

# **The Individual And The (Large) Group**

Heribert Knott, Stuttgart

*Summary:* The individual is from the very beginning member of an unconscious large group. The group analytic large group can ideally be a setting which allows to understand some unconscious implications of this fact. In this short paper I try to outline some aspects of this human condition in its relevance to conducting a LG.

*Keywords:* *Individual and Group Analysis, Large Groups, Anxiety in Large Groups, Negative Capability, Negative Transference/Countertransference, Institutional Rivalry*

## **Preliminary note**

I am very honoured to be invited today to speak about some of my thoughts regarding group analytic large groups. As I don't know about the theory you use and the way you conduct groups and especially large groups I decided to see the group from the individual's perspective. At the end of the day, the individual's angle, the individual's point of view is the decisive point if you think about the usefulness of a group analytic large group. The question is if the group analytic experience helps the group's members to be enriched by sharing the phantasies the group develops and works through. – I hope this perspective fits with your needs.

As my cultural background as a West German from Cologne might be slightly different from yours it might be interesting to discuss the experiences you made in comparison to my experiences. On top of that the political system changed in your country during the last decades. As manipulation – on an unconscious level, on a preconscious level, as well as on a conscious level – is a common occurrence in large groups in every society, I wonder if it was possible at all to run large groups in an atmosphere of confidentiality – confidentiality seen as a prerequisite for successfully exploring the unconscious of a group and its members. In Germany at least the mistrust of East-Germans to one another changed only slowly.

The time we have is very limited. Maybe the material I prepared is too detailed. As time goes on I shall see how much I have to cut. Please excuse this somewhat improvised procedure. Please feel free to make my presentation more lively by sharing your thoughts with us.

## **Freud and the large group**

In his paper “mass psychology and ego analysis” Freud referred to the individual's

feelings and especially the individual's seduction by the crowd. His special interest he applied to the transference onto the leader of the large group. Freud did not refer to the large group as such nor could he imagine any kind of group analytic group: a group trying to analyse the here and now of the group's unconscious.

Later on in this paper he mentions "the social drive", the "herd instinct" and the "group mind". I quote again

These remarks are valid, I think, for the large group as well as for psychoanalysis, the smallest possible analytic group consisting of two people. Joining another person in order to disclose intimate feelings is a move forward, which many people never dare to make.<sup>1</sup> The loneliness of patients in individual analysis is often due to numerous anxieties regarding people they meet and anxieties regarding the equilibrium of the individual ego and self, and of the internalized object relations. Thus, patients in 'individual' analysis approach a micro-culture of society not only in the sense of the two-persons-group, but also in the sense of opening up about their fantasies about society – often for the first time in their life. Anxiety must be overcome also in individual analysis – and I quote again – 'a watershed between the world and the personal individual experiential mind.'

Since psychoanalysis nowadays tends to analyse the patient's and analyst's unconscious two-person-relationship, psychoanalysis is *sensu strictu* not individual but group analysis, as it is about the unconscious acting and associating of both partners of the analysis. Psychoanalytic theory and practice have become intersubjective. We could ask, if there is any difference between individual analysis and group analysis apart from the number of participants? I would think there is, but I won't further discuss this question, as in my view it requires further consideration<sup>2</sup>. For the purposes of this paper it seems important to maintain that individual and group analyses have a great deal in common<sup>3</sup>: both address the unconscious and they are about triangulation (apart from many other aspects<sup>4</sup>).

## **Two Aspects of Being in a Group**

I want to add a very complicated perspective. Donald Meltzer wrote in his book "studies in extended metapsychology" about the first primordial phantasies of the baby. He found that these phantasies of a new born baby are about groups of pleasure and, more importantly, groups of unpleasure. Only later in its development, the baby child becomes aware of individuality – its own individuality and the individuality of the others. Thus, we have to differentiate the two perspectives of group membership:

---

<sup>1</sup> These states are described for example by John Steiner in his book 'Psychic Retreats' (1992).

<sup>2</sup> See Hopper (2009).

<sup>3</sup> For example, the use by L. Kreeger of material from *individual* psychoanalysis for his lecture in the IGA General Course on transference/countertransference in group analysis (Kreeger 1992: 397) has remained unquestioned.

<sup>4</sup> From the psychoanalytic viewpoint, the confrontation with the stranger and the unknown offers another chance: namely to acquire an understanding of the 'stranger in us', that is, of the unconscious; (Shaked, 2003 b: 157).

on one hand the conscious membership in the group as we perceive it ordinarily, normally used, and on the other hand the very unconscious group feelings I just tried to outline. These feelings and phantasies are linked to auditive/auditory and motoric sensations the baby perceives already during pregnancy in the womb.

### **Who Conducts the Large Group?**

Generally it is accepted that a group is conducted by its convenor: He is at least the time keeper and in most cases he seems to be the most important reference point for the transference.

To broaden our view it could be interesting to see this question from another standpoint: **the group being conducted by the unconscious of the group.** In Foulkesian terms: All members of a group – including the conductor – share the unconscious of the group, and all members are part of the group's matrix. According to Freud the unconscious never gets conscious. The only possibility is creating better interpretations of the reality with the help of the manifestations of the unconscious. That is what we do in Psychoanalysis and group analysis. Those manifestations are as we know slips of the tongue (1), dreams (2), somatic sensations (3), etc. and during a group session especially the succession of the group's associations (4) – including the conductor: in this respect the conductor should be taken as any group member. Looking at the development of a group session from this perspective we can try to observe the unconscious narration the group is trying to become aware of.

What we know from small group experience is valid for the large group as well: i.e. each contribution of a group's member can be seen as one sentence of the story the group is telling to itself. The transference can shift from one to another member; each group member's contribution – including the conductor's contribution – can be seen as an interpretation of the group's state or the group's dynamic. But often the contributions are told in very difficult languages that need translation. At those moments all members try to translate what they hear, each into his own language. In order to understand one another better, the group then tries to develop a common language.

Most often a group consists of people with very different experiences regarding the translation of unconscious feelings. There are people with a God-given talent but no psychotherapeutic training at all. There are people who are very anxious getting aware of the feelings they feel. There are other people with different talents. The more a group consists of well-experienced people the more those experienced people are able to give interpretations of the group's unconscious. And they do so – partly not being aware of this fact.

I hope I find the proper way to open our minds and our souls for the large group we'll have together in a few minutes. (At this point it may be a good opportunity to remind you a book that emphasises the difficulties of translation: Bettelheim, Freud and

man's soul.) You are far more experienced in group analysis as other people and so you'll be able from the very first moment to translate what you feel and to receive the translations of the other group members.

## **Confidentiality**

In this chapter I do not deal about the political aspects of confidentiality. I concentrate on the every-day, you can say 'medical' point of view: the confidentiality every psychiatrist has to offer his patients everywhere in the world.

How can we report about large groups? Do we report about the outer event or the inner processes? We obviously anonymise our notes in individual therapy. The same is true for small groups. With regard to the large group, however, we could hold that due to the internal publicness during session – a wide publicness compared to all other analytic settings – a delimitation against outer publicness is almost superfluous. But, to carry on my argument, I believe, that the great deal of similarities which analyses share independently from the number of participants, confidentiality about any content of large groups is also a necessity. Participants should be able to rely on this. The more group members feel secure, the more unperturbed development can take place.

I have discussed thoughts on the public function of large group sessions onat another occasion<sup>5</sup>. Following the publication of a report of a large group within the profession, I ended up feeling that my inner freedom had been restricted retrospectively. I also noticed that following an ambiguous attitude towards the publicness of a concrete large group, successive sessions are in danger of becoming emotionally flat and meaningless. This could in fact be one possible source of boredom in large group sessions.

Violations of confidentiality are to be expected in any group, and even more so in large groups. In my experience this occurs when the group, subgroups or individuals cannot feel contained by a holding environment. An episode may exemplify this. A group patient accused 'a member of the group' for having 'anonymously told the district attorney' that her father had abused her. (She herself had told the group her fantasies about being abused a few sessions previously.) After some discussion I realised, that the only group member who could have done this was herself. This remark eventually removed her (and the group's) tension. Later on we were able to understand her fantasy of abuse being driven by hers as well as the group's feeling of insecurity.

The helplessness in controlling what group members talk about inside and outside the group has to be recognised, as well as possible limits of confidentiality in a particular situation. At the same time, openly addressing border violations helps the group to

---

<sup>5</sup> Knott (2009).

regain a status of confidentiality. – In large groups most people feel the need of being more thoughtful about how they present themselves to the group than they do in small groups. On the other hand, people in large groups often disclose themselves involuntarily without being hurt by the group afterwards. Like all agreements in analytic settings, confidentiality has to be brought to fruition by carefully addressing its violations.

## **Framework**

Just like the medium sized and the small group, the large group has, no doubt, a framework which should be respected. The rules of the time frame and the rule of free association, for example, are also valid in the large group. The more stable the framework, the more freely all participants can express themselves and the surer they can be that, after a large group session, they will not be confronted by other members or even by strangers with possibly intimate details that have their own meaning within the large group.<sup>6</sup> – Another example for taking care of the large group's framework is the occurring of subgroups spontaneously during the break between large group sessions. The question arises whether or not we can understand these groups, however, as part of the holding mechanism of the large group. For example, the convenor has to examine whether the *emotional* content of those subgroups is expressed in the beginning of the following large group session. In my experience those questions of possible boundary violations have to be decided as the case arises.

J. Shaked (Shaked, 2003 a: 5) maintains that the larger a group, the greater the danger that free association would shift to free discussion<sup>7</sup>. This is quite true, albeit on a rather superficial level. The individual tends to present his contribution in the large group more as a contribution to a discussion, and also as a conscious, rational statement, than as an unconscious association. Personally, I have made positive experiences with taking *all* contributions to be involuntary associations, also in the large group. This also helps understand the different transference levels and identifications in the large group (see below).

A further element of a well working large group is its particular sense of situation comedy. This is due to the atmosphere of alertness and occasional excitement resulting from the simultaneity of the multiple available transferences and identifications. The difference to smaller groups where often there is more tension is also apparent here. (At the other end of the range, in individual analysis situation comedy often is not perceived or not addressed due to shame conflicts.) At the same time, the members of the large group often get carried away to disclose intimate infantile desires which are shamefully kept secret in the small group. Each individual, especially the conductor, is moreover confronted with ideas of grandeur and power

---

<sup>6</sup> It is important to be aware of the fact that all insights obtained during a large group session are primarily valid in this special group at the given time. Using those insights for other purposes (like subgroup or individual deduction) has to be done reticently.

<sup>7</sup> This refers to conscious-targeted discursive speaking, see below.

fantasies, but also with feelings of inferiority. I will refer to the raised anxiety level resulting from this later.

To give an example of situation comedy I may remind you of the fairy tale of the new clothes of the tsar.

### **Anxiety in the Large Group – Negative Capability**

The anxiety level can be much higher in the large group than in the small group. Transference interpretations that could reduce the anxiety level are much more difficult in the large group because it might be oversimplifying to reduce the often very complex situation by interpreting it. For in the large group as well as in the small group, everybody can transfer or receive transferences, and anybody can interpret. These considerations are relevant for each member at any time, whether or not he is speaking at that moment. It is therefore not astonishing that members leave a large group session or – as happens even more frequently – go into ‘inner emigration’ or hide or will not attend any more sessions. They find the multiple transference pressure too much.

These open or hidden drop outs must not be confused, however, with those who drop out because a large group has become simply boring as all members and the convenor consciously and/or unconsciously agreed to keep the discussion at a superficial level. In such situations, the anxiety level is kept down for psycho-dynamic and group dynamic reasons so that nothing else can happen. This method of reducing anxiety levels by keeping the conversation shallow can be observed particularly well in large groups. Hence, if an individual participant is bored, this can on the one hand be an expression of the anxiety which the particular group as a whole might well be able to cope with, but which is too much for the individual. On the other hand, being bored can be the expression of a lacking stability and resignation of the large group as a whole.

Let us return to the large group that can cope with more anxiety, that can hazard a higher level of uncertainty, of curiosity, and where therefore more can be discovered and more can happen. The group as a whole, and the individual members of such a group have to be able to ‘contain’ more anxiety. The term ‘contain’ is derived from the Latin – ‘continere’ – and means to hold something within certain boundaries; or to have the capability of holding something, giving something room, space, potential, capacity. This includes in particular the so-called negative capability that has been described by the poet Keats<sup>8</sup>. Sometimes all group members are affected at once. But often it is only subgroups or individuals, and the ones who are affected can change

---

<sup>8</sup> Keats' expresses his theory of ‘negative capability’ in 1817 in a letter to George and Thomas Keats: ‘I had not a dispute but a disquisition with Dilke, on various subjects; several things dovetailed in my mind, & at once it struck me, what quality went to form a Man of Achievement especially in literature & which Shakespeare possessed so enormously - I mean Negative Capability, that is when man is capable of being in uncertainties, Mysteries, doubts without any irritable reaching after fact & reason.’; in Horace Elisha Scudder (ed.), ‘The Complete Poetical Works of John Keats’, Boston, Riverside Press, 1899, p. 277 (available on [books.google.com](http://books.google.com)).

quickly. Bion would say that the positions of container and contained alternate quickly, within the individual as well as between individuals. On top of that, the extent of integration of container/contained constantly alternates with states of disintegration<sup>9</sup>. The group members, and the conductor in particular, alternate in holding the group ('container'). Participants or conductor introduce a content, a content that wants to be contained, or they feel persecuted ('paranoid-schizoid position'), even disintegrated. Insight can be gained because of the pattern of interaction. Establishing connections is the central principle in the development of thinking. In containment, maternal (receiving) as well as paternal (observing and connecting) functions are at work (Staehle, 2008: 120).

### **The Lonesome Position of the Large Group Conductor**

I would like to share my observations regarding the anxiety in the large group, and in particular the anxiety of the large group conductor. His anxiety can become extreme. In him the positions of container and contained alternate constantly. As he goes through disintegrated and paranoid-schizoid states, he might find it difficult to return to the depressive position. The group conductor, also of the large group, is expected to be able to handle his anxiety. He has to provide what Foulkes calls 'dynamic administration': maintaining the setting (not only in a formal sense), dealing with border violations. He has to bring together, translate, unite, analyse resistance, interpret. But above all he has to take hold of the group's *unconscious* fantasies – under often very complex conditions.

A particular problem in this setting is the loneliness of the large group conductor. The large group conductor is not able to share the inner processes of the large group with one of the participants as in a supervision or intervision situation. He has no closed meetings with other experienced colleagues who are not directly involved in the large group, unless he arranged this beforehand. It is a very frequent reaction for large group conductors to look after the setting in an 'over-reactive' way. Large group conductors often believe that containment is solely their responsibility and are hence unable to sufficiently trust in the containment of the large group itself. In these cases the large group conductors find it particularly difficult to see themselves as part of the process. They think they alone are in charge while they really only have what Wilke would call 'temporary leadership' (Wilke, 2007: 215). The group conductor is also somebody who often enough does not understand anything, who interprets and is interpreted, who is teacher and learner. (The same is true if two or more conductors are working together.)

### **Countertransference as a Guideline**

Being a large group analyst means in my view to analyse the transference.

---

<sup>9</sup> Steiner (1987).

Sociological, institutional and other expertises are secondary. They are derivative and tend to sidetrack the group analyst. Sitting in a large group as analyst requires focusing on the transference at the different levels mentioned above: it requires focusing on one's own countertransference and the quality of anxiety the group is actually dealing with. I have to observe/to feel the delicate and tender feelings the group is actually expressing or avoiding. If I am able to do so I can give a 'running commentary' on what is going on. This running commentary does not have to be verbalised at all times. But the analyst speaking frankly about delicate and tender issues frees the group. The group will benefit, will be grateful, and will be encouraged to do likewise. To follow the development of the group's anxiety is the best guideline to understand the unconscious meanings that await analysis.

In the development of concepts regarding the analytic relationship, the notion of transference was prior to the notion of countertransference. Both notions initially were seen as obstructive barriers or hindrances to analysis. Later on each of them was seen as an indispensable resource to analysing.

Furthermore, the notion of countertransference has to be divided (a) into countertransference the (group) analyst feels unconsciously towards the group as a whole or to member(s) of the group, caused by his personal neurosis, and (b) into countertransference caused by his reaction to the transference of the group. In a given situation the threshold of definition is hard to identify. We often cannot precisely define what is going on. Additionally we are subjected to projective identificatory mechanisms. If we work through a given group session in a supervision or intervision situation we are lucky to get some clarity by hindsight. But as the unconscious never is conscious, we have to settle for generating the best possible hypothesis. By all means, transference and countertransference are reciprocal processes. It seems to me that the most practical approach is to describe a group situation depicting each of the notions according to the occurrence in my mind while working through what I felt.

### **The Large Group and its Institutional Context**

Conducting large groups requires a very careful transference relationship analysis firstly with regard to the group ('the group in the mind') and secondly to the (organisational and institutional) framework of this particular large group. The institutional framework becomes more significant the larger the group is and cannot be valued highly enough. Aspects of institutional dynamics play a prominent part, because any group, including the large group, always strives to become an institution in itself. This means it wants to continue existing, be permanent rather than transient. On the other hand, the setting and a particular institution are always a given, especially the institution that organizes the large group. The institutionalizing tendency of a particular large group often enough conflicts with the institution that organizes it. I call this phenomenon institutional rivalry: which is the better institution? Triest describes this rivalry in hierarchical terms: 'The large group will always threaten the setting imposed upon it by the organization, although it is



naturally dependent upon that setting for its existence.’ (Triest, 2003: 167).

In organizational consultancy the large group is often experienced as more helpful than the conventional committees. This can be a cause of rivalry. The conductor of the large group, however, should be aware of the danger to get roped into this rivalry without analysing the transference.

In my experience, the group analyst is sufficiently prepared for the complex situation if, inwardly, he has gained clarity about the possibly multiple transferences. In his own inner space the large group conductor needs to concentrate on the overall framework of the event, especially before and between sessions. His inner thinking space should then be adequately equipped for the group.

To trust in the large group and to trust in the large group analyst is only possible if the large group conductor avoids any rejection of negative transferences onto himself and onto the group. On top of that, he has to deal insouciantly with the negative transference onto the institution (initially: ‘*devil may care*’, but afterwards: ‘we care very thoroughly since we understand what is going on’). This is only possible through the analysis of unconscious emotions, which avoids embarrassing the group and enables it to think and develop freely.

Many conductors emphasise their good experiences in large groups. And they assume that young colleagues are reluctant to start group work as their beginner's anxiety may be increased by the unpredictable demands of authority and leadership, especially in the large group. In his presentation ‘Authority and Revolt: The Challenges of Group Leadership’, M. Nitsun observes regarding the small group: ‘I doubt whether these anxieties in the conductor are ever fully resolved. While most group analysts probably can live with the uncertainty, I suspect that others cannot and this may account for the fact that some group analysts do not run groups once they have qualified.’ (Nitsun, 2009: 331). I agree with this observation, it fits well with the observation I made in my training institute. And it is even more true for large group conducting. In my view, one reason for this is a sort of *splitting* in the idea of the large group. On one hand, the large group is seen as the possible fulfilling of *Koinonia* (a very constructive working together, see my Introduction, de Maré et al., 1991), while on the other hand, the large group can be seen as a destructive mass, a horde, a mob.

This splitting cannot be resolved by emphasising the creative potential of the large group. On the contrary, anxieties have to be addressed by the conductor. The conductor should not relate to the hope of participants, instead he should rely on participants’ fears of being in the large group and their fears about getting gutted by the large group.

Being in the large group, I therefore analyse very carefully my countertransference. I explore *any impulse to switch from an associative into another mode of discussion*,

for example conscious-targeted discursive speaking. By 'conscious-targeted discursive speaking' I try to describe a reasonably managed discussion about any obvious concerns, such as sociological or gender differences in the group. This often conceals subliminal, free-floating discussions/associations of preconscious/unconscious matters. For example, sociological and gender differences are omnipresent, you find them in any group at any time in one or another way. Speaking about such 'objective' matters is a very popular defence mechanism. Often discussing these well-known matters means a defence against the uncertainty: one never knows what we'll find today in the here and now of the actual group.

Relying on the actually existing anxieties shortens the way to the emotional development of the group. Taking care of the negative transference can act as a spur to development and lessen the need for a group to develop a 'false self'.

## **Conclusion**

In the interest of the process and the development of the individual as well as of the large group as a whole, it is as a matter of principle desirable that every conflict can be expressed and understood *within* the group. In order to enable and promote the emotional growth of the large group, confidentiality in its content is a necessary prerequisite to be re-established at any time. The conductor's guiding principle in this process should be his countertransference. By attempting to discover his conscious and unconscious fears, the large group can develop as 'a watershed between the world and the personal individual experiential mind, which offers the opportunity to humanize both the individual and society concurrently' (Kreeger, 2009: 284).

Although it might sometimes appear even hopeless, it is possible to address real emergencies in a large group. A prerequisite is maintaining 'negative capability'. Just like a small or medium-sized group, a large group can also be an excellent intermediary (transitional) thinking space from which everyone can benefit. In order to help the group to make use of this space, the conductor must face the transferences and identifications without prejudice, especially the negative transferences onto the group, onto the institution that organizes the large group, and onto himself. He must do so, when preparing for the large group as well as during sessions. He will then be able to help generate a rich and creative transitional space.

## **References**

- Bettelheim, B. (1983) *Freud and man's soul*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Bion, W.R. (1982) *The long week-end. 1897 – 1919. Part of a life*. Abingdon: Fleetwood Press. Cited from Quinodoz, J. M. (2006) 'Thinking under fire', *Int. J. Psa.* 87(1), 1–10.

- de Maré, P.B., Piper, R., and Thompson, S. (1991) *Koinonia: From Hate, Through Dialogue, to Culture in the Large Group*. London: Karnac Books.
- Grotstein, J.S. (2009) "... but at the same time and on another level ..." *Psychoanalytic Theory and Technique in the Kleinian/Bionian Mode. Volume two: Clinical Applications in the Kleinian/Bionian Mode*. London: Karnac Books.
- Hinshelwood, R.D. (2007) 'Bion and Foulkes: The Group-as-a-Whole', *Group Analysis* 40(3): 344–356.
- Hopper, E. (2009): 'Building Bridges between Psychoanalysis and Group Analysis in Theory and Clinical Practice', *Group Analysis* 42(4): 406–425.
- Knott, H. (2009) 'Verschwiegenheit über Sitzungen von Großgruppen? Öffentlichkeit – Containment – Denkräume', in: R. Maschwitz, C. Müller, H. Waldhoff (ed.) *Die Kunst der Mehrstimmigkeit*, pp. 105–114. Gießen: Psychosozial-Verlag.
- Kreeger, L. (ed.) (1975) *The Large Group*. London: Constable Publishers & Co.
- Kreeger, L. (1992) 'Envy Preemption in Small and Large Groups', *Group Analysis* 25(4): 391–407.
- Kreeger, L. (2009) 'Introduction to Large Groups', *Group Analysis* 42(3): 282–285.
- Nitsun, M. (2009) 'Authority and Revolt: The Challenges of Group Leadership', *Group Analysis* 42(4): 325–348.
- Shaked, J. (1996) 'Großgruppe und Kleingruppe als Orte der Öffentlichkeit und Intimität', *Jb. f. Gruppenanalyse* 2: 113–122.
- Shaked, J. (2003 a) 'Großgruppe, Massenpsychologie und Gewalt', *Gruppenpsychother. Gruppendynamik* 39(1): 4–21.
- Shaked, J. (2003 b) 'The Large Group and Political Process', in S. Schneider and H. Weinberg (ed.) *The Large Group Re-Visited*, pp. 150–161. London: J. Kingsley Publishers.
- Staehle, A. (2008) 'Sehen und Gesehen-Werden – Verstanden-Werden und lernen, sich selbst und andere zu verstehen', in: M. Hirsch (ed.) *Die Gruppe als Container*, pp. 117–143. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Steiner, J. (1987) 'The Interplay between Pathological Organisations and the Paranoid-Schizoid and Depressive Positions', *Int. J. Psa.* 68: 408–431.

- Steiner, J. (1992) *Psychic Retreats: Pathological Organizations in Psychotic, Neurotic, and Borderline Patients*. London: Brunner, Routledge.
- Triest, J. (2003) 'The Large Group and the Organization', in S. Schneider and H. Weinberg (ed.) *The Large Group Re-Visited*, pp. 162–174. London: J. Kingsley Publishers.
- Wilke, G. (2007) 'Sterben in der Großgruppe – die Sicht des Gruppenleiters', in C. Krause-Girth (ed.) *Die Gruppe, das Paar und die Liebe*, pp. 215–229. Gießen: Psychosozial-Verlag.
- Winnicott, D.W. (1949) 'Hate in the Countertransference', *Int. J. Psa.* 30: 69–74.

**Heribert Knott**, MD, is training group analyst and training psychoanalyst in private practice in Stuttgart, Germany. He was chair of the training committees in Zürich and Stuttgart. Scientific work concerning Balint groups, deferred action and brain physiology, large groups. *Address*: Lindpaintnerstraße 56, D 70195 Stuttgart. *Email*: Heribert.Knott@t-online.de.