiene Society of Maryland was among those present and he left informal notes about that meeting and the first of many summer sessions at Lifwynn Camp. The following report is based on his notes:

In their mutual analysis, Shields and Burrow had experienced both aspects of the analytic relation; they wanted the students at Lifwynn Camp to have the same experience. So they divided the group into rotating sub-units in which each member eventually served as both analyst and analysand to every other student in camp.

At the end of the day the group met together, analysts and analysands, in Dr. Burrow's cabin overlooking the lake, when all the experiences of the day's sessions were critically reviewed with Burrow and Shields. (One such discussion was prompted by Mrs. Murray, mentioned earlier, who was staying across the lake and who arrived one morning to find that her analyst was Louis LaGarde, aged fifteen!) In this program the "analytic relation" was studied and restudied and all the shortcomings to which an analyst may be liable were made material for public thought. The resistance, the concerns of analysand to analyst, and vice versa, came in for observation. In the evening there was a session in which anything was material for study and everyone participated.

It was a diverse group. Louis' father, who also attended, was an Army officer. Another participant was a motorman on the Baltimore trolley system. There were physicians, teachers, social workers, students. And Lifwynn Camp was an ideal spot for this innovative investigation. Isolated and accessible only by boat, it is set on the shore of Lake Chateaugay. It is lushly beautiful and primitive with running water only in the kitchen and a bubbling spring for drinking water. In 1923 many of the campers lived in tents and tent houses.

There were projects of a practical nature concerned with the running of the camp as well as recreational activities. But a halt could be called by any student at any time for a challenge of latent motives and emotions. These periods were always given precedence over the practical and recreational work and were adhered to rigidly.

Early it appeared that the moral viewpoint was quite general—the position that "I who criticize am better than he or she who is criticized." And the dependence of the group on Burrow and Shields was apparent not only in lack of initiative for investigation, but in all other matters. Thus, the child-father reaction, the patient-analyst reaction, the unwillingness to think that is taught with obedience, was clearly seen in the endeavors of the group.

In the course of the summer, Burrow invited as many as were interested to assist him on the manuscript of *The Social Basis of Consciousness* which he had recently completed. (FN, p.59) The whole manuscript was read and discussed in detail. "It was a tremendous opportunity," Thompson adds in concluding his notes about the summer, "and of a piece with the incalculable opportunity of the whole revolutionary group investigation."

Mrs. Burrow, Jack, then eighteen, and Emily, fourteen, participated in the activities of the camp throughout the summer. We can only speculate about the

ambivalence that they may have felt at this "invasion" of their beloved summer playground. Burrow's new field of endeavor presented Mrs. Burrow with what was from many viewpoints an intensely trying situation. For it involved not only the change of status from the wife of a highly successful analyst to the spouse of a person whose viewpoints were questioned by many of his colleagues, but it also required her to stand half-way between her husband's new field of inquiry and the "normal" community of which they were inevitably a part. In his introduction to *The Neurosis of Man* Burrow speaks of her "gallantry" and I think this is a suitable word to describe the way she carried off for many years the difficulties she faced and at the same time helped her children to follow up their own programs and desires. Emily, I believe, always reflected her mother's ambivalence; she was deeply touched by her father's earnest work and at the same time she recognized the sadness that it often caused her mother. Jack on the other hand seems always to have understood and valued his father's efforts—indeed he took pride in them. From early childhood Jack displayed a special kind of thoughtfulness combined with a sunny, outgoing charm that was without guile or affectation.

On their return in September from the three-month camp experience, the group was even more committed to the analysis of normal behavior as exemplified in their own interaction. They took on a literary project—it was to be both an extension of their sociological experimentation and a means to acquaint a wider public with the viewpoints of group analysis.

As Medical Director of the Mental Hygiene Society of Maryland, Charles Thompson conceived the idea of a small monthly journal devoted to the perspectives of the social analysis. Burrow was intrigued by the idea. But he felt the material would be of most interest if it were produced by people who had actually confronted the social neurosis within themselves and were coming to grips with its implications. He suggested that the editorial board be composed of the patients and students (including himself and Clarence Shields) who were taking part in group analysis and that all the writings be anonymous.

With strong support from Dr. Edward N. Brush, president of the Society, the project was well received by its members. The publication did not have literary pretensions—the essays, stories and vignettes were clearly those of amateurs engaged in reevaluating themselves and their society—it was the perspective on social mores that was original. The publication, which was called *Mental Health*, continued for three years and the writing and group editing provided many opportunities for behavioral observation. (FN, *Our Common Neurosis*, p. 59)

The first scientific report emanating from the new experimentation was published in 1924: "Social Images versus Reality," followed shortly *by "A Relative Concept of Consciousness."* From today's perspectives *"A Relative Concept..."* (ref) is perhaps the more relevant for in it Burrow emphasizes the need to include the subjective processes of the observer in any observations that are made. Citing the relativists in physics, he points out the fallacy of the position in which the viewpoint of the observer is a privileged one—in which it is assumed that he/she occupies a position outside of the material being observed. On the contrary, there is need to include what Burrow called "the consciousness of our own kinetic function" (our organic somatic function) for without this element, bias inevitably creeps in (10).

This same failure to take into account the organic dimension of life is the theme of "*Social Images...*"; In this difficult paper we can see Burrow struggling with the changing concepts being forced upon him by the rigors of group analysis. "To the serious exclusion of the actuality of the world around him, [man] is now unconsciously occupied almost entirely with his own image and its reflections." (FN on "sexist" language) This preoccupation seems to entail a mechanism whereby we unconsciously substitute the private satisfaction of arbitrary social images for the larger interests of the race as a concerted functional unit.

> For some time I have been deeply interested in this form of unconsciousness which we may see in the tendency among us to substitute social pictures in our quest for personal satisfaction. I have been the more interested in this social recourse of the unconscious because of the vital circumstance that these mental pictures within the social mind appear to present the same mechanism that actuates the dream images within the individual mind. Upon analysis it may be shown that the social image is prompted in every instance by the same tendency to substitution, symbolism and indirection which through Freud we have found to underlie the dream. Indeed a relative or inclusive analysis of our mental life reveals a parallelism that shows step by step an unbroken correspondence between the psychic manifestations characterizing the individual's unconscious and the psychic manifestations that comprise the unconscious of the race.

This is a very different concept of the collective unconscious from that put forth by Jung. Burrow suggests that the processes of the social unconscious are, like those of the individual unconscious, "cunning, self-protective, and secretly suspicious of every approach to self-discovery. In all their relationships, individuals are constantly measuring their behavior according to the estimate of those in front of them, unconsciously taking stock at every moment of how they appear in the eyes of others. We see ourselves in the light in which these relationships reflect us" (232).

Burrow proposes that the mother image, so important in psychoanalysis, is actually the sum of the reflections of the social community transmitted from mother to child. "What we call `love for the mother' is upon analysis but love for ourselves as reflected to us in the image of the mother, as this same self-love was reflected by her in turn from the social environment about her..."

(233). But what is the nature of this mother-image? What relation has the mother-image as existing within the mind of each of us, to the personality of the mother as actually existing in the world of objective experience?" (page 233) ...[W]ith the social mind, the important image is the immediate community about it...the absorbing desire to which the social image prompts us is the approbation of the community. Our every effort is bent toward winning its favors. Thus it would seem that the community is both the projection or extension within the social unconscious of the mother-image within the individual unconscious...but if the social-image represented by the community possesses the same underlying psychology as the mother-image, then the social image could have no more relation to the reality of the social organism than the image that the mother has to the reality of the mother-organism. If true, such a conclusion deals a stunning blow to our social as well as our personal prepossessions...we shall have to reckon altogether anew with the unconscious factor that is of central importance in psychoanalysis."

Burrow sent reprints of these papers to a number of people in the psychoanalytic field including Freud and Jung. Jung responded with his customary forthrightness:

> Thank you for the interesting articles you sent me. I was astonished that you did not care to mention the fact that "Social Images" are known in scientific literature since considerable time under the name of Archetypes. It is now thirteen years ago that I first spoke of them. Perhaps you did not notice that I have emphasized the "collective

unconscious" as a most important fact in psychology. (ref. At Yale - unpublished letter 5/2/1925) (FN)

In spite of his assertion, however, I believe that Jung had not read Burrow's paper carefully for it makes clear that the social images Burrow is discussing are invalid, organically "false." "We have been diverted from the organic reality of our relationships and have substituted for them the mental pictures formed by our own artificial projections." In my acquaintance with the concept of archetypes, there is not this questioning of their reality. In his book on the subject, Anthony Stevens, for instance, refers to archetypes as "biological entities...evolved through natural selection." (1983) [Anthony Stevens, *Archetypes: A Natural History of the Self*, New York, Quill, 1983]

Freud on the other hand actually misread the same paper and took Burrow to task for a statement that he had not made:

> I have received both your articles. Unfortunately, I am not very much pleased with them. The first, "*A Relative Concept of Consciousness*," has given me no clear insight into the world of your thoughts. I can see that the theory of relativity has gripped you and that you are making an effort to find its analogy in the psychic realm. But I do not see that you are successful. I can judge more easily regarding the second article, "Social Images versus Reality." I find in it the effort already familiar to me through Jung to make the parental images (imagines) impersonal and unhistoric, but I consider that to be a mistake and when I read in your paper that the mother image "bears no relation whatever to the early associations of our childhood," I must say to myself that the daily experience of our analyses contradicts this vigorously. (unpublished letter February 22, 1925 and Burrow's Papers Yale). **(?FN format)**

Burrow wrote a lengthy reply to this letter of Freud's challenging his assessment:

> Your letter...has left me not a little puzzled and I can not but feel that you will welcome my wish to speak to you quite frankly of it...
>
> With regard to..."Social Images versus Reality," I feel that I have been placed at a distinct disadvantage...You quote me as having said that the mother-image "bears no relation whatever to the early associations of our childhood."...I do want to state most emphatically that my article contains no such statement as this...
>
> I not only did not make this statement but I made the directly contrary statement...over and over again throughout the paper. For example: "The image, in short, which every individual carries in the locket of his unconscious is the image of his mother...From Freud we have learned the far-reaching influence of the mother-image upon the affective life. But there is the need to recognize that the mother-image becomes the underlying criterion of every judgment that the individual forms. Its impress is the emotional substrate of all the thoughts and activities of his life."
>
> As nearly as I can discover the passage to which you refer, the actual statement, page 233, reads that the "mother-image bears no relation whatever to the mother-organism." My distinction between the mother-organism and the mother-image is clearly explained. If this distinction cited throughout the paper—the distinction between the impression the mother suggests and the reality that the mother is--has been understood, you will realize that I could not have made a statement as utterly unwarranted and as utterly contradictory of the experience of every psychoanalyst, including myself, as this statement you attribute to me...
>
> May I say that in attributing to me a position that is identical with that of Jung you again do me an injustice. My attitude toward the social neurosis is definitely analytic, personal, historical, and has been daily subjected to the scientific discipline of actual experiments in group procedure. Jung's position is theoretical and, as you say, impersonal and unhistorical. Far from being identified with Jung's concept, I have wholly repudiated what seems to me to be Jung's...mystical and unscientific position. The social images to which I refer are nothing other

than the extension socially of the repressed images first described by you in their individual manifestation.

...To be quite as frank with you as I should like to be, I really am not so much interested in the mistaken interpretation you have made of my statements as I am in the motive that has led to your attitude toward them. I should be very interested analytically, as I feel you would be also, if you would discover, in what I feel to be in keeping with a spirit of mutual confidence between us, just what has been the underlying occasion of your having so completely and so unsympathetically read me.

...From my first acquaintance with your work fifteen years ago, nothing has ever so completely compelled my interest and assent. I have labored diligently through all this time endeavoring to understand human life on the basis of the psychological concepts set forth by you. I have tried earnestly to extend the application of the principles first enunciated by you to the social as well as to individual repressions. In response my efforts are discredited upon interpretations which have no basis whatever in fact...

In remonstrating, as I do, against your misunderstanding of me, I must not be thought as offering any word of defense. There is no need of any. I...feel that I owe it to myself and to you, however, to forestall, if possible, a misunderstanding that is based upon a criticism that rests not upon what I have said but upon what I have not said, and to give myself and you the opportunity of discovering, if possible, wherein lies the occasion for your discrimination against my scientific endeavors...

...I know that your days are very full and that it cannot be expected of you that you be familiar with the work and the endeavors of all of your pupils. It is inevitable that you should know many of us merely second hand and by hearsay. I quite understand this circumstance and accept it with entire respect, but I feel sure that where, through inadvertence, I have been incorrectly misconstrued by you, you will be the first to wish me to call your attention to this unintentional misapprehension on your part.

With my high esteem and most cordial greetings (Galt, W., 1958, pp. 94-98).

Freud responded by writing:

Honored Colleague:

> I am satisfied that I was mistaken in my judgment of your second article and I am ready to correct my judgment. In apology may I say that it is my impression that your method of expressing yourself could somewhat easily be misunderstood. The deeper reason probably lies in the fact that your paper, "A Relative Concept of Consciousness," disappointed and irritated me, so that I was prejudiced also against your other formulations.
>
> With respectful greetings (Ref. Yale Collection, 3/5/25).

This was the most direct and open exchange to occur between the two men at any time. And Freud's response was the more generous since in "*A Relative Concept...*" Burrow was bold enough to compare Freud's position with the Newtonians' and that of group analysis with the relativists!

Burrow was elected president of the American Psychonalytic Association for the year 1925 and it was decided at Lifwynn Camp that, in this capacity, he should attend the Ninth Congress of the International Psychoanalytical Association in Bad Homburg, Germany, in September to report on the development of group analysis. A party of four would make the trip to Europe—Burrow and Shields, (FN p.) Jack Burrow, and John E. Huiskamp, M.D. Dr. Huiskamp had been a member of the analytic group since its beginning. He not only had a deep interest in Burrow's work but the financial resources to help further it. It seems possible that he funded much of the trip abroad that fall.

(FN. Shields' Passport for this trip lists his profession as "secretary". And indeed initials on the letters in the William Galt file indicate that he was the typist for them. He had an unusual capacity for organizing office details and many of the systems that he introduced in Burrow's office are still in effect with us today.)

The paper prepared for presentation at Bad Homburg, "The Laboratory Method in Psychoanalysis: Its Inception and Development," (1926) is one of Burrows finest in my opinion. In it he extends the principle of primary identification to the species at large. In its original application Burrow spoke of the preconscious in terms of individual analysis.

Footnote: At this point both Elizabeth Behnke and Mary Alice Roche both raised the question of why the sense of unity should stop with the human species. "Why not an interspecies solidarity too—a 'continuum embracing all of life'"? I think the answer is that the human species is the only one that is destroying its own habitat and that of other forms of life. The sense of solidarity with our kind and thus with our environment is something that we have lost touch with and the lack of which is both serious implication for the planet. Elizabeth also asks when the human continuum began was there a break with the pre-human? Among other passages in Burrow's writings that indicate the understanding of the solidarity of organism and environment see page 52 to 58 in Burrow, 1984, Toward Social Sanity. It also indicates that a sense of continuity among human beings stretch back into time immemorial.

> But man is not an individual. His Mentation is not individualistic. He is part of a societal continuum that is the outgrowth of a primary or racial continuum. As the individual finds his basis in an individual continuum with an ontogenetic matrix or maternal source, so the social organism has its basis in a continuum with a phylogenetic matrix that is societal or racial. It is my thesis that this racial continuum is the phylogenetic basis of man's societal life, precisely as the individual's early continuity with the maternal organism—his primary identification with the mother—is the ontogenetic basis for his subsequent development as an individual.
>
> In recent years the attempt has been made on the part of myself and a few students to establish a means for the practical recognition among us as individual organisms of this common substrate of feeling and reactions… It has been our practical endeavor to relate individual manifestations to this common racial principle shared among us and to study the pathological divergences of our various feeling reactions in the light of this common feeling continuum. The result has been the establishment of a practical laboratory of psychoanalysis in which a consensual agreement concerning the subjective material has rendered possible an exact observation of individual deflections precisely as the laboratory of structural biology has made possible the scientific observation of structural divergences from a commonly accepted phyletic norm.

observation of structural divergences from a commonly accepted phyletic norm.

This "method of consensual observation," Burrow points out, enables observers to see the private biases of the psychoanalyst in the same light as those of his/her patients, and places them on the same footing in the laboratory. "The time has come," he wrote, "when the laboratory method initiated by Freud through the principle he applied to the study of the individual neurosis must extend itself to the larger application envisaged by a laboratory study of the neuroses in their wider social implications."

It is my belief that this paper with its emphasis on consensual observation was a potent influence on Harry Stack Sullivan. (FN; ___) The paper was published *in The Journal of Psychiatry*, and, as with all Burrow's papers, a reprint was sent to Sullivan. I also believe that its emphasis on the social matrix of human consciousness was important later in the formulations of S.H. Foulkes.

Writing from Bad Homburg to Mrs. Burrow on September 3, 1925, Clarence Shields reported:

...

The paper went off well. No time was allotted on the program for discussion, so we do not know how the audience reacted...Sensing the irritation on account of the great length of some of the papers, Dr. Burrow quickly cut his to 23 minutes. He read well--there was the usual

applause and then the next paper. There is something very unbeautiful about this Congress. I don't know how else to put it in the moment, but Dr. Burrow and I both feel that it has been most important that the statement of his work occurred before this international audience...[But] everything on the trip tends only to increase our interest in the work in Baltimore and to awaken us more fully to the great need of its further development.

The next day he again wrote Mrs. Burrow:

> It doesn't seem likely that Dr. Burrow will find time for letters until tomorrow late or Sunday. It is now 7:00 o'clock. The morning's session was long—lunch about 2:00—a half hour's rest and then he was off to the "business meeting." Tonight the banquet which all of us expect to attend—Jack and Dr. H. have just returned from Frankfurt.
>
> I expect Dr. Burrow most any minute.
>
> Here's the most important news—Fraulein Freud and Dr. Federn both said to Dr. Burrow personally that they were "very much interested" in his paper and Dr. Jelliffe in his address before the Congress made definite reference to Dr. Burrow.
>
> ...

Burrow himself wrote a report on the meeting to Hans Syz which reads in part:

> The Congress concluded at noon today. In the main it has been worthwhile. To present our position here was almost necessary. I mean it was a necessary formality. I do not think many of the Germans were able to follow my paper. They are interested though to read it and I am to send it to the *Zeitschrift*....There were two "business meetings." These were quite painful for me. It became apparent that they were mere political rallies—that psychoanalysis was about to disintegrate with the passing of Freud and that every effort is being made in the use of artificial respiration to keep alive an organization that lacks the vitality of internal coordination and accord (Ref. Galt, W., 1958, pp. 110-112).

After some further travel—to Heidelberg, Strasburg and Zurich—the party, with the exception of John Huiskamp, returned to be met at the dock in New York by Elaine Kinder, a member of the Baltimore group and an associate of

Burrow's at the Phipps Clinic. Accompanying her, surprisingly, was my mother, Alfreda Payson Sill.

(FN: This was not the last letter that Burrow received from Jung who continued to acknowledge with cordiality the reprints and other writings that Burrow sent him.)

1998 AG. Lab IV

CHAPTER IV

The Summer of 1926

"Lake Chateaugay lay before us" my mother wrote in 1968, "as I and my two teenage daughters stood beside the motor-boat waiting to take us to Lifwynn Camp. We were starting on an adventure, and I being doubtful as to the outcome, was in need of reassurance. The smiling boy who had greeted us, Bill Galt, offered such reassurance. He, I knew, was a member of the experimental group which we were about to join, and he was neither eccentric nor forbidding. I got into the motor-boat with less misgiving.

"Six months previously I had been talking with an old friend about the problems in the new approach to the parent-child relationship which I had recently found in my reading of Freud—in 1926 among people like myself with little experience in psychological reading, a profoundly moving and exciting writer. I was a teacher in a private school in New York City. My youngest daughter, Jane, was twelve years old. My eldest daughter, Margaret, who was eighteen and the second daughter, Alfreda, fifteen, were both presenting the usual difficulties of adolescent youth, and I had been finding that the customary moral approach was not adequate in the light of my reading of current literature in the behavioral field. My old friend, Elaine Kinder, was a psychologist and I had turned to her with some of the more pressing problems that were confronting me. She had interested me by her description of the group analysis initiated by Trigant Burrow in which she was involved. We had many long talks about

it and, at last, she suggested that I come and spend a weekend with her in Baltimore and go to see Dr. Burrow. This I did, and found Dr. Burrow to be the most interesting and, at the same time, the most difficult to understand, of all the people I had ever known. I went to Baltimore several times and the upshot of these visits was that I applied for permission to join the group at Lifwynn Camp—I and my two daughters the older of whom was given a scholarship as the expense for me was considerable. (F.N. re campers sharing expenses) (Jane's summer was to be spent in a children's camp in Connecticut.) If it had not been for the cooperation of my slightly bewildered family, I could not have gone. And now we were headed around the bend of shore to Lifwynn Camp.

"But I need not have had misgivings, for Dr. Burrow had intuitively sensed, I imagine, that not only I, but others of the new students were somewhat frightened, and for the first evening, a so-called normal program was followed—a picnic around a blazing fire on the shore, and songs and jokes and conversation. Dr. Burrow was an excellent mimic and an inimitable teller of funny stories. He kept his audience in gales of laughter most of the time. Mr. Shields was, for the most part, a quiet spectator but, every now and then, he would say something that indicated his full acceptance of the situation.

"There were twenty-four of us in the group, including Mrs. Burrow and their son and daughter. The group was not a heterogeneous one as far as social classes were concerned. They all came from the upper middle class. But, within these limits, they

represented widely varied business activities and professions. Many of them had been patients of Dr. Burrow. Some of them were, like me, confused and doubtful about living with the old moralities and looking for an approach to human behavior less stereotyped and rigid. They were assigned to cabins under the trees along the lake-shore, usually two to a cabin but not two of the same family. Margaret was placed in one cabin with a roommate and Alfreda in another and I was given a cabin by myself. The cooking, drawing of water, carrying wood to supply the Franklin stoves, the marketing and trips for all sorts of supplies, the care of the grounds--all this was carried on by the group. Teams were assigned through various meetings to take over these activities, according to the interests of the individual and what he or she would be likely to be able to manage.

"A great many affect situations (See P. ?), of course, arose in the course of the day, and were the material for observation in group meetings. I well remember my initiation into what it was all about. As a member of the housekeeping committee, I had gone across the lake in the boat to buy a very long marketing list. On my return to the camp, I was horrified and profoundly embarrassed to find that I had omitted to buy much-needed coffee. A meeting of the whole group was in progress in the dining room, a large many-windowed room with a big fireplace, and I at once appeared before them pouring out my apologies and begging that I be allowed to return immediately and rectify my lapse. Was not this the thing to do? When one fell from grace, one confessed and paid tribute to God by putting oneself out to make up for one's sin. To my utter bewilderment, the matter of the coffee was not considered in the least important. What was important was my distress. What was the nature of

this distress? What was its root? These were questions I could not answer but gradually there developed through the comment and questions of members of the group and of Dr. Burrow that the affect I was demonstrating seemed to belong to other members of the group as well and to be, perhaps, implicated in a much larger social situation. I do not remember whether we got the coffee that day. But I have never forgotten the utter confusion I felt and the gradual, faint appreciation for what I and my children were going to be doing.

"Every evening the students gathered in the bungalow for a group-analysis. The bungalow was a large, rustic building with a fireplace, chairs, couches and tables on which kerosene lamps gave a feeble light. It must be remembered that the procedure was unprecedented. Nobody had ever heard of such doings and the techniques had to be worked out from day to day. Affect involvements between students ran the gamut from sexual attraction to extreme hostility, and what they said was largely bewildering to their hearers.

..."Dr. Burrow did most of the talking although Mr. Shields was profoundly significant on many occasions. So far as I can remember, no one ever challenged Dr. Burrow's behavior or that of Mr. Shields. That was done in their mutual study of man's neurosis as expressed in themselves and, as we know now, was often most devastating to the 'I'-persona.

..."The impact of this summer's experience remained with us and in the end, changed our lives."

In her reminiscences, my mother speaks only of problems with her teenage daughters. Actually she must have had questions about her own life as well. Widowed at thirty-two, while she was recuperating from tuberculosis in Saranac, she was left with virtually no funds and with the necessity of having her children cared for by relatives. Moreover, after more than ten years of the pleasant social life of a Cornell professor's wife, she had to return with her daughters to the home of her parents, to the parsonage where she had grown up. It seems to me remarkable that her health mended, that she was able to bring the family together again and eventually, as she said, take a position as a teacher in the girls' private school which we were attending on scholarship. She did this with much help from her brother, Armour, and her brother-in-law, Frederick H. Sill, O.H.C. The former helped her financially, while the latter provided wonderful summer holidays for the four of us—the founder of Kent School, he made us welcome there in the summer months and it gave a delightful opportunity for Margaret, Jane, and me to enjoy the farm and the cattle and to romp with the faculty children. For Mother a vacation at Kent provided almost her only social life, but that in itself was fraught with problems. For she found herself involved in a frustrating relationship with a young faculty member, too much her junior for marriage, and too scared of my uncle to risk an outright affair. It was in this stalemate that she watched the burgeoning adolescence of her daughters, and I suspect that her own situation was tied in with the problems she speaks of.

I do not recall that first evening at Lifwynn Camp and the picnic my mother describes. But I, too, remember Burrow's humor and charm, both that early summer

and in later years. He was very serious with regard to his investigation, but otherwise there was always laughter ready to bubble up and an outgoing warmth that everybody valued. Nevertheless, during the time at Camp, we dispensed with some of the niceties we are accustomed to in daily life; for instance, there were no greetings in the morning when we came together for breakfast—no cheery good mornings or other ways of easing the start of the day. This was not due to any lack of appreciation for good manners, but was a research ploy that served to draw attention to our reliance on the *signals* of geniality and on expressions of good will from other people to maintain our sense of ourselves as worthy beings.

The campers ranged in age from fifteen to fifty-five and most had previous exposure to social self-inquiry and Burrow's perspectives. Of the young people in the group, there was William Galt who was then twenty-two and Jack Burrow, twenty-one. Emily was seventeen while Elizabeth Scheetz, Clarence's younger half-sister, was sixteen. I asked my sister, Margaret, shortly before she died what she recalled from that summer and she said at once, "the feeling that we were doing something absolutely new." For me, the outstanding feature was the sense of inclusiveness, the feeling that all of us, young and old, professional and lay, were equally subject to a fixation on the self and that it was socially engendered. This being in the same boat and the emphasis on feelings in the immediate moment created a culture of openness that still seems to me remarkable.

I was fortunate enough to share Emily Burrow's charming chalet overlooking what was called the "Woman's Cove." A bright airy cottage, it was divided by curtains into

three small rooms, two for sleeping and a small wash-room where we kept our pitchers of water dragged up the hill from the lake and spring. The north end of camp was occupied by the women and the south end, with its Men's Cove, was devoted to the men. Each had its own out house set in sylvan beauty.

I have read that in the compound where Gurdjieff lived with his students and disciples, it was a regular habit on his part to carry out affairs with the young girls of the group. (Johnson). Such behavior was utterly excluded at Lifwynn Camp. Burrow was studying the prerogatives and presumptions of leadership along with other social factors and could not have encroached in such a flagrant manner upon the sensibilities of the young women in the group. When people say to me that Gurdjieff and Burrow "say the same thing," I can only reply, "How is that possible since their basic attitudes toward people and particularly toward the young were at variance?" The attitude of Burrow and Shields toward their shared research was one of complete integrity, even though the investigation itself demanded the recognition of the lack of integrity within and around them. In a letter to Adolf Meyer in 1931 Burrow explained, "In our effort to get down to an organic basis, to efface entirely the emotional basis that can project itself socially in ideas and words, none of the nice things we do and think were, in our experimental group, admitted as any evidence of the actual sanity or integrity of the organism. Correspondingly, all the unseemly, cruel, self-satisfying, narcissistic things we fantasy 'but would not do for the world' were placed in the category of things actually done" (Galt 1958, 242).

In addition to the numerous meetings, there were various non-verbal pursuits that summer. Rhythmic dancing, recently introduced by Isadora Duncan was popular at the time and Emily who had studied with Alys Bentley and Ruth Doing, regularly led the rest of the campers in rhythmics on the front lawn. Some of us went across the lake for singing lessons with Florence Holtzman, a professional teacher; Rosalind Bruce taught arts and crafts at camp; and there was a well equipped shop where various woodworking projects were carried out, particularly by Clarence Shields. There were also exceptional water sports and boating. Dr. Burrow urged me to take advantage of the numerous typewriters in the camp to learn the touch system while I was there. I spent a good deal of time doing this and never regretted it.

It should be understood that there was not at that time in the development of social self-inquiry the physiological grounding of later years (as described on pp. 5-6). My mother speaks of procedures being developed as we went along, but I do not think it was that *ad hoc*. Each meal was regarded as a laboratory session for observation of our feelings and motivations. In addition there were seminars and general meetings held in the evenings and each camper was a member of a small group of perhaps five or six that met three times a week, often with Burrow and Shields. A select "Medical Group," consisting of more experienced students and including Dr. Syz, psychiatrist, and Elaine Kinder, psychologist, met separately. As in previous summers, it was understood that wherever and whenever an affect situation arose, other activities would stop to examine the presenting situation.

Yet, in spite of this plethora of meetings there was very little in the general group that could be described as group analytic observation. Too often, affect situations were presented as *bona fide* expressions of feeling. For instance a student might express his or her attraction or irritation toward another camper, but do it in a way that presented the anger or admiration as valid. Clearly, it was an elusive task. Years later when I came to work with other groups—T-groups, Encounter Groups, Tavistock groups and others—I was impressed by the ease with which people seemed to be able to describe their feelings. But of course they were not being asked, as we were, to question the very nature of the self and its motivations. In a T-group what you said you felt was accepted as accurate, whereas in group analysis what you said you felt was open to question by yourself and everyone else.

Nevertheless, it was during this summer that Burrow experienced the periods of "interrelational nihilism" which he describes in *The Neurosis of Man* and which opened the way to his definition of contrasting modes of attention. The constant challenge and probing of ordinary motivation and feeling that he submitted himself to, in solitude and with Clarence Shields, brought on these "moments [when] the sense of frustration had reached the saturation point. At these times of intense social frustration and feeling-disparagement, all affective response to affective stimuli as ordinarily experienced, appeared to have become nonexistent." (1953, 245).

Although I have derogated the capacity of the general group for phyloanalysis, I want to make it clear that the group setting was absolutely essential to, and continueous with, the deep probing in which Burrow and Shields—and later Nell

Holljes—engaged. Moreover, Burrow took advantage of this setting to, as it were, defy the dominant social mood, to give himself and his fellows the experience of challenging the precepts and images handed down by the mother community. All of Burrow's observations to the group issued from examination of his own affective responses so that we became used to recognizing that his comments on the behavior of other people resulted from probing of his own motivation. It was a common recognition of affect.

In later years transcripts of meetings were not made because of the recognition that the verbal record of a meeting could not include "one's own kinetic function," (p.?) that is, the underlying physiological adjustments that are part of every interchange. Burrow himself particularly questioned the use of transcripts and wrote a letter of explanation to Thomas D. Elliot on the subject in 1930 (Galt, W., 1958, pp. 232-36). But in the summer of 1926 several amateur stenographers were designated to make records of meetings. As a result our files contain transcripts of laboratory sessions, often incomplete and sometimes inaccurate but including commentaries by Burrow on such subjects as people's relationship to food, people's relationship to work, marriage, sexuality, honesty, private property and a variety of other subjects. These transcripts represent what is probably the earliest records of group meetings anywhere. I have been conscious of this material as a historical resource, although recognizing that it represents an extremely rudimentary phase of what later became a highly sophisticated piece of research. And because of their historical interest, I am going to take the liberty of including a few excerpts from the transcripts in this chapter and in appendix. Can we **transport** ourselves into those early meetings as

though present? Can we note the tendency to objectify the participants, to judge their attitudes from the "normal" position of supreme arbiter? Does this material give us an opportunity to observe, as the group was attempting to do in 1926, their own affective trends to form opinions and take sides?

The first record that I have selected is of a meeting held at breakfast on July 19th—all campers were present. I believe it is the first record of a group meeting anywhere. In this transcript, Burrow's biases are clearly shown **and the reader may care to note his or her own reactions in considering them. At...** but at the same time I am impressed by the fearlessness with which the young people undertake to challenge their elders and question their motivations. How was it possible for this change of cultural emphasis to be accomplished in three short weeks when ordinarily at that time young people were expected to defer to their seniors? One possibility is that it was not so much what was said in the meetings that affected the participants as the very unusual social situation in which we were all involved in the camp. We were part of a living community—an inclusive living community, as I have said. Moreover, the camp was not regarded as the private preserve of the owners (the Burrows) but was freely offered for the joint venture in which we were engaged. The private basis was abrogated; the community basis was in the ascendant; and the surroundings were of great natural beauty, a solace to all involved.

A word of explanation for the use of last names in the transcripts for the benefit of those who do not realize how much more formal life was in the twenties than it is today. This was particularly true of medical organizations where doctors and nurses

who had worked together for twenty or thirty years commonly addressed one another by their last names, even well into the nineteen-sixties. The group analytic investigation was always regarded as a medical endeavor, and it seemed particularly important to keep up the conventions of that field where there was the situation of an "experimental family." It was difficult enough for the members to be clear that they were a research organization, not a group of happy campers. I recall, early in the summer of 1926, Burrow proposing that Jack and William should from then on be addressed as "Mister" rather than by their first names as had been the habit up until that time.

Breakfast Meeting, July 19, 1926, transcribed by Elaine Kinder:

Miss Holljes said that she wanted to speak of a situation chiefly because she did not want to speak of it. She said that last evening Emily and Elizabeth had been in one of the canoes. She had been out in front of the Bungalow and had seen them out on the water. Then she heard some boys whistle to them from across the lake. They had not answered the whistle but had begun to sing. Then she saw a boat with the boys coming closer and finally the boys came up to the girls and conversed with them. She thought the boys were from Chateaugay. She heard Emily say they were from the Deming Camp. Then Mrs. Burrow went out and called "Emily." One of the boys said "Mamma's calling" but Miss Holljes did not hear Emily's response. Miss Holljes thought that Emily had been frightened when the boys came up to them and she had been frightened when she said to them that they had to go in, that they were from the Deming camp.

Dr. Burrow said that he did not see why Miss Holljes should hesitate to speak of this.

Miss Holljes said that she had thought of speaking to Emily and Elizabeth privately. She thought it was because she wanted Emily and Elizabeth to like her.

Dr. Burrow mentioned the "cheap rendezvous" and the reflection which must necessarily fall upon the camp as a result of such a meeting.

Emily replied that that was why she had said they were from the Deming camp.

Miss Guggenheimer said that that was placing the same reflection on the Deming camp.

Miss Blum mentioned that last evening she had left the Bungalow for a few minutes' fresh air and had found Miss Holljes lying down on the rhythm ground. That she felt that Miss Holljes in withdrawing from the group on the two preceding evenings had been doing exactly the same sort of thing that Emily and Elizabeth had been doing.

Miss Bruce said that she felt that there was much criticism in Miss Blum's statement and that we could not consider the situation in view of this mood.

Dr. Burrow called attention to the fact that although there was much affect in Miss Blum's presentation of this matter that there was a situation here which he thought might be considered apart from this affect. That Miss Holljes also was out having a rendezvous clandestinely and that she had mentioned the rendezvous of Emily and Elizabeth in order to hide her own. That she also had met her lover and that he was just as cheap as the loves of Emily and Elizabeth.

Margaret said that she didn't see what there was that was cheap about the occurrence last evening. That she could understand that it was cheap for the girls to try to put criticism on the Deming camp but that she couldn't see anything cheap about talking to the boys.

Dr. Burrow said that he didn't have the feeling of the modern young people. He did feel that it was cheap for a girl to be in the position of being what men call "picked up." He said that he realized that the modern girl did not seem to share that position but he thought that there was coming a generation that would not be interested in cheap rendezvous with unknown boys.

Emily said that she felt that the camp here was just like a convent; that she felt as though she were in a convent; that one couldn't do this and couldn't do that and there were all sorts of rules.

Dr. Burrow called attention to the fact that this was Emily's interpretation of the camp decisions, there being no similarity whatever between the conventual atmosphere and that of the camp.

Emily replied that she wouldn't feel that way if she were a member of the camp but she was not a member, that she does not attend group meetings and that she is not a part of the camp.

...

Dr. Burrow called attention to the fact that Emily and her mother and Mr. Burrow were quite united while at a previous meeting two of them had been at daggers' points with the third and that this constant image relationship went on all the time. He said

that he was not in the least interested in changing this condition but that he did wish to speak of it because he did not want to be taken in by it.

Alfreda said that she felt that Dr. Burrow did not mean what he said when he said he was not interested in Emily changing; that he had spoken on a previous evening of missing Emily's companionship and that she felt that he was very much interested in Emily's thinking as he did.

Mr. Shields called attention to the fact that Alfreda was not saying what she had in mind.

Dr. Burrow called attention to the fact that for years he had been continuing the work that was of interest to him and that it was quite evident that he would not have done this if he had wanted his family to like him; that it was quite evident that Alfreda had not at all understood what he had said at the meeting to which she referred; that he felt that the constant image relationship which exists between individuals of so-called families is not thoughtful and that he refused longer to accept this constant image basis. He said that he felt that some more thoughtful basis was possible and that he was interested in the establishment of such a basis and interested only in that.

On July 30th, the meeting dealt with a subject of particular concern to my family. Here is an excerpt from it; my mother is speaking:

> I want to speak of a matter that has been on my mind for a great many years and which I had no thought of speaking of when I first came up here, but I feel on several occasions to have kept it a secret has kept me from complete participation in the group life and I'd like to talk about it and there's another reason that will come up later.

Then she went on to describe her marriage and the fact that my father suffered from depressions and melancholia. After about five years of marriage she realized that they were recurrent and came periodically. She said he "suffered a great deal for many years before we were married; a very dependent relationship existed between us. He depended on me and looked to me for a great many things. I was very pleased

to respond to that but occasionally got very tired of it and wanted to have some petting for myself, so that I used to have breakdowns of health and finally achieved a particularly successful one and had to be sent to Saranac. This was at the beginning of one of his periods of depression. He was in New York teaching at Columbia University." And she goes on to speak of how he suffered from insomnia and even hallucinations and sought the advice of a famous psychoanalyst [Smith Ely Jelliff] who told him that indeed he was quite ill and might have to go to a sanitarium for treatment and then sent him home and told him to come back on Monday. That weekend my father took his own life. My mother goes on to say;

> I have never told my children; I have lied to them consistently about this; I never meant to tell them. But in these weeks here I feel that I was defrauding them of something--their opportunity to face life as it is.

The meeting went on to talk of the sense of failure that is always associated with such an event, and Mr. Shields spoke of the secrets in families and the pain associated with them. I think it is possible that my sisters and I might never have known the nature of our father's death if we had not been at the camp; and the simplicity and clarity of the telling, the placing it in a wider context were significant in softening the effect the news had on us. As a matter of fact, I do not remember this news being any kind of a blow to me—characteristic of my fifteen-year old toughness," I recall being primarily concerned about whether Jack Burrow, for whom I had developed a strong admiration, was watching my reaction to it.

Margaret, on the other hand, was deeply shaken. She was a sensitive and tender-hearted young woman and was sorely conscious of the pain that this event signalized

for both our parents. In fact, the impact of my father's death had consistently been stronger for her, probably because I always had her to count on whereas, as the eldest, she was the more bereft. But the summer also held many positive experiences for Margaret. For instance, there is a transcript of a meeting held early in August in which she was recorded as saying, "This summer I have been happier—happier at least than any other time that I can remember, and I feel that it is because I have been able to observe my attitude towards Alfreda and Mother in a group way, at least as far as I have been able to. I felt that it would help me in that way a great deal—I think that if I were to go home in September thinking that I would never be coming back to the group work, I would feel very lost, as it were, in my own life. Simply that, it seems to me that my irritation with Alfreda has always been something that I have kept within myself a lot and not been able to observe it at all—at least I have not wanted to." Both Burrow and Shields commented in meetings about Margaret's and my expressed desire to continue with the group work. I have placed these and other transcripts in Appendix I along with one or two other records of meetings held that summer. Burrow wrote later of this particular phase of the work. (INSERT TO COME LATER)

A significant part of the summer's experience for me was my feeling for Jack Burrow and my decision to follow the example of others and speak of it in an open meeting in August. I have hesitated to include this event because the romantic feelings of a fifteen-year-old girl seem picayune in the setting of a serious research effort. Yet, it was the nature of that effort that determined how my feelings were

expressed and were dealt with. Under other circumstances I think it is very unlikely that they would have been known at all except to me.

At a general meeting held the day after I had spoken of my affection for "Mr. Burrow", he replied with the following rather touching comments:

> In regard to Alfreda's statement last night at the supper table it would appear that I had gotten no reaction or feeling out of it. I know I hold the same attitude toward her as she says she holds toward me. My reaction was that I did not want this mentioned, that I wanted to keep it secret as long as possible, that I did not want to have it uncovered. And I think it is interesting in regard to me that last winter I was constantly worried in regard to girls...and when I came up here I said that I would have at least two months of freedom from this. I had not been up here very long before the same thing happened. I do not think there is anything to do about it...

Jack did not often make such contributions to the meetings and his father's immediate response seems to me to have had in it a tone of encouragement and support:

> This situation it seems to me is a very significant one from the point of view of our work. I don't know of anyone in whom this tendency has been more marked all of his life than it has in my life. I tend to sentimental relationships towards people.

The transcript shows that I then said:

> I think the feeling of possession is very strong with me for Mr. Burrow because I felt very self-conscious when I spoke last night and I was hoping that he would speak of his feeling for me for I thought that if he did speak it would clear the air to some extent. When he did start to speak this afternoon I was afraid that he would say that he was annoyed by what I said last night but when he did speak and say that he had the same feeling for me, my immediate reaction was that, "well, everything is all right now—he is mine now".

Although the transcript does not show it, my recollection is that Dr. Burrow responded to my statement by saying, "That's what I call an observation!" For I had noted and then reported my immediate affect-reaction and it clearly showed the self-bias of the speaker. Such an immediate realization was perhaps easier for a younger person than for others who had lived longer with the old analytical methods.

That was the event, but it did not lead, as it might today, to a physical expression of affection. It is difficult to realize how extremely innocent I was at that time—I was not really looking for anything more, whereas Jack at twenty-one was considerably more sophisticated than I. I recall on one occasion his stating that he did not understand his "resistence" to me but I was not sufficiently skilled in group analysis to be able to respond adequately to his invitation to examine more closely our feelings for each other. And I don't recall the situation coming up again in a group meeting.

As the final weeks of the camp season drew to an end, meetings began to focus more and more on the plans for a new foundation that would formalize the loosely organized analytic group. Burrow was increasingly embarrassed by the situation in which former patients continued to pay him for consultation, "as though I were still the healthy psychopathologist" able to dispense wisdom. It began to be recognized that almost in spite of the members of the analytic group, the situation of a foundation had gradually taken shape. A board was set up to consider the legal and organizational steps that would be needed to formalize this situation.

This board consisted of Aimee Guggenheimer, Dr. Syz and Mrs. Burrow whose sensitivity and acumen were especially valuable to it. In fact, Burrow had recently

written his old friend, Laura Spencer Portor, "Brownie's, Jack's and Emily's growing participation in the growing need of our group endeavor has meant very much to me this summer. They have, and very naturally, been so confused by it all. And I have not, until lately, been half articulate enough myself to explain away what must often have seemed to them, to their great pain and disappointment, a very unworthy discrepancy in my own position toward them. Things seem to clear though somewhat now and I to clear somewhat along with them."

As Burrow expressed the organizational situation in a meeting of the new board on August 22nd: "We have the foundation. We have had it for sometime. Through the work, through the position of the office at the Tuscany [his office in Baltimore] and through the collaboration of co-workers with the office at the Tuscany an unusual circumstance has been brought about in which a psychopathologist thinking himself well and treating patients becomes as ill as his patients, and his patients and he become together one organism in which he himself is a natural sequence to the organic circumstance to be maintained by a foundation. I was once in a normal position, entitled to my office and living on its fees. Today I have no fees, I have no income practically—but my family and I are maintained by a foundation, by a group of people who are giving their work, who are giving their means to further a sociological investigation and, furthering which, is participating in it."

The meeting went on to discuss the mood of opposition that existed in the very people who were establishing the new organization. "This mood amounts to saying," Dr. Burrow goes on, "I am quite capable of being organically responsible mentally

without being organically responsible economically. I can be organically responsible mentally but I can be organically irresponsible economically." The very foundation that exists now has disproven that position.

"We have gone on always on the assumption, 'Well, everybody is financially independent, everybody has a right to get everything he can and hold on to it and see what becomes of it.' This group takes the position, as I understand it, that nobody has such a right. The only thing is a united use of our resources and see what will come of it."

While the idea of a foundation was being projected, plans were also underway for Burrow and Shields to establish a small base that fall in New York City. It was felt that the broader outlooks and opportunities that presented themselves there would provide a more hospitable setting for the investigation. Burrow, Shields and Jack stopped briefly in New York on their return trip from Lifwynn Camp, a couple of weeks after my family and others had left. In the meantime my mother had helped in trying to locate office space for them. Jack took me to the theatre during his few days in the city, and at long last we exchanged the kisses and caresses that had not been bestowed at camp. However, by the time he returned from Baltimore with his father and Shields, he told me that his feeling for me had cooled. This was a sad conclusion to my first romance which I had somehow thought would go on forever!

Before closing my report on the summer of 1926, I want to speak of the only camp function I have not yet mentioned: the office. It stood half-way up the hill between

the bungalow and Dr. Burrow's study and was presided over by Bessie Blum, his secretary, Aimee Guggenheimer, the office secretary, and John Leigh who, as an accountant for Metropolitan Life Insurance, was well equipped to handle the camp's budgets and accounts. They were often assisted by Rosalind Bruce and others when the work was pressing. Daily mail trips were made to the post office by Jack or William in the sleek motor launch the *Geraldine*, built and named for the Metropolitan Opera star Geraldine Ferrar who had grown up nearby.

During 1926, Burrow had nine papers published in various journals including The American Journal of Sociology. The response from sociologists was particularly gratifying and a number of them were answered from Lifwynn Camp(ref)—men like Kimball Young at Wisconsin University, Alvin Johnson, Director of The New School for Social Research, and Eduard C. Lindeman, who headed the New York School of Social Work. With their background of study in social trends and processes, they seemed to appreciate, more than the psychiatric profession, the nature of the phenomena Burrow was investigating. There also must have been a number of papers written that summer because Burrow's output the next year continued high. I do not recall any of this highly productive activity spilling over into the routine of the camp activities and meetings but I have probably forgotten. Surely a letter from Freud which arrived in the middle of August must have prompted discussion. It read:

> I am always interested in your publications, I see you are grappling with an important, still unsolved problem, but I have made no progress in understanding how you manage it. A plain and clear description of the way your laboratory-method is performed, would help me more than all your

theoretical speculation and your reference to the Theory of Relativity which to me seems out of place.

Even this grudging acknowledgement on Freud's part was heartening to Burrow. But already the first phase of the phyloanalytic study was drawing to a close. Never again did such a large group converge on Lifwynn Camp, nor was the investigation carried on principally in verbal terms. Rather the participants began to concern themselves with deeper organismic processes as they approached more closely the "biophysical bedrock" Burrow claimed for his findings.

****

The question of whether to include some of the early transcripts in this chapter and in the appendix has been a difficult one. As I say, it had been a decision of the entire group many years ago that they did not represent the interchange that they were supposed to record, but my feelings in favor of publishing them are strong enough to override the conclusions of the early group. Nevertheless, the night I decided to do so I was awake without knowing why and when I finally fell asleep, I had the following dream:

We were at Lifwynn Camp. The entire group was meeting in a large, rectangular building with windows along the sides and chairs along the wall beneath them. I was not in this building but could see into it in my mind's eye. Miss Flora Guggenheimer was reading a letter and I realized that the group was engaged in selecting letters from the correspondence of Clarence Shields to be published in a book as we had done with Burrow's. Shortly the room was emptied and the group went forth to get lunch. I, who had evidently not been included, went in with the thought that I would take an empty seat while they were available and be there for the afternoon session. Jane Curtin who (in the dream) was part of the group was seated two or three chairs from me; she turned to me with a disparaging expression on her face and said, "Well, look what the cat dragged in." And she indicated that I was not welcome. I said, "Well, pardon me," and got up and left. I realized that Jane Curtin's expression reflected coldness toward me by Dr. Burrow and I was deeply hurt. The more so as it meant being cut off from my husband who was also working with the group. When I awoke the pain of the situation remained with me.

I believe that the dream reflects a conflict between my desire to be "open" and "frank" with my readers and my loyalty to the deceased co-editors *of A Search For Man's Sanity, The Selected Letters of Trigant Burrow*, with whom I collaborated and with whom I shared a commitment to protect Burrow and our work from adverse criticism. This conflict has not yet been resolved in my work on this volume and I plan to proceed with the possibility in mind that a resolution will make itself clear before I have completed the work. Are the two alternatives merely image-concerns

related more to a static idea of self than to the living reality of communication? Let us see.

Chapter 5

Burrow's first book, *The Social Basis of Consciousness: A Study in Organic Psychology* appeared in 1927. To the author's delight, it had been accepted by C. K. Ogden, editor of the International Library of Psychology, Philosophy and Scientific Method, published by Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner in London and Harcourt, Brace in New York. In the Introduction, Burrow wrote:

> After sixteen years devoted to psychoanalytic work...I have come to a position which differs so essentially from the followers of Freud..., that I am impelled to set down some account of the development through which my conceptions have passed...The personalistic basis...on which psychoanalysis rests has not in my experience proved sufficiently broad...[I]t has not as yet really uncovered the essential meaning of our human problems as they touch the consciousness of man in its organic reality.
>
> To speak, however, of the organic reality of life is to enter upon a new universe of consciousness. It is to acquire a wholly altered concept of the inherent consciousness of man. This concept is not one that is interpretable upon our accustomed individualistic basis. As its envisagement is societal, its realization must necessarily be societal also.
>
> ...
>
> It is to abrogate [the] prejudice of personal partisanship and differentiation besetting the intrinsic system of psychoanalysis as well as of our private dogmatizations elsewhere, that I have undertaken the investigations of which this study is in part the outcome (1-3).

Burrow adds that in no sense is his book a repudiation of the teaching of Freud but rather the acknowledged outgrowth of that teaching.

In "*Psychoanalysis in Theory and in Life*," (Chapter 1) Burrow notes that the theory of psychoanalysis rests on the conception that nervous disorders are the

substitutive manifestation of a repressed sexual life. Burrow agrees that there is substitution, but he no longer views it "as primarily for sexuality as we now know it." Rather, he believes that sexuality is identical with the unconscious and is itself a substitution for the basic harmony of function that is the biological birthright of all humans. "The restless, obsessive quest that everywhere masquerades as sex," he wrote, "is the hallmark of the mental reaction-average known as 'normality'."

"We who are psychoanalysts...are very largely misled by an unconscious that is social—we, too, are neurotic in so far as every expression but that of life in its native simplicity is neurotic...For a system of psychoanalysis is itself but a substitution for life, a theory of life in place of life itself. The theory of life sets out with a premise; life does not. Psychoanalysis offers a solution; life is its own solution." (10-17)

"In dealing with life in its actuality we are not dealing with the descriptive and objective. Human life is subjective. It is something experienced, something felt. Life is not theoretical; it is actual. It is not descriptive; it is dynamic...Subjectivity or intrinsic feeling is the very basis of life." (18-19)

"*A Relative Concept of Consciousness*" is included as Chapter 2, and as we have seen (p.) he began in this paper to describe the kind of science needed to observe subjective processes.

From this broader organic frame of reference, *The Social Basis of Consciousness* discusses, among other matters, the unconscious in its individual and social aspects; the dream and its analysis; the biological substrate of neurotic conflict; the distinction between sex and sexuality; and the ultimate resolution of the societal neurosis.

In many ways, this is a revolutionary book; it is also a difficult book. Yet surprisingly the critical response was favorable, particularly from the lay press in England and the U.S. It appeared at a time when even the smallest city had at least one daily newspaper and often two or three. Each of these papers boasted a book reviewer and many of these men and women took pride in their ability to review books of significance in the arts and sciences. A few professional journals greeted *The Social Basis of Consciousness* with scorn but on the whole the trend of the reviews was at least respectful and often laudatory.

But perhaps more important were the artists who came to know Burrow's position through, *The Social Basis of Consciousness*, and enthusiastically encompassed it. The first the American writer, Sherwood Anderson, whom Burrow met at Lake Chateguay on an early visit there and who tried, in 1921, to assist Burrow in finding a publisher for the preliminary version of *The Social Basis*.... When it finally appeared, it received high praise in a review from *The New Republic* (?) (check with Penny) Leo Stein, Gertrude's artist-brother (?) (FU library computer has biography of Leo Stein) or

sculpler/dancer (ref.) December 15, 1927 (penny check list of reviews) In this review he writes, "Trigant Burrow...has psychoanalyzed psychoanalyis and has written a book, although it is rather difficult in style, it is essentially profound and clear in thought. My review will consist of little more than a summary of it.

> "The sexuality which, according to the analyst, produces a neurosis is, according to Burrow, a consequence of the neurotic social condition. Burrow considers sexuality, which he descriminates from the natural sex-impulse to be essentially autoerotic. It is one's sexual self-consciousness...
>
> "Burrow finds that the analyst accepts the world which has been made personal by the acceptance of self-reference in the individual. Burrow finds...that the analyst's psychological basis is the highly artificial world of the psychoneurosis, and that he tries to remedy the individual neurosis on this basis. Burrow's suggested remedy for the false situation...is the group analysis."

Equally appreciative was the English novelist, D.H. Lawrence. In a review published in *The Bookman*, in England, in November 1927.

> Dr. Burrow is that rare thing among psychiatrists, a humanly honest man...Subjective honesty, which means that a man is honest about his own inward experience, is perhaps the rarest thing, especially among professionals. ...If..., Dr. Burrow asks himself, it is not sex-repression which is at the root of the neurosis of modern life, what is it? For certainly, according to his findings, sex-repression is not the root of the evil.
>
> The question is a big one...but Dr. Burrow has struggled through years of mortified experience to come to some conclusion nearer the mark and his finding is surely much deeper and more vital, and also, much less spectacular than Freuds'.
>
> The real trouble lies in the inward sense of "separateness" which dominates every man. At a certain point in his evolution, man became cognitively conscious: he bit the apple: he began to know. Up till that time, his consciousness flowed unaware as in the animals. Suddenly his consciousness slipped.

> ...[This] is a book one should read and assimilate for it helps a man in his own inward life.

In a private letter, however, Lawrence chided Burrow for the convolutions of his language. Burrow replied, "I love what you say about my excruciating style. It is awful...The as yet unresolved conflict within me between science and art is the thundering noise one hears on every page as I come laboring along." He hopes that "his breathing is less stertorous" in some of his subsequent writings.

Lawrence's review, in turn brought *The Social Basis of Consciousness*, to the attention of the poet and artist, Herbert Read. In __ when Read's book was published, *Education Through Art.* ~~In his seminal work, *Education Through Art,*~~ Read referred extensively to *The Social Basis...*

> If individual and social sanity is to be restored, and cultural growth continued, then we must strive to recover on a physiological and psychological basis what Burrow calls "the total organism's internal feeling-behaviour." How that can and must be done has best been shown by this psychologist in his very significant but little appreciated work, *The Social Basis of Consciousness.*
>
> I have read this difficult book three times since its appearance in 1927, baffled and discouraged by it crabbed style, but always with a deepening sense of its truth and importance. I've also read all the criticisms that were written of it, mainly about the time of its appearance, and in so far that they were antagonistic, mainly by Freudians.
>
> I have the greatest respect, as must be already evident, for the genius of Freud, but I have found that he fails to provide us with an adequate solution to the problem just stated—the cure of our modern mass- neurosis; and at the point where Freud fails us, there Dr. Burrow who is himself a pupil of Freud's, comes to our rescue and provides us with a solution which is as D.H. Lawrence wrote, "sure, much deeper and more vital, and also much less spectacular than Freuds."

In this same book, Read includes a footnote in which he tries to explain the widespread dissemination of Burrow's insights that occurred without acknowledgment in the 1930's and later. He wrote, "Lawrence was much influenced by Trigant Burrow, and in this way some of Dr. Burrow's ideas have been diffused among people who have never heard his name. The sociological emphasis introduced into modern psychology has been reinforced more recently by writers such as Karen Horney (*The Neurotic Personality of our Time* and *News Ways in Psychoanalysis*) and Erich Fromm (*The Fear of Freedom*)." Read continued his support of Burrow as indicated later in these pages, and became his most important ally in the literary and publishing field.

Footnote: Education Through Art (Ref.)

Following the close of the 1926 camp season, Burrow and Shields, rather than returning to Baltimore, took up residence in New York City. It was felt that the reception there might be more hospitable to their innovative research and they rented a small apartment on lower Park Avenue, which contained Burrow's office and their living quarters. Burrow wrote in a footnote to (paper saying the first phase of study was over) nevertheless, the majority of the analytical group which had carried out this first phase of the research, continued to work together in Baltimore during this transition period under the guidance of Dr. Syz and Dr. Huiskamp. Emily remained in Baltimore to prepare for her bow to society during the coming year while Jack sojourned briefly with his father and Shields in New York. There he accepted a position with the LaSalle Motor Company, a subsidiary of Cadillac which was producing

a small but upscale car for the beneficiaries of the ever rising stock market. I visited him once at the LaSalle showroom on East 57th Street found him in elegant attire and much impressed by the luxurious features of the cars ~~his~~ he was selling. He remained in that position until he sold one of their most lucrative models at which point he took the commission and exchanged the snowy streets of New York for a sojourn to Florida after which he returned to Baltimore and ~~went to~~ accepted a position in a bank there.

The debutante season was in full swing and Emily and Mrs. Burrow were very much involved in the round of parties it entailed. Many years later I heard a description of her from one of her dancing partners of those early days, "There were bad dancers, and good dancers," he said, "and then there was 'Buddy' Burrow." Evidently she was outstanding. The following year she went abroad with Mrs. Holtzman to study for the first of several years, singing and dance in Paris and Milan.

My sister, Margaret, was by this time attending the epochal cultural Training School for Kindergarten Teachers, while I was beginning at an exciting new school: The Lincoln School of Teachers College, the experimental school backed by John D. Rockefeller, Jr. for testing John Dewey's theories on education. My younger sister, Jane, had been enrolled before we went to Lifwynn Camp and I had longed to be able to transfer from the staid girls' boarding school which I was attending to what sounded like a most creative

environment. The experience of the summer freed me to investigate the possibility of my attending Lincoln and I arranged with the school myself to attend on a full scholarship.

"Because we like to have members of the same family here," Dr. Jesse H. Newlon explained. There I joined the remarkable class of 1928, which included not only Laurance Rockefeller, but also the future writers Louis Halle and Charlton Ogburn, the architect and first City Landmarks Commissioner, Harmon Goldstone, the prize-winning hematologist, Anne Pappenheimer, the philanthropist, Pauline Baerwald, the nuclear physicist, Phillip Powers and other classmates who distinguished themselves in their own fields. I also came to know Linda Eder who still remains my closest and dearest friend.

In addition to the publication of *The Social Basis...* the August 1927 saw the formation of another event significant in relation to the group analytic research: the establishment of The Lifwynn Foundation for Laboratory Research in Analytic and Social Psychiatry as projected in the meetings held at Lifwynn Camp the previous summer. A Maryland corporation role was his first scientific director position he fulfilled until his death. The bylaws composed by Clarence Shields and still in effect, precisely reflect the conditions of the group work: the corporation is not only to carry out its stated purpose of research into the "feeling, affective or emotional life of man," but to observe the unfolding of its studies from its same research position. In the preface to section on active membership, Shields describes this process as follows:

(Get bylaws and copy the preface or preamble to active membership- to the community endeavor—indent and single space]

In the preamble to section on Finances there is the following significant (?) statement after it. It is the position of the foundation that man's sense of property is intimately connected with his feeling or affective life and that there is no sociological setting which does not embody a sense of property that is synonymous with restricted feeling. In other words, viewing property as funds as commensurate with a biologically philatelic approach to mans feeling or affective life, The Lifwynn Foundation receives and disburses funds to the end that the community participate in its own study of its own affective or feeling life, through its application of the laboratory principles of The Foundation. (page 12 and 13) As far as I know, this is the only organization in corporate history whose bylaws direct it to carry out its program at the same time that it studied the process of doing so.

In the introduction to *The Neurosis of Man* (?) Burrow speaks of the loss of the friendly, collegial relationships he had enjoyed in the early days of psychoanalysis as his new research changed the direction of his old life and work. Men like Jelliffe, Coriat (?), ~~Frank~~, and others had shared the leadership of the American Psychoanalytic Association. But when Burrow started reporting at Association meetings the new trend of his studies, with their implication of a need for a drastic change in the approach to pschoanalysis, the situation became strained. While Burrow's writings were sometimes turgid, a

judgmental and didactic note often intruded, as he wrote many years later. (Ref. Galt, W., 1958)

Burrow published thirteen papers between 1925 and 1928. Nine of these were delivered at the American Psychoanalytic Association and were intended to explain his position to ~~this~~ [his] psychoanalytic colleagues. They bear such titles as, "Psychoanalytic Improvisations and the Personal Equation," "Our Mass Neurosis," (1926), "Psychiatry as an Objective Science," 1925, "The Reabsorbed Affect and Its Elimination,"(1926), "The Need for an Analytic Psychiatry," (1927), "The Basis of Group Analysis," 1928, "Speaking of Resistances," 1927, "The Group Method of Analysis," (1927), "The Problem of the Transference," (1927), "The Autonomy of the 'I' from the Standpoint of Group Analysis," (1928) "Our Social Evasion," (1926), "Insanity a Social Problem," (1926). "The Heroic [Role]" (19 (**check all dates and place in order**)

~~Quote from some of these papers.~~

Charles Thompson left his recollections of some of such meetings in a brief note. (Quote) [Folder of HISTORICAL MATL. – red sticker on lazy SUSAN –]

[Blum ... – HSS – ? [illegible]]

Burrow continued to try to present his findings of group analysis to his psychoanalytic colleagues, but only L. Pierce ~~Claut~~ [CLARK] seemed to value them. In

two or three papers he apparently (Principle of Primary Identification) applied Burrow's formulations to the preconscious to the study of epilepsy. (Dates of those papers). Otherwise Burrow continued to meet a stone wall in the field of psychoanalysis. Freud wrote to Federn, the editor of _____, that Burrow's failure to expound his method made it impossible to judge it. (Date- could not locate in historical file-ph) The intensity of the situation has to be judged a brief episode recorded in the file of Burrow's correspondence with Harry Stack Sullivan to whom he sent a number of reprints. Sullivan was perhaps the only physician of the American Psycholytic Association meetings who actually understood what Burrow was saying. Sullivan saw them, as is well known, had no psychiatric training himself before he was appointed by William Allenson White (?) to serve as the head of the psychiatric unit at St. Elizabeth's Hospital, Washington, D. C. after the first World War. He had received his medical training at a somewhat questionable medical school in Illinois (?) which was known as something of a diploma mill (Chatelaine) but had studied at George Mead at the University of Illinois (?) and with _____. He himself had short shrift for psychiatrists (Chatelain) and ____ did not permit any on the staff on the special facility that he set up for schizophrenic patients at St. Elizabeth's. He thus brought something of a tablula rasa to the revolutionary that Burrow was expounding. Many of the predessessors that underlay his own radical treatment of skitzophrenics benefited from Burrows ideas, particularly from the latter's view about the lasting influence of prenatal conjugation (Chatelain) and the importance of consentual participation. (ref.

Delete section on Sullivan

Burrow)

The following year The Lifwynn Foundation for Laboratory Research in Analytic and Social Psychiatry was organized with a unique set of bylaws, crafted by Clarence Shields and precisely reflecting the conditions of the group study. At the same time the first phase of that study was drawing to a close. Never again did such a large group converge on Lifwynn Camp, nor was the investigation carried on principally in verbal terms. Rather the participants began to concern themselves with deeper organismic processes as they approached more closely the "biophysical bedrock" Burrow claimed for his findings.

Alternate closing for Chapter IV:

While these arrangments were being for Burrow and Shields to take a smaller office in New York City, where it was felt that the setting might be particularly hospitable to their investigation.

During the summer of 1926, although responses from Burrow's psychiatric and psychoanalytic colleagues remained highly critical, he received expressions of appreciation from several sociologists--Kendall Young at the University of Wisconsin, Alvin Johnson, Director of The New School for Social Research, and Edward C. Vindimin who served on the New York School of Social Work. With their background of study in social trends and processes, they seemed to appreciate more Freud than the psychiatrists, the nature of the phenomenon that Burrow was investigating. And while we were at camp that summer, Burrow received letters from Paul Federn, a close associate of Sigmond Freud, as well as from Freud himself. Federn passed along Freud's wish that Burrow write more fully regarding his methods and findings. (get letter) But Freud wrote that he realized that Burrow was "grappling with an important _____ still unsolved problem," and this was meaningful to Burrow.

The following year The Lifwynn Foundation for Laboratory Research in Analytic and Social Psychiatry was organized with a unique set of bylaws, crafted by Clarence Shields and precisely reflecting the conditions of the group study. At the same time the first phase of that study was drawing to a close.

The conceptions which Freud has brought to the study abnormal and individual psychology have been of incalcuable significance...

It is the falasy of personalism and the differentiation in our human relations which is the essential element in our unconscious agencies of suggestion.

to meet the demands of a more inclusive societal psychology...while in reconstructing the mechanics of the unconscious, psychoanalysis have given the impetus to a truer comprehension of the many distorted expressions of individual mentation,

In the work of psychoanalysis as in our human endeavors everywhere, there enters unavoidable the personal bias that is inseparable from the position of observation concomitant to the observer.

:

Whatever may be the value of this work, in the spirit of its presentation it is in no sense a personal discrimination against the teaching of Freud but rather it is the acknowledged outgrowth of that teaching.

In the usual process of observation, he points out, there is an unwarranted assumption, namely that the position of the observer is valid and privileged. It does not take into account the observer's own organic dimension.

So that we look out at the phenomena of life as from a background, detached spectators of a merely static aspect.

From the point of view of relativity, he goes on, such a detached observational outlook toward life is to view it in the flat, bi-dimensional plane of the image. But an account of life that does not include the consciousness that is our own kinetic function does not encompass life in the full orb of its actuality. "It is within the subjective sphere of our affects, representing our organic racial continuum, that this distortion of outlook is manifested in its deepest poignancy." Burrow compares his more inclusive position to that of the relativists, Freud's to the Newtonians!

the dream and itsnd its analysis; the biological substrate of neurotic conflict; the distinction between sex and sexuality; and the ultimate resolution of the societal neurosis.

In many ways, this is a revolutionary book; it is also a difficult book. Yet surprisingly the critical response was favorable, particularly from the lay press in England and the U.S. A few professional journals greeted it with scorn but the novelist, D. H. Lawrence, wrote a laudatory review.

"Dr. Burrow is that rare thing among psychiatrists, a humanly honest man...Subjective honesty, which means that a man is honest about his own

inward experience, is perhaps the rarest thing, especially among professionals" (1927).

In a private letter, however, Lawrence chided Burrow for the convolutions of his language. Burrow replied, "I love what you say about my excruciating style. It is awful...The as yet unresolved conflict within me between science and art is the thundering noise one hears on every page as I come laboring along." He hopes that "his breathing is less stertorous" in some of his "later things."

These "later things" included "The Laboratory Method in Psychoanalysis," which Burrow delivered as president of the American Psychoanalytic Association at the Ninth Congress of the International Psychoanalytical Association in Bad Homburg, Germany, in 1925. Freud did not attend the Congress but Burrow had sent him copies of his first two reports on group analysis and Freud's reaction not surprisingly was negative. He sent word through Paul Federn, editor of ____ , Zeitschrift that Burrow should explain more fully his method and results; and in "The Group Method of Analysis," he did so. But Freud's coolness persisted—in a letter to Burrow, he expressed his belief that analysis could only be practiced in a group of two and added, "I do not believe that we should be grateful to you for the fact that you want to extend our therapeutic task to improving the world" (November 14, 1926; see also Rosenbaum, 1986).

But a new dimension was already being added to group analysis that would introduce the concrete grounding I referred to earlier.

. It remained as a bitter-sweet memory but by this time I was beginning at an exciting new school:

This provided me with a moment of triumph, but when I mentioned this Burrow indicated that it was to be expected and was not significant. Jack's response, however, was significant to me in my puppy-love and innocence. Although, it did not lead, as it might in more recent years to a physical expression of affection. We spent more time together and it was exciting and meaningful to me, but something about the openness of our declarations was perhaps inhibiting and the different levels of sophistication between Jack and me was also daunting. I recall his mentioning something about his "resistence" to me but I was not sufficiently as sensitive to the signficance of this remark to be able to follow it up with further phyloanalysis.

Toward the end of the summer Margaret and my interest in continuing with the group activities.

Explanation about other transcripts in the Appendix.

Our leaving camp and my going to a new school.

The termination of the group work.

6/6/98

E Getti says TB barred from p/a literature.
She discounts Amer jos. — that his work appeared in

Send EG list of papers appearing