

# Chapter 3: Why Groups | 第三章：为什么是群体

## Why Groups

Carrie Sackett and Murray Dabby

### Abstract

This chapter introduces conceptual tools by which the reader can move to the activity of “seeing groups”. The authors provide multiple examples of social therapeutic practice drawn from their Life Development Groups. The authors also point out the primacy of human sociality and deconstruct the myth of the individual—in particular how individualism feeds into loneliness. They add supporting evidence to this claim from science and a growing number of opinions by popular thought leaders. They conclude that a seismic cultural shift is already underway towards something new and emergent. This chapter challenges the tenets of the Enlightenment as applied to the social sciences and introduces the importance of relational activity, i.e., looking to what people are doing (activity) with each other over what they are saying (content) to each other. The authors show that in co-created group environments, it is not necessary for participants to know what they are doing. Freed up from knowing and as an alternative to the cognitive-driven acts assumed to drive behavior change, the Newman and Holzman concept of performed activity is introduced as the key to emotional growth. In performing what we are doing together we can become both more of and other than who we are, i.e., we can grow and develop.

In our country, we see a deeply dangerous turning away from public obligations that is the result of a dangerous turning inward to find sufficiency where it is finally not—only in the self.

— A. Bartlett Giamatti (1980)

The legacy of individualism is loneliness.

— Terry Real (2022)

Historically, pandemics have forced humans to break with the past and imagine their world anew. This one is no different. It is a portal, a gateway between one world and the next.

We can choose to walk through it, dragging the carcasses of our prejudice and hatred, our avarice, our data banks and dead ideas, our dead rivers and smoky skies behind us. Or we can walk through lightly with little luggage, ready to imagine another world and ready to fight for it.

— Arundhati Roy (2020)

For a brief moment in March of 2020, the world stopped. We sat together in global silence for two weeks as quarantines were enforced in almost every country in the world. What did we hear? Melodious birds we had never noticed before. The most delicate sound of the wind rustling through the trees. The sorrowful wail of an ambulance siren echoing on an empty street. We heard the citizens of Italy on their balconies playing musical instruments at exactly the same time. In New York City, people hung out their windows at 5 o'clock every evening for weeks, banging pots in solidarity with frontline health workers.

## 为什么是群体

Carrie Sackett 与 Murray Dabby

### 摘要

本章介绍了一组概念工具，使读者能够进入“看见群体”这一活动。作者以其“生命发展小组”中的实践为例，展示了社会疗愈的多种实践样态。作者还指出人类社会性的首要地位，并解构“个体”这一神话，尤其揭示个人主义如何滋养孤独。为支持这一论点，作者援引科学研究以及越来越多公共思想领袖的观点作为佐证。作者得出结论：一场面向某种新的、正在涌现之物的深层文化转向，已经在发生。本章挑战启蒙运动原则在社会科学中的应用，并引入关系性活动的重要性；也就是说，相较于人们彼此“说了什么”（内容），更应关注人们彼此之间“正在做什么”（活动）。作者指出，在共同创造的群体环境中，参与者并不需要知道自己正在做什么。摆脱“知道”的束缚，并作为对那些被假定能够推动行为改变的认知驱动行为的替代，Newman 与 Holzman 所提出的“表演性活动”概念被引入，作为情感成长的关键。当我们表演我们共同正在做的事情时，我们既能成为更多的自己，也能成为不同于既有自己的存在；换言之，我们能够成长与发展。

在我们的国家，我们看到一种极其危险的转向：人们背离公共责任，而这种背离源于一种危险的向内转向——到最后并不存在充分性的地方去寻找充分性，也就是只在自我之中寻找。

——A. Bartlett Giamatti (1980)

个人主义留下的遗产，是孤独。

——Terry Real (2022)

从历史上看，疫情曾迫使人类与过去决裂，并重新想象自己的世界。这一次也不例外。它是一道门，是一个从一个世界通往另一个世界的入口。

我们可以选择走过这道门，同时把我们的偏见与仇恨的尸骸、我们的贪婪、我们的数据库与死去的观念、我们死去的河流与烟雾弥漫的天空拖在身后。或者，我们也可以轻装走过，带着很少的行囊，准备好去想象另一个世界，并准备好为它而奋斗。

——Arundhati Roy (2020)

在 2020 年 3 月的短暂片刻里，世界停了下来。随着隔离措施在几乎世界上每一个国家实施，我们共同坐在一种全球性的寂静中，持续了两周。我们听见了什么？是此前从未注意过的婉转鸟鸣；是风穿过树梢时最细微、最柔软的声音；是救护车警笛在空荡街道上回荡时悲怆的长鸣。我们听见意大利市民在阳台上，于同一时刻演奏乐器。在纽约市，一连数周，每天傍晚 5 点，人们探出窗外，敲打锅盆，以此表达对一线医护工作者的声援。

People everywhere sought ways to connect in spite of being physically separated. It was an unprecedented moment which ignited an infinitude of creative acts to facilitate a shared sense of community—whether that be learning to do something new together as a family, delivering food for a neighbor with COVID or socially-distanced outdoor group workouts. We were all in it together! At least, for a couple of weeks. Meanwhile lockdown dragged on for two more years (more or less depending on one's geography).

Social distancing and isolation magnified the already unfolding mental health crisis in the US. A 2021 Harvard survey found that 36% of respondents claimed to feel lonely “frequently” or “almost all the time or all the time” with that number jumping to nearly two out of three young adults aged 18-25 (Weissbourd et al., p. 1). While loneliness is broadly recognized as a public health (read: social, of the world) issue, it is not generally seen as socially produced. By and large, loneliness is understood to be an internal subjective state, defined by an inability to form intimate connections and intense feelings of self-doubt and self-worth (Cigna, 2022), regardless of what is happening in the world around us—even a global pandemic! Might the unit of the ‘self’ and the focus on individualism be the issue? And might the solution to loneliness lay outside of the individual?

In the classic *Bowling Alone* (2001) sociologist Robert Putnam postulated a correlation between the erosion of US social institutions since the mid 20th century and the concurrent increase in loneliness. The mass structures through which ordinary people used to connect for pleasure and solidarity—the bowling league, the fraternal lodge, church, unions, book clubs—are in rapid decline. Best-selling author Johann Hari writes in *Lost Connections* (2018), “We are homesick even when we are at home” (p. 97)—an apt description of the experience of feeling disconnected from all that is around us. To effectively address loneliness, John Cacioppo, a University of Chicago researcher and social neuroscientist told Hari that there had to be something more involved than adding other people to one's life. One has to feel, “you are sharing something with the other person, or the group, that is meaningful to both of you [author's italics]” (p. 100). The activity of creating meaning together is appreciated by both coaching and social therapeutics. We will speak more to this in the next chapter.

Perhaps in the collective creativity performed in first weeks of COVID—amidst the uncertainty, fear, chaos, sickness and death—we felt more connected with each other than usual, in both a local and global way. But the rush of doing meaningful activities with and for each other at the beginning of the pandemic was left to fade, unsupported by American political leadership and our deeply embedded cultural insistence on individualism.

## The limits of individualism (the isolated individual to loneliness pipeline)

The Western fixation on the individual has a long history. One way this gets expressed in our times is through consumerist culture. Think of our highly individuated coffee orders, where we are asked to choose from dozens of add-ons. We are more likely to feel pleasure and satisfaction from things we buy than we are from relationships. Organized to be individual consumers of things, we can hardly see that we are producers and co-creators—of relationships, families, communities. This is a key driver of loneliness; we immediately disassociate (feel alienated) from what we have just done, felt and given towards a relationship. In late capitalist Americanized culture, we expect to get what we want emotionally, socially and sexually for our individual selves from

尽管身体上彼此分离，世界各地的人们仍在寻找连接的方式。那是一个前所未有的时刻，点燃了无数富有创造性的行动，以促成一种共享的共同体感——无论是一家人一起学习做新的事情，为感染新冠的邻居送食物，还是在保持社交距离的户外进行集体锻炼。我们都身在其中！至少，在最初的几个星期是如此。与此同时，封锁却又拖延了大约两年（具体长短因地理位置而异）。

社交距离与隔离放大了美国本已展开的心理危机。哈佛大学 2021 年的一项调查发现，36% 的受访者表示自己“经常”或“几乎一直 / 一直”感到孤独；在 18 至 25 岁的年轻成年人中，这一比例跃升至近三分之二（Weissbourd 等，第 1 页）。尽管孤独被广泛视为一个公共健康（也就是：社会性的、世界性的）问题，但它通常并不被看作是由社会生产出来的。总体而言，孤独被理解为一种内在的主观状态，被定义为无法建立亲密连接，以及强烈的自我怀疑与自我价值感低落（Cigna, 2022）；这一理解似乎不受我们周围世界正在发生什么的影响——即使那是一场全球性疫情！问题会不会就在于“自我”这个单位，以及对个人主义的关注？而孤独的解决之道，会不会位于个体之外？

在经典著作《独自打保龄》中，社会学家 Robert Putnam（2001）提出，自 20 世纪中叶以来美国社会机构的侵蚀，与同期孤独感的上升之间存在相关性。普通人过去借以获得快乐与团结的那些大型结构——保龄球联盟、兄弟会会所、教会、工会、读书会——正在迅速衰落。畅销书作家 Johann Hari 在《失去的连接》（2018）中写道：“即便身在家中，我们仍然思乡”（第 97 页）——这恰如其分地描述了那种与周遭一切断开连接的体验。为了有效回应孤独，芝加哥大学研究者、社会神经科学家 John Cacioppo 告诉 Hari，单把更多人加入一个人的生活还不够，还必须有一种更深的东西。一个人必须感到：“你正在与另一个人，或与那个群体，分享某种对你们双方都有意义的东西 [作者斜体]”（第 100 页）。共同创造意义这一活动，同时受到教练与社会疗愈的重视。我们将在下一章进一步讨论这一点。

也许，在新冠疫情最初几周所表演出的集体创造力中——在不确定、恐惧、混乱、疾病与死亡之中——我们比平时更强烈地感到彼此连接，既是在本地层面，也是在全球层面。然而，疫情初期那种与彼此一起、为彼此而做有意义活动的热潮，后来被任其消退；它既没有得到美国政治领导力的支持，也被我们文化中根深蒂固的个人主义坚持所削弱。

## 个人主义的局限（从孤立个体到孤独的管道）

西方对个体的执迷有着漫长的历史。在我们这个时代，这种执迷的一种表现形式就是消费主义文化。想想我们高度个体化的咖啡点单：我们被要求从几十种附加选项中选择。我们更容易从购买的物品中获得愉悦和满足，而不是从关系中获得。我们被组织成物品的个体消费者，以至于几乎看不见自己也是生产者和共同创造者——生产并共同创造关系、家庭、共同体。这是孤独的一个关键驱动因素；我们会立即与自己刚刚为一段关系所做、所感、所给予的东西解离（感到异化）。在晚期资本主义的美国化文化中，我们期待从其他个体自我那里，为我们的个体自我获得情感上、社会上以及性方面想要的东西。当我们得不到想要的东西时，就转向我们最熟悉的做法——把它丢掉。以这种方式生活，作为一个从世界中分离

other individual selves. When we do not get what we want, we turn to what we know how to do best—throw it out. Living like this, as an individual separated out from the world, is a very painful way to exist. As Hari notes, “The primary cause of all this rising depression and anxiety is not in our heads. It is...largely in the world, and the way we are living in it” (p. 14).

The more we feel alone, the greater the difficulty we face in seeing that we are all and always have been part of groups. If we are to consider our fundamental sociality, then we need to look at how deeply Western culture is organized around the primacy of the individual. Of course, individuals exist. But to reduce all the complex happenings of a day or a week, a year or a lifetime, to something happening solely inside us artificially truncates the richness of all that occurs around us, both in society and nature, in all of human history and all of natural history. If our emotional pain is socially and culturally produced, then must not we also consider that the cure is socially and culturally produced?

The primacy of the individual is now being challenged by different disciplines. Terry Real, popular author and family therapist notes that neuroscientists are questioning “the wisdom of singling out the individual as the proper unit of study in human psychology” (2022, p. 36). We are excited by this development, as we are here arguing that the unit to be studied is the group. Adam Grant, organizational psychologist at Wharton Business School, consults with top business leaders and is an advocate of team coaching. He too is concerned with limitations of individualism. “Psychologists find that in cultures where people pursue happiness individually, they may actually become lonelier. But in cultures where they pursue happiness socially—through connecting, caring and contributing—people appear to be more likely to gain well-being” (2021, July 10). Across the Blue Zones of the world—locations where people live the longest—two of the six universal qualities are social engagement and family, i.e., having active social support networks (Poulain, et al., 2004). Healthy relationships fortify responses to trauma as well and become part of the cure to PTSD (Eubanks, 2022, July 5).

For David Brooks, public intellectual and New York Times Op-Ed columnist on culture and the social sciences, we are living in an era of hyper-individualism (2019, February 18). He founded Weave: The Social Fabric Project in 2018 whose manifesto declares, “We need to articulate a creed that puts relation, not the individual, at the center” (2019, February 3). Brooks claims that the myth that an individual alone can make themselves happy or be self-sufficient is driving disconnection (2019, July 3, min. 1:45-2:45). University of Kansas professor of communication studies Jeffrey A. Hall has researched the correlation and impact of the contemporary shift of people spending less time with other people and more time attending to the self. Echoing Yale President Bart Giamatti’s prescient warning to the class of ’84 in this chapter’s epigraph on the danger of shifting away from public obligations, Hall found that “removing the routine obligations of social life drains presence, conversational practice, relational effort and friendship from all of us” (2022, August 11). Like losing muscle mass from skipping gym workouts, we lose our capacity to be social when we avoid interacting with others.

Coaching, by and large, holds to the individual model, in which co-creation is used as a tool to drive the client’s internal process of surfacing the answer to an issue. It operates with the assumption that each person is their own individual, living their individual life. According to executive and life coaching authors Skiffington and Zeus, personal development, “occurs within the context of self-knowledge and self-awareness... the coach, attempts to lead coachees to a deeper and rational understanding of their own

出来的个体，是一种非常痛苦的存在方式。正如 Hari 所指出的：“所有这些日益上升的抑郁与焦虑，其主要原因并不在我们的头脑里。它.....很大程度上在世界之中，在我们生活于其中的方式之中”（第 14 页）。

我们越感到孤单，就越难看见我们所有人都属于群体，并且一直以来都属于群体。如果我们要思考自身根本性的社会性，就需要考察西方文化在多深的层面上围绕“个体优先”而组织。当然，个体是存在的。但是，把一天、一周、一年或一生中所有复杂的发生，都化约为某种只发生在我们内部的东西，就人为截断了我们周围所有发生之事的丰富性——无论是在社会与自然中，还是在人类历史与自然历史的整体之中。如果我们的情感痛苦是由社会和文化生产出来的，那么我们是否也必须考虑，疗愈也同样是由社会和文化生产出来的？

个体的优先地位如今正受到不同学科的挑战。畅销书作者、家庭治疗师 Terry Real 指出，神经科学家正在质疑“把个体单独挑出来作为人类心理学适当研究单位的智慧”（2022，第 36 页）。我们对这一发展感到振奋，因为我们在这里主张，真正应被研究的单位是群体。宾夕法尼亚大学沃顿商学院组织心理学家 Adam Grant 为顶尖商业领袖提供咨询，也是团队教练的倡导者；他同样关注个人主义的局限。“心理学家发现，在那些人们以个体方式追求幸福的文化中，人们实际上可能变得更加孤独。但在那些人们以社会性方式追求幸福的文化中——通过连接、关怀和贡献——人们似乎更有可能获得福祉”（2021 年 7 月 10 日）。在世界各地的“蓝区”——人们寿命最长的地区——六项普遍特质中有两项是社会参与和家庭，也就是拥有活跃的社会支持网络（Poulain 等，2004）。健康的关系也能强化人们对创伤的回应，并成为创伤后应激障碍疗愈的一部分（Eubanks，2022 年 7 月 5 日）。

公共知识分子、《纽约时报》文化与社会科学专栏作家 David Brooks 认为，我们正生活在一个超个人主义的时代（2019 年 2 月 18 日）。2018 年，他创立了 Weave: The Social Fabric Project，其宣言写道：“我们需要阐明一种信条，把关系，而不是个体，置于中心”（2019 年 2 月 3 日）。Brooks 声称，认为单独的个体可以让自己幸福或自给自足的神话，正在驱动人们彼此断联（2019 年 7 月 3 日，1:45-2:45）。堪萨斯大学传播学教授 Jeffrey A. Hall 研究了当代转变的相关性与影响：人们花更少时间与他人在一起，而花更多时间关注自我。呼应本章题词中耶鲁大学校长 Bart Giamatti 对 1984 届学生所作的预见性警告——背离公共责任的危险——Hall 发现：“移除社会生活中的日常义务，会让我们所有人身上耗尽在场感、对话练习、关系努力和友谊”（2022 年 8 月 11 日）。就像不去健身房会失去肌肉量一样，当我们回避与他人互动时，也会失去我们的社会能力。

总体而言，教练仍然坚持个体模型；在这一模型中，共同创造被用作一种工具，以推动客户内部浮现出某个问题的答案。它以这样一种假设为基础：每个人都是自己的个体，过着自己的个体生活。根据高管与人生教练作者 Skiffington 和 Zeus 的说法，个人发展“发生在自我知识与自我觉察的语境之中.....教练试图引导被教练者对自己的个人真理与价值形成更深、更理性的理解”（2003，第 34 页）。我们相信，教练领域——无论是从其根源出发，还是从其对

personal truths and values (2003, p. 34). We believe there is room in coaching—both coming out of its roots and in its appetite for innovation—to offer models that move beyond the self. It might feel natural to look inward, but that does not mean that it is the only place we can look. However, looking anywhere else involves examining and questioning ways we have stayed invested in the individual model.

As we examined in the first chapter, coaching emerged out of the group work of est and other counter-cultural initiatives of the 1960s and 70s. It also emerged out of the Human Potential Movement (HPM), self-help, and personal development trends of the times. The emerging demand for executive coaching created the market for individual work. As coaching expanded it carried with it psychology's inward-looking constructs. For early coaching chronicler Vicky Brock, it was a "logical next step after group participation" (2014, p. 78). The client can look inside for self-knowledge and change how they think. They can change their individual story. One of coaching's main influences and founder of humanist psychology Carl Rogers, asserted that what gets in the way of understanding ourselves is our social experiences—i.e., in interacting with other humans, we run the risk of losing, or never finding, ourselves (1961).

Even newer, more holistic approaches to well-being hold onto the individual, internal view of change. In coaching, psychotherapy and neuroscience involving trauma, somatics and psychedelics, great advances have been made to bridge the dualism of mind/body. There is broader mainstream understanding and acceptance today that mind/body is a unified whole. However, at the same time, those approaches rarely question the dualistic divide between inside and outside, self and other. The assumption that looking inward is the path to relieving our emotional pain is difficult to dislodge.

## Human sociality and community

For us as practitioners, almost every client who walks through the door carries those same host of assumptions about themselves and the world based on a nearly impenetrable belief of the isolated individual. Our culture and our psychology drive the belief that we start out as individuals and then become acculturated to groups. As such, we do not see ourselves in relation to others, as social. There are, however, a few cultural exceptions where we do see groups: sports, music and theatre. In a marching band we expect to hear the total sound, not a particular instrument. In vocal harmonies, if the listener hears one particular voice, the performance is considered to fall short. As the saying goes, there is no 'I' in team. The incredible feats of an individual player cannot be recounted without the team's efforts. In these cases, the unit is socially understood to be the group. It is theater that gave us the word 'ensemble'—a seamless group performance. The phrase we use in English to capture this sort of group work is the sum is greater than its parts.

In the previous chapter, we shared how Lev Vygotsky saw child development as occurring first as a social activity, then on an individual level as the child adapts to social norms and the world around them. Now, there is a growing body of scientific research supporting the sociality of the human species, that we are "wired to connect" and that our "social behavior is a critical part of our adaptive toolkit. It allows us to come together and do things that we wouldn't be able to do on our own" (Platt, as quoted in Sukel, 2019, November 13). That is, in groups, we can perform ahead of ourselves. Or as Holzman puts it, "human development is not an individual accomplishment but a socio-cultural activity" (2015, p. 131). Studies are now showing that community-building is essential to social and emotional development. (Weissbourd et al., 2021,

创新的渴望出发——都有空间提供超越自我的模型。向内看也许感觉自然，但这并不意味着那里是我们唯一可以看的。然而，要看向其他任何地方，都意味着我们必须检视并质疑自己一直以来如何投注于个体模型。

正如我们在第一章所考察的，教练兴起于 est 以及 20 世纪 60、70 年代其他反主流文化倡议中的群体工作。它也兴起于当时的人类潜能运动（HPM）、自助以及个人发展潮流。对高管教练的新兴需求创造了个体工作的市场。随着教练的发展，它也携带了心理学向内看的建构。对于早期教练史记录者 Vicky Brock 而言，教练是“群体参与之后合乎逻辑的下一步”（2014，第 78 页）。客户可以向内寻找自我知识，并改变他们的思考方式；他们可以改变自己的个体故事。教练的主要影响来源之一、人本主义心理学创始人 Carl Rogers 断言，妨碍我们理解自身的是我们的社会经验——也就是说，在与其他人互动时，我们面临失去自我或永远找不到自我的风险（1961）。

即使更新、更整体的福祉取向，也仍然抓住个体的、内部的改变观不放。在涉及创伤、身体性和迷幻药的教练、心理治疗与神经科学中，已经取得了很大进展，弥合了心 / 身二元论。今天，主流社会对“心 / 身是一个统一整体”已有更广泛的理解和接受。然而与此同时，这些取向很少质疑内部与外部、自我与他者之间的二元分割。认为向内看就是缓解情感痛苦之路的假设，仍然很难被撼动。

## 人的社会性与共同体

作为实践者，在我们看来，几乎每一位走进门来的客户，都带着同样一整套关于自己和世界的假设，而这些假设建立在一种几乎无法穿透的“孤立个体”信念之上。我们的文化和心理学共同推动这样一种信念：我们起初是个体，随后才被社会化进入群体。因此，我们并不把自己看作与他人处在关系之中，也不把自己看作社会性的。当然，也有少数文化例外，在那里我们确实能够看见群体：体育、音乐和戏剧。在行进乐队中，我们期待听到的是整体的声音，而不是某一件乐器。在声乐和声中，如果听众听见某一个具体的声音，这场表演就被认为有所欠缺。俗话说，团队里没有“我”。一个个体球员的惊人表现，不可能离开团队的努力而被讲述。在这些情形中，社会上被理解为单位的是群体。正是戏剧给了我们“ensemble（合奏 / 群戏 / 整体演出）”这个词——一种无缝衔接的群体表演。英语中用来概括这类群体工作的表达是：整体大于部分之和。

在上一章中，我们分享了 Lev Vygotsky 如何看待儿童发展：它首先作为一种社会活动发生，随后才在个体层面发生，因为儿童会适应社会规范和周围世界。如今，越来越多科学研究支持人类这一物种的社会性：我们“天生被连接所塑造”，而且我们的“社会行为是我们适应工具箱中的关键部分。它使我们能够聚在一起，做那些单靠自己无法做到的事情”（Platt，引自 Sukel，2019 年 11 月 13 日）。也就是说，在群体中，我们能够超前于自己而表演。或者正如 Holzman 所说：“人的发展不是个体成就，而是一种社会文化活动”（2015，第 131 页）。如今的研究正在表明，共同体建构对于社会与情感发展至关重要（Weissbourd 等，2021 年 2 月 9 日，第 4 页）。甚至在非营利与社会正义领域，也正在出现一种“共同体照护”（相对于自我照护）的运动（Dockray，2019 年 5 月 24 日）。

February 9, p. 4). There is even a ‘community care’ (as opposed to self-care) movement emerging within the nonprofit and social justice worlds (Dockray, 2019, May 24). The task of social therapeutic groups is to work together to create the possibility of human development. Along the way, clients create their sense of belonging and shared meaning.

By the 1990s, participants of the diverse therapeutic, cultural and political efforts led by Fred Newman—shorthanded as The Development Community—took to exploring what it meant to share the responsibility of collectively creating the community itself. In a talk by Newman in 1990, later published as *Community as Heart in a Havenless World*, he said:

I want to talk about community not as a haven, not a place where we can go and hide, but as an active principle, as a human, passionate, living environment which has the capacity to nourish those of us who are committed to engaging the cruelty of a havenless world. I want to talk about that kind of community...a community which takes responsibility for defining what community is (Newman, 1991, p. 142, 145).

In social therapeutic Life Development Groups, the group takes responsibility for defining itself. The activity of creating, reshaping and rebuilding what the group is week after week builds community. The next section provides much practical guidance to the practitioner on what that activity looks like.

Many assume that seeing and working in groups requires giving up individuals and individuality. That is not the case. In our experience with both Life Development Groups and couples work, clients become more of who they are as they build the group. They discover how to articulate their wants, desires, reactions, emotions as part of a co-created play with others. People together creating their relationships, their communities, their families, their work teams—their groups—is an antidote to the pervasive lonely culture of individualism in the US and beyond. When people do this kind of couples or group work together in social therapeutics, it becomes a challenge—in practice—to relating to ourselves and others as individuals with inner selves and inner-problems (Holzman, 2015). Or, as our clients say of their experience in group sessions, we “get off the me [tread]mill and onto the we [tread]mill.”

## The case for heterogeneous groups

If the unit is the group, then building the group involves using everything around us—our histories, our tragedies, our joys, our pains, our similarities, our differences, our conflicts, our families, our communities and the state of the world. Social therapeutic groups break with the most common model of group work—the assumption that participants must be “like” each other in order to get any help. Those groups are called homogeneous groups. Most groups today are based on a sameness—of identity (e.g., LGBT+), emotional issue (e.g., depression), life experience (e.g., trauma survivor) or life goals (e.g., weight loss). The assumption is that with sameness comes understanding, and with understanding and being understood lies the path to recovery and normalcy.

There is a lot to unpack in that assumption. How does the cognitive act of understanding bring people together in a qualitative way? Might the requiring of sameness keep us at a distance from one and other, less curious and more assumptive? How do we keep working out our relational/emotional muscles if we set identity-based boundaries upon whom we may converse with? Some think the loss of everyday connection and conversation—including with people different than ourselves—increases our rigid assumptions of and

社会疗愈小组的任务，是共同工作以创造人类发展的可能性。在这个过程中，客户创造出他们的归属感和共享意义。

到 20 世纪 90 年代，由 Fred Newman 领导的多样化疗愈、文化和政治努力的参与者——简称为“发展共同体”——开始探索：共同承担集体创造共同体本身的责任，意味着什么。Newman 在 1990 年的一次讲话中说，后来这篇讲话以《无庇护世界中的共同体之心》为题发表：

我想谈的共同体，不是一个避难所，不是一个我们可以前往并躲藏起来的地方，而是一项主动原则；它是一种人的、充满热情的、活生生的环境，有能力滋养我们这些致力于直面一个无庇护世界之残酷的人。我想谈的是那样一种共同体……一种承担起定义“什么是共同体”之责任的共同体（Newman, 1991, 第 142、145 页）。

在社会疗愈的“生命发展小组”中，小组承担起定义自身的责任。每一周，创造、重塑并重建小组是什么的活动，建构着共同体。下一节将为实践者提供大量实践性的指引，说明这种活动看起来是什么样子。

许多人以为，看见群体并在群体中工作，必须放弃个体和个体性。事实并非如此。根据我们在生命发展小组和伴侣工作中的经验，客户在建构群体的过程中，反而成为更多的自己。他们发现，自己的需要、渴望、反应和情绪，可以作为与他人共同创造的游戏 / 戏剧的一部分而被表达。人们一起创造他们的关系、共同体、家庭、工作团队——他们的群体——这是对美国及其以外地区弥漫的个人主义孤独文化的一剂解药。当人们在社会疗愈中共同进行这种伴侣或群体工作时，它在实践中就成为一种挑战：挑战我们将自己和他人关系化为拥有内在自我与内在问题的个体（Holzman, 2015）。或者，正如我们的客户谈到小组体验时所说，我们“从‘我’的跑步机上下下来，走上‘我们’的跑步机”。

## 异质性群体的理由

如果单位是群体，那么建构群体就意味着使用我们周围的一切——我们的历史、悲剧、喜悦、痛苦、相似之处、差异、冲突、家庭、共同体，以及世界的状态。社会疗愈小组打破了最常见的群体工作模型——即参与者必须彼此“相像”才可能获得任何帮助的假设。这类群体被称为同质性群体。今天，大多数群体都建立在某种“相同”之上——身份（例如 LGBT+）、情感议题（例如抑郁）、生命经验（例如创伤幸存者）或人生目标（例如减重）。其假设是：有相同就会有理解，而在理解与被理解之中，存在着通向康复与正常化的道路。

这一假设有许多值得拆解之处。理解这一认知行为，究竟如何在质性意义上把人们带到一起？要求相同，会不会反而让我们彼此保持距离，减少好奇，增加想当然？如果我们依据身份边界来限定自己可以与谁交谈，又如何持续锻炼我们的关系 / 情感肌肉？有些人认为，日常连接和对话的丧失——包括与不同于我们自己的人连接和交谈的丧失——会增加我们对他人僵硬假设，并随后增强对他人的不感兴趣（Grant, 2021; Hall, 2022）。我们被社会建构的身

subsequent disinterest in others (Grant, 2021; Hall, 2022). Our socially constructed identities overdetermine how we see ourselves, what we think we can do with others, who we think we can be in the world and how we are supposed to feel. In the unfinished work of social justice, there is growing awareness that we must innovate how we come together, create together and build together in the organically heterogeneous groups in which we live, work and play. In our Life Development Groups, clients get challenged and challenge each other on “who they think they are.” It is enormously valuable to hear how others experience us. It helps create the space for becoming. As we outlined in the previous chapter, transformation is better understood as the dialectical relationship of being/becoming.

Through the lens of Newman and Holzman’s zpd, the growth occurs through group members with their differing levels of development working together. This is a break from the idea that we must understand or know each other in order to move forward together. Instead, we must build together. And, if the focus is on the group, then there is no longer a need to arrange groups based on a single interest. Everyone can build a group. The drive to understand and coalesce around each other’s sameness gets in the way of seeing the activity of what people are doing together. In short, in heterogeneous groups it is more obvious that growth grows out of the activity of creating together with what there is.

### <box 3.1 >

An example of a social therapeutic Life Development Group session

A gay man asked the group for help on having a conversation with his partner of six months. They went out of town for a wedding. His boyfriend was away at a rehearsal for several hours and he sought out a casual sexual encounter. Should he tell his partner? The partner had reluctantly agreed to the arrangement and said he wanted to hear if/when there were encounters. However, the client was not sure his boyfriend really meant it. The client added that he was unsure about bringing this to group, as he was the only LGBT+ person in the eight-person group.

The group started out doing what we had all learned to do: help an individual solve their problem, to get it “right” or do it the “right” way. They went to giving advice on what he should do, then slowed down and became more philosophical. What do people in the group do when they desire different things than their partner (sexual or otherwise), the coach asked? I try to give voice to my needs, someone responded. Someone else shared their experience with monogamous and non-monogamous relationships and concluded the intimacy generated had way more to do with how they spoke with each other and approached hard conversations. Another client raised the issue of possession in relationships. A woman added her experience of being possessed by her male partner and how hard and scary it was to leave the relationship.

The coach questioned, “Can we converse with our partners/loved ones/dear friends in such a way to create a conversation, rather than speaking in a way designed for us to get our way/what we want? How do we do it here, in group?”

At the end of group, the client noted that he felt supported by the group to have a more open and connected conversation with his partner than he had considered on his own. He said he was glad that he was not leaving with a specific directive on what to do.

### <Box 3.1 ends>

份，过度决定了我们如何看待自己，认为自己能够与他人做什么，认为自己在世界上能够成为谁，以及认为自己应该如何感受。在社会正义尚未完成的工作中，人们越来越意识到，我们必须创新我们如何相聚、共同创造并共同建构，尤其是在我们生活、工作和游戏其中的那些有机的异质性群体中。在我们的生命发展小组里，客户会就“他们以为自己是誰”受到挑战，也彼此挑战。听见他人如何体验我们，具有巨大的价值。它帮助创造一个“成为”的空间。正如我们在上一章中所概述的，转化最好被理解为“存在 / 生成”的辩证关系。

通过 Newman 和 Holzman 的 ZPD（最近发展区）视角，成长发生在发展水平不同的小组成员共同工作之中。这打破了一种观念：我们必须理解彼此、知道彼此，才能一起前进。相反，我们必须一起建构。而且，如果焦点在群体上，那么就不再需要围绕某一个单一兴趣来安排群体。每个人都能够建构一个群体。那种围绕彼此的相同性去理解并凝聚的冲动，会妨碍我们看见人们共同正在做什么这一活动。简言之，在异质性群体中，更明显的是：成长是从带着已有之物共同创造的活动中生长出来的。

### <框 3.1 >

一个社会疗愈“生命发展小组”会谈示例

一位男同性恋者请求小组帮助他与其交往六个月的伴侣进行一次谈话。他们曾出城参加一场婚礼。他的男友因排练离开了数小时，在那期间，他寻求了一次随性的性接触。他应该告诉伴侣吗？伴侣曾勉强同意这种安排，并说如果 / 当发生这样的接触时，他想听到相关情况。然而，这位客户并不确定男友是否真的那么想。他还补充说，自己不确定是否该把这件事带到小组中来，因为在这个八人小组里，他是唯一的 LGBT+ 成员。

小组一开始做的是我们所有人都学会了去做的事：帮助一个个体解决他的问题，让事情变得“正确”，或以“正确”的方式去做。大家开始给他建议，告诉他应该怎么做；随后小组慢了下来，变得更具哲学性。教练问：当小组中的人们想要的东西与伴侣想要的不同时（无论是性的，还是其他方面的），他们会怎么做？有人回答说：我会努力说出自己的需要。另一个人分享了一夫一妻和非一夫一妻关系中的经验，并得出结论：所生成的亲密感，更多取决于他们如何彼此交谈，以及如何面对困难对话。另一位客户提出了关系中的占有问题。一位女性补充了自己被男性伴侣占有的经验，以及离开那段关系有多么艰难和可怕。

教练提出问题：“我们能否以一种创造谈话的方式，与伴侣 / 所爱之人 / 亲密朋友交谈，而不是用一种旨在让我们得到自己想要的东西、让事情按我们意愿发展的方式说话？在这里，在小组中，我们是怎样做到这一点的？”

小组结束时，这位客户表示，他感到自己得到了小组的支持，能够与伴侣进行一场比自己独自设想时更开放、更有连接的谈话。他说，他很高兴自己离开时并没有带着一具体指令，告诉他该做什么。

### <框 3.1 结束>

In this sample Life Development Group shared above, the group both responded to the gay client and gave of themselves. In doing so, their different-ness from one and other contributed to the conversation of the group. There was no need to identify (presume an understanding based on a category) with what someone else was saying. The philosophical questions from the coach helped to guide the conversation away from identity-based talk toward more emotionally intimate conversation.

Social therapeutic practitioners offer short-term groups, but mostly their groups are ongoing. Many clients move out of crisis, begin developing emotionally (more on this in the next chapter) and decide to continue with group. They see the activity of building the group as a weekly opportunity for an emotional workout with others with whom they have built a sense of community. Rather than seeking tools to adapt better to society, social therapeutic clients seek to create new ways of being, seeing, doing and feeling together.

There are two other examples of heterogenous group work we have come across. Interpersonal process group psychotherapy brings together people with diverse issues—grief, loneliness, etc. Clients are invited to include their emotional experiences in the moment as a way of understanding themselves better. This is a powerful advance and creates space to include how clients relate to each other in group, which can lead to important discoveries and growth. And, at the same time our sense is that the therapist remains the authority in group, adding explanations and causes to why a client might be the way they are, helping them to adapt to the world. The focus is to build up individuals, not necessarily the group. As a corollary, the invitation to the group to build itself is missing.

Corporate team coaching is growing rapidly, and again the business community is leading the way in innovating how people communicate and interact together (See Rod & Fridjhon, 2020). First, a grouping of employees is assumed to be heterogeneous in demographic diversity, subject matter expertise, emotional development as well as leadership skills. In *The Wisdom of Crowds* (2004), James Surowiecki sought to understand the elements of high-achieving corporate teams and smart team decision-making. He found that diversity, independence and decentralization were key. Of course, Surowiecki's eye was towards discovering the best conditions for a specific outcome—achieving the company's strategic goals. Social therapeutics' eye is toward creating the conditions for the group to grow, without a predetermined outcome of what that might or should look like. In this way, social therapeutics is process-oriented, whereas corporate coaching is ultimately results-oriented. In the final section, we include a case study on social therapeutic team coaching.

Second, the unit of team is more commonly appreciated. Adam Grant advocates for companies to “start treating teams, not individuals, as the fundamental building blocks of the organization” (2019, May 2). To achieve mastery in team coaching according to the International Coaching Federation, the coach must relate to the client team as a unit (2020, p. 5). As for how to do that, we hope that this book offers innovative methodological guidance.

## Seeing groups (Everywhere)

As a social species, connected and interdependent, (think: Robinson Crusoe's “no man is an island” or Tom Hanks in *Cast Away*) we are always in groups. Native American and indigenous cultures have understood and practiced a way of life in which it is understood that everything and everyone is connected. Genetic scientists are finding proof of our inherent sociality (Dobbs, 2013). In Western culture,

在上面分享的这个生命发展小组例子中，小组既回应了这位男同性恋客户，也贡献了自己。在这样做的过程中，成员彼此之间的差异性为小组的谈话作出了贡献。没有必要去认同（也就是基于某个类别预设一种理解）他人所说的话。教练提出的哲学性问题，帮助谈话从基于身份的言说，转向更具情感亲密性的谈话。

社会疗愈实践者会提供短期小组，但他们的小组大多是持续性的。许多客户走出危机，开始在情感上发展（下一章会进一步讨论），并决定继续留在小组中。他们把建构小组这一活动，看作每周一次与他人进行情感锻炼的机会，而这些他人已经与他们共同建立起一种共同体感。社会疗愈的客户并不是寻求工具以便更好地适应社会，而是寻求共同创造新的存在、看见、行动和感受的方式。

我们还遇到过另外两个异质性群体工作的例子。人际过程团体心理治疗会把带有不同议题的人聚在一起——悲伤、孤独等等。客户被邀请把当下的情感经验纳入其中，以便更好地理解自己。这是一个有力的进展，也创造了空间，使客户能够纳入他们在小组中如何彼此关联；这可能带来重要的发现和成长。与此同时，我们的感觉是，治疗师在小组中仍然保有权威，会为客户为什么会成为那样的人添加解释和原因，帮助他们适应世界。焦点在于建构个体，而未必是建构群体。作为相应结果，邀请小组建构自身这一部分是缺失的。

企业团队教练正在迅速发展，而且商业共同体再次走在创新人们如何共同沟通与互动的前沿（见 Rod & Fridjhon, 2020）。首先，一组员工被假定为异质性的，无论是在人口统计多样性、主题专业知识、情感发展，还是领导技能方面。在《群体的智慧》（2004）中，James Surowiecki 试图理解高成就企业团队和明智团队决策的要素。他发现，多样性、独立性和去中心化是关键。当然，Surowiecki 关注的是发现实现特定结果的最佳条件——也就是达成公司的战略目标。社会疗愈关注的则是创造条件，使群体能够成长，而不预先决定这种成长可能或应该是什么样子。由此，社会疗愈是过程导向的，而企业教练最终则是结果导向的。在最后一节，我们会纳入一个社会疗愈团队教练的案例研究。

其次，“团队”作为单位更常被重视。Adam Grant 倡导公司“开始把团队，而不是个体，视为组织的基本构成单元”（2019 年 5 月 2 日）。根据国际教练联合会的说法，要在团队教练中达到精通，教练必须把客户团队作为一个单位来关联（2020，第 5 页）。至于如何做到这一点，我们希望本书能够提供创新性的方法论指引。

## 看见群体（无处不在）

作为一个社会性物种，彼此连接、相互依存，（想想鲁滨逊·克鲁索的“没有人是一座孤岛”，或 Tom Hanks 在《荒岛余生》中的处境），我们始终身处群体之中。美洲原住民和其他原住民文化理解并实践着一种生活方式，在其中，一切事物、每一个人都被理解为彼此连接。遗传科学家正在发现我们内在社会性的证据（Dobbs, 2013）。在西方文化中，转向看见我们始终处在群体之中，需要

shifting to seeing that we are always in groups requires a challenging, but experientially learnable shift of ontology. By experiential, we mean a doing-with-others. By ontology, we intend a different 'lens and mindset' if you will. One example in human history of an ontological shift occurred in the late Renaissance. In the early 1600s, Galileo published scientific evidence that the sun, rather than the earth, was at the center of the universe. This caused a huge upheaval in how people saw themselves in the world and in relation to God. The Catholic Church felt so threatened by this new way of seeing that they forced Galileo to retract his findings. As we know, that did not stop the shift to heliocentrism. Today we characterize that moment in human history as a scientific revolution. Humans created and propelled a new lens—both scientific and cultural—through which to operate in the world.

Another way this gets talked about in our era is that we construct—socially construct—our understandings of how the world works, the norms of our society and who we are in it. The principal way this occurs is through creating narratives, i.e., language and communication, inclusive of people's subjective experiences. Ken Gergen was an early proponent of and one of the pioneers of social constructionism. Chair of the Psychology Department at Swarthmore College when he published *The Saturated Self* (1991), Gergen postulated that what we can know in this postmodern world is created in relation to others also living in this moment. In other words, our understandings cannot be reduced to a single truth; they change as the world changes.

Having an appreciation that we humans are the producers of world change and also the product of all of human history up until this moment, enables seeing groups. We live in both society—with norms and rules that we are meant to follow—and history, made by humans who have again and again broken with the norms and rules of their times to create something new. It is that capacity that we tap into in social therapeutic work: the capacity to create groups everywhere. It is bringing the intentionality of creating a performance together and asking, "How do we want to do this?" Unfortunately, American capitalist culture (society) relates to us as consumers—of diagnoses, of products, of problems, of roles. It alienates us from our experiences and feelings as well as from others' experiences and feelings.

### <Box 3.2 begins>

Taking the group with you

Sometimes the group will be working on something and a more experienced group member may say to another, "Take the group with you, when you're nervous and walking into a meeting." Usually there is someone in the group who objects to that metaphorical direction. They see it as ridiculous or as a weakness, saying something like, "Why would I take the group with me? I am an individual. What I do in group is separate from my life." Yet, when clients do take the group with them, they are embracing what they have created together. In holding onto individualism, that group member sees the group's work as a consumer, as someone whose role is to get as much out of the group without giving much. To not take the group with them is a rejection of the group's offer, the coach and what everyone has built together.

Here is an example of what 'taking the group' looks like.

A client does what she calls a 'U-turn' in group. At first, she provides leadership to the group, saying something beyond herself, something bold and helpful to the group. Then, she has reactions to having done that and backtracks, takes it away, and feels humiliated.

一种具有挑战性但可以通过经验学习到的本体论转变。所谓经验性，我们指的是一种与他人一起做。所谓本体论，我们指的是一种不同的“镜头与心态”，如果可以这样说的话。人类历史上本体论转变的一个例子发生在文艺复兴晚期。17 世纪初，伽利略发表了科学证据，证明位于宇宙中心的是太阳，而不是地球。这在人们如何看待自己在世界中的位置以及与上帝的关系方面，引发了巨大震荡。天主教会感到这种新的看见方式构成了严重威胁，于是迫使伽利略收回他的发现。正如我们所知，这并没有阻止向日心说的转变。今天，我们把人类历史上的那个时刻称为一场科学革命。人类创造并推动了一种新的镜头——既是科学的，也是文化的——借由它在世界中行动。

在我们这个时代，另一种谈论这一点的方式是：我们建构——社会性地建构——我们对世界如何运作、社会规范以及我们在其中是谁的理解。发生这一过程的主要方式，是创造叙事，也就是语言和沟通，其中也包括人们的主观经验。Ken Gergen 是社会建构论的早期倡导者和先驱之一。在出版《饱和的自我》（1991）时，他是斯沃斯莫尔学院心理学系主任。Gergen 提出，在这个后现代世界中，我们所能知道的，是在与同样生活于此刻的他人的关系中被创造出来的。换言之，我们的理解不能被化约为一个单一真理；它们会随着世界变化而变化。

当我们能够理解，人类既是世界变化的生产者，也是截至此刻为止全部人类历史的产物，我们就能够看见群体。我们同时生活在社会之中——社会有我们被要求遵守的规范和规则——也生活在历史之中，而历史是由一次又一次打破其时代规范与规则、创造新事物的人类所构成。社会疗愈工作所调动的，正是这种能力：到处创造群体的能力。它把共同创造一场表演的意向性带入其中，并发问：“我们想怎样一起做这件事？”不幸的是，美国资本主义文化（社会）把我们当作消费者来对待——诊断的消费者、产品的消费者、问题的消费者、角色的消费者。它使我们与自己的经验和感受相异化，也使我们与他人的经验和感受相异化。

### <框 3.2 >

把小组带在身边

有时，小组正在处理某件事，一位更有经验的小组成员可能会对另一位成员说：“当你紧张地走进会议时，把小组带在身边。”通常小组中会有人反对这个隐喻性的指引。他们会把它看作荒唐，或看作一种软弱，并说出类似这样的话：“我为什么要把小组带在身边？我是一个个体。我在小组里做的事，与我的生活是分开的。”然而，当客户确实把小组带在身边时，他们是在拥抱自己与他人共同创造出的东西。当那位小组成员抓住个人主义不放时，他把小组的工作看作一个消费者所看的东西——把自己的角色理解为尽可能从小组中获取，而不必给予太多。不把小组带在身边，就是拒绝小组的给予、拒绝教练，以及拒绝每个人共同建构起来的一切。

下面是一个“把小组带在身边”看起来是什么样子的例子。

一位客户在小组中做了她称之为“U 形转弯”的事情。起初，她为小组提供领导，说出一些超越自身的、勇敢而对小组有帮助的话。随后，她对自己做了这件事产生反应，开始往回退，把它收回去，并感到羞辱。这一直是小组与她共同参与处理的事情。两个月后，她

This continues to be something the group engages with her on. Two months later she reported to the group how getting closer to and building the group helped her through.

"I was in the mountains with Antonio (the person I have started seeing) and I felt shame and fear of failure many times (when I was cooking, when I was hiking, when I was doing anything I don't do on a normal basis). In those moments I reminded myself of what we all have built together in group and I felt so proud. I thought about: What would [group member] Michelle say right now? What would Ashok say? Coach? How do I create a new performance in this moment? The group has helped me through the 'U-turns' that I'm inclined to make out of habit and reminded me that I have power and that I can be a leader in those moments. And everything turned out great! I'm grateful to be building our group with all of you and thank you for giving me that support."

This story exemplifies the social therapeutic process of "deconstructing the sense of self...and reconstructing the concept of social relationship." In doing so, people "exercise their collective power to create new emotional growth" (Newman & Holzman, 2004, p. 78).

## It's all in the activity!

Just as the knowledge that smoking or high sugar intake is bad for us is not enough to make us quit, it takes more than knowing the positive impact of sociality in order to effect it. In our cognitive-dominant world, our over-thinking brains become obstacles to growth and development. In *The End of Knowing* (1997), Newman and Holzman entered into the fray of the intellectual debates of the 1990s of whether, if and how science could continue and in what form. They dissect the modernist thirst for knowledge, tracing the history of science and its methodological error in expanding into social sciences, an area in which scientific objectivity is impossible. They offer social therapeutics as a positive way out of the modern fly bottle. They introduce performed activity as the path forward for the human race. We have to do, and do with others, for emotional growth to become possible. Relating to our doings as a performance, as we reviewed in the previous chapter, creates the possibility of doing something new, of becoming 'a head taller' or other than who we are (our fixed role or identity). Newman and Holzman write:

[It is a] story/myth that human life and growth require a way of knowing the world. It is this epistemic posture (considered by many to be as natural as our upright stance) more than any particular epistemological positions that fascinates and disturbs us. This book is part of our call for the end of knowing as the revolutionary, humane, and developmental move our species needs to make at this moment in history (p.7).

Of course, there are numerous wellness practices with widespread following today that do not rely upon knowing, and instead sit in the moment and attend to the emergent. Coaching locates itself as part of this surge in non-cognitive driven wellness practices. For example, a key posture of the coach is to 'maintain presence', i.e., to stay in the moment with the client and be comfortable "working in a space of not knowing" (ICF, 2020, p. 14).

As social therapeutic coaches and therapists, on our best days we see, articulate and respond to human activity rather than responding to the particular facts, causes or explanations clients are saying. Is the group being judgmental? Distant? Conflicted? Loving? Curious? How is the group relating? In seeing and relating to the group rather than individuals, coaches shift from "me" to "we" environments, from interpreting to doing/responding, and from

向小组报告说，走近小组、建构小组，如何帮助她走了过来。

"我和 Antonio (我刚开始交往的人) 在山里时，我很多次感到羞耻，也害怕失败 (做饭时、徒步时，或者做任何我平常不做的事情时)。在那些时刻，我提醒自己想起我们所有人在小组中共同建构的东西，我感到非常自豪。我想：[小组成员] Michelle 现在会怎么说？Ashok 会怎么说？教练呢？在这个时刻，我如何创造一种新的表演？小组帮助我穿越那些我习惯性倾向于做出的'U 形转弯'，提醒我有力量，在那些时刻我可以成为一个领导者。结果一切都很好！我很感激能够与大家一起建构我们的小组，也感谢你们给予我的支持。"

这个故事体现了社会疗愈的过程："解构自我感.....并重构社会关系的概念。"在这样做的过程中，人们"行使他们的集体力量，创造新的情感成长" (Newman & Holzman, 2004, 第 78 页)。

## 一切都在活动之中！

正如知道吸烟或高糖摄入对我们有害，并不足以让我们戒掉它们一样，要真正实现社会性的积极影响，仅仅知道这一影响也是不够的。在我们这个认知占主导的世界里，我们过度思考的大脑会成为成长与发展的障碍。在《知道的终结》(1997)中，Newman 和 Holzman 进入了 20 世纪 90 年代关于科学能否、是否以及如何继续、以何种形式继续的知识论争。他们剖析了现代主义对知识的渴求，追溯科学史及其方法论错误：当科学方法扩展到社会科学这一科学客观性不可能成立的领域时，便产生了这一错误。他们提出社会疗愈，作为走出现代"苍蝇瓶"的一条积极道路。他们引入"表演性活动"，作为人类种族前进的路径。我们必须去做，并且与他人一起做，情感成长才可能发生。正如我们在上一章中回顾的，把我们的所作所为关系化为一场表演，就创造了做出新事情的可能，创造了"长高一个头"或成为不同于我们是谁 (我们的固定角色或身份) 的可能。Newman 和 Holzman 写道：

[这是一种] 故事 / 神话：人的生活与成长需要一种认识世界的方式。令我们着迷并不安的，与其说是任何特定的认识论立场，不如说是这种认识姿态本身 (许多人认为它像我们的直立姿势一样自然)。本书是我们呼吁"知道的终结"的一部分；在我们看来，在历史的这个时刻，这正是我们这个物种需要做出的革命性的、人道的、发展性的行动 (第 7 页)。

当然，今天有许多拥有广泛追随者的福祉实践并不依赖于"知道"，而是安住于当下，关注正在涌现之物。教练把自己定位为这股非认知驱动的福祉实践浪潮的一部分。例如，教练的一项关键姿态是"保持临在"，也就是与客户同处当下，并能够自在地在"不知道的空间中工作" (ICF, 2020, 第 14 页)。

作为社会疗愈教练和治疗师，在状态最好的时候，我们看见、表达并回应的是人的活动，而不是回应客户所说的具体事实、原因或解释。小组是否在评判？是否疏离？是否冲突？是否充满爱？是否好奇？小组正在如何关联？当教练看见并关系化于群体而非个体时，就从"我"的环境转向"我们"的环境，从解释转向做 / 回应，从说明转向给予小组。这是我们试图用文字把社会疗愈方法中的本体论转变具体化。以下几节将尝试展示它。希望这种"谈论"与"展示"的结

explaining to giving to the group. This is our attempt to put into writing a concretization of the ontological shift of social therapeutic method. The following sections attempt to show it. Hopefully the combined 'talking about' and 'showing' will make the practice of social therapeutics accessible.

In the building of the group, participants attend to what they are doing together. This creates space for collectively creating meaning and denies the individualistic pull to speak in, search for and identify a Truth or Right Answer. Holzman writes, "The [social therapeutic] methodology shifts the focus from cognition to the collaborative activity of creating something new together" (Holzman, 2020, p. 179). Social therapeutic clients relate to themselves and others as givers to the group, as giving the material on which the collaborative activity rests. This is another key element of seeing groups, to work with what is given as an offer to build with. This is an inversion of our getting culture. Seeing groups is inseparable from seeing offers; building the group (yes, and-ing...offers) occurs without knowing beforehand what we are building together or where we are going.

### <Box 3.3 >

Seeing the group rather than analyzing it

Ursula is a very successful professional. She is analytical, thoughtful and works with hundreds of people at her job. When she first joined the group, she would come prepared with questions for each group member, like she does with her work colleagues. It is part of her daily mindfulness routine to ponder others, their strengths and weaknesses and how she can best operate with them.

After a few weeks in group, she shared that she was learning to do something different—to experience the emotionality in the group, rather than analyze it. She saw that analyzing individuals in the group was a way of stepping out of the group rather than being in it. She was starting to see other areas of her life she stepped out of what was happening, rather than getting closer to others in the moment.

### <Box 3.3 ends>

## Beyond the Enlightenment

To get 'comfortable' with performed activity (not knowing), we must engage with and dismantle the cognitive-dominant scaffolding we have inherited from the Enlightenment—the modernist philosophy/methodology which positioned the individual as its central unit. We already mentioned Galileo's early 17th century public demonstration that the sun, rather than the earth, anchor the universe. The advances in mathematics in 16th and 17th century Europe that enabled Galileo also ushered in the birth pangs of the modern scientific era. It was an era that chipped away at eradicating mystery, magic and God's omnipotence from everyday life, replacing them with an understanding of the natural world that could be measured, quantified, categorized and thereby known.

Incredible advances in human civilization have been produced through the scientific method. There was a rational, objective system through which to discover the world. All of this seems natural to us. This is how we are taught science in school. Inquiries can be quantified, results predicted and categorized. Evidence and facts are used to prove or disprove a hypothesis. Causes and effects can be postulated and scientifically proven. Particular parts of a thing can be separated out for study. Whereas science replaced believing in God, today we relate to science as a God, an omnipotent

合，能使社会疗愈的实践变得可进入。

在群体建构中，参与者关注的是他们共同正在做什么。这为集体创造意义打开空间，并拒绝个人主义的牵引：不再在言说中、寻找中、认同中追求一个真理或正确答案。Holzman 写道：“[社会疗愈] 方法论把焦点从认知，转向共同创造新事物的协作活动”

(Holzman, 2020, 第 179 页)。社会疗愈的客户把自己和他人关系化为对小组的给予者，也就是给予协作活动赖以展开的材料。这是看见群体的另一个关键元素：把被给予之物作为可以共同建构的提议 / 给予来工作。这是对我们“获取文化”的一种倒转。看见群体与看见给予不可分割；群体建构（是的，并且.....接纳并发展给予）发生时，并不预先知道我们共同在建构什么，或要去往哪里。

### <框 3.3 >

看见群体，而不是分析群体

Ursula 是一位非常成功的专业人士。她善于分析、思虑周全，并在工作中与数百人打交道。刚加入小组时，她会像对待工作同事一样，准备好给每位小组成员的问题。思考他人、思考他们的优势和弱点，以及自己如何最好地与他们运作，是她日常正念练习的一部分。

在小组进行了几周之后，她分享说，她正在学习做一件不同的事——去体验小组中的情感性，而不是分析它。她看见，分析小组中的个体，其实是一种走出小组而非身处小组之中的方式。她开始看见，在生活的其他领域里，她也会从正在发生的事情中退出来，而不是在当下更靠近他人。

### <框 3.3 结束>

## 超越启蒙运动

为了对表演性活动（不知道）变得“自在”，我们必须参与并拆解自己从启蒙运动继承而来的认知主导脚手架——这是一种现代主义哲学 / 方法论，它把个体置于中心单位。我们已经提到，伽利略在 17 世纪早期公开证明：支撑宇宙中心的是太阳，而不是地球。16、17 世纪欧洲数学的发展使伽利略的工作成为可能，也同时带来了现代科学时代的阵痛与诞生。那是一个逐渐从日常生活中削弱神秘、魔法和上帝全能性的时代，并以一种可测量、可量化、可分类、因而可被知道的自然世界理解来取而代之。

科学方法推动了人类文明令人难以置信的进步。它提供了一套理性、客观的系统，用以发现世界。所有这一切对我们来说似乎很自然。我们在学校里就是这样学习科学的。探究可以被量化，结果可以被预测和分类。证据与事实被用来证明或证伪假设。原因与结果可以被提出，并得到科学证明。事物的特定部分可以被分离出来进行研究。过去，科学取代了对上帝的信仰；而今天，我们却把科学关系化为一个上帝，一个全能的力量，其发现被我们毫无疑问地相

force whose findings we unquestionably believe in.

The Enlightenment can be understood as the widespread cultural diffusion of the tools of scientific method. Starting in the 18th century, philosophers, intellectuals and the elite emphasized reason and individualism as a replacement to community and faith. It birthed a new political form—democracy, based on the vote of the individual. It birthed a new economic form—capitalism, based on the individual consumer. And as the Industrial Revolution unfolded, it birthed a new social form—psychology, based on the behavior of the individual. Giving primacy to reason and rationalism drove a relentless pursuit of knowledge, justified imperialism and slavery on a scale never before seen in human history and drove the global expansion of capitalism. The results have been both extraordinarily positive and devastatingly horrific.

As we mentioned in Chapter 1, psychology was born in the midst of this seismic shift. The focus on individuals and individualism was embedded into psychology. Psychology embedded itself into mass culture. And here we are today believing that the individual is primary.

This is a simplistic history, of course. There are many fantastic sources on the birth of modern science, capitalism and the Enlightenment (Hobsbawm, 1962, 1975; Newman & Holzman, 1996; Wootton, 2015). Our goal here is to radically accept that we are all products of our times and carry with us the assumptions of the Enlightenment. Social therapeutics challenges the rational, scientific way of seeing and studying humans as individuals, as established by psychology and psychiatry, in favor of the fundamental sociality of the human species. We are a social species, rather than individuals contained within our own minds.

Two major premises of this book are that a) those modernist assumptions no longer help people to grow and develop, and b) it is possible to break out of them and create new ways to go forward. Indeed, we would argue that the conceptual revolution is already underway—we have shared in this chapter and the previous one statements from significant public intellectuals and leaders on how the scaffolding of modernism and the institutions built upon them are no longer functioning. On a cultural level, we must already be in the midst of a shift into a new way of seeing for these insights to make mainstream headlines—even if we are not able to articulate exactly (read: know) what it is or how that is happening. Social therapeutics—with its unique root influences remixed and built upon by Newman and Holzman and informed by their community-building efforts—is a methodological articulation of a radical new approach to human development.

To go somewhere new, we must embrace individuals/individualism while shifting to seeing and building groups. This is akin to Newman and Holzman's articulation of being/becoming introduced in the last chapter. In social therapeutics we relate to clients as socialized individuals who are building groups—the activity of which overthrows the assumptions of who we are as individuals. We are simultaneously doing both. We are products of our environment and creators of environments. It is that dialectical relationship that can hold the paradox of individual/group. Embracing that two things can be going on at the same time (both/and) opens the window to seeing what something/someone is and what they are becoming. It creates space for possibility, for new things to emerge (in relation to others...).

The Enlightenment framework cannot hold paradox. The Enlightenment was built upon the millennia-old Western philosophical idea of separating out particulars from the whole and then putting them back together as dualisms such as mind and body,

信。

启蒙运动可以被理解为科学方法工具在文化层面的广泛扩散。自18世纪开始，哲学家、知识分子和精英强调理性与个人主义，以取代共同体和信仰。它孕育了一种新的政治形式——民主，其基础是个体的投票。它孕育了一种新的经济形式——资本主义，其基础是个体消费者。随着工业革命的展开，它又孕育了一种新的社会形式——心理学，其基础是个体行为。赋予理性和理性主义以优先性，推动了对知识的无休止追求，为人类历史上前所未有规模的帝国主义和奴隶制辩护，并推动了资本主义的全球扩张。其结果既极其积极，也毁灭性地可怖。

正如我们在第一章中提到的，心理学诞生于这场深层转变之中。对个体和个人主义的关注被嵌入了心理学；心理学又把自身嵌入大众文化。于是，我们今天来到这里，相信个体是首要的。

当然，这是一段简化的历史。关于现代科学、资本主义和启蒙运动的诞生，有许多极好的资料（Hobsbawm, 1962, 1975; Newman & Holzman, 1996; Wootton, 2015）。我们在这里的目标，是彻底接受这样一点：我们都是自己时代的产物，并且随身携带启蒙运动的假设。社会疗愈挑战心理学和精神病学所确立的那种理性、科学地把人作为个体来看见和研究的方式，转而强调人类物种根本性的社会性。我们是一个社会性物种，而不是被包裹在自己头脑之内的个体。

本书有两个主要前提：a) 这些现代主义假设不再帮助人们成长和发展；b) 我们有可能突破它们，并创造新的前进方式。事实上，我们会主张，概念革命已经在发生——在本章和上一章中，我们已经分享了重要公共知识分子和领导者的陈述，他们指出现代主义的手脚束缚以及建立其上的制度已经不再运作。在文化层面上，我们必然已经处在一种新的看见方式的转变之中，这些洞见才会登上主流媒体的头条——即使我们还不能准确地表达（也就是：知道）它是什么，或它如何正在发生。社会疗愈——带着其独特根源影响，经由 Newman 和 Holzman 重新混合并发展，并受到他们共同体建构努力的滋养——是对一种激进的人类发展新取向的方法论表达。

要去往新的地方，我们必须拥抱个体 / 个人主义，同时转向看见并建构群体。这类似于 Newman 和 Holzman 在上一章中引入的“存在 / 生成”表述。在社会疗愈中，我们把客户关系化为正在建构群体的社会化个体——而正是这一活动推翻了关于我们作为个体是谁的假设。我们同时在做这两件事。我们既是环境的产物，也是环境的创造者。正是这种辩证关系，能够容纳个体 / 群体这一悖论。拥抱两件事可以同时发生（既 / 又），就打开了一扇窗，让我们看见某物 / 某人是什么，以及他们正在成为什么。它为可能性创造空间，让新的东西涌现（在与他人的关系中……）。

启蒙运动的框架无法容纳悖论。启蒙运动建立在西方哲学数千年来的观念之上：把个别部分从整体中分离出来，再把它们重新组合成二元对立，例如心与身、内与外。然而，当 20 世纪的社会科学

inner and outer. However, whereas 20th century social sciences like psychology moved more aggressively towards evidence-based models, the most advanced hard sciences, like quantum physics, were making discoveries that could only be made by giving up traditional scientific method. Holding paradoxes is grounded in much newer form of science.

## Quantum physics and relationality

Quantum physics was established in the 1920s when subatomic particles could be studied for the first time. Those particles did not adhere to the normal laws of physics. For example, particles could be both present and not present at the same time, in relation to other particles. The dualism of either/or was unhelpful to scientists as they sought to explain what they were seeing. With this, the foundations of modern science were immediately antiquated.

How can 'A' and 'not A' exist simultaneously? What does it mean to be only brought into existence in relation to the other? World-renowned theoretical physicist Carl Rovelli beautifully articulates this contradictory unknowingness in regard to humans and our reality as we currently 'know' it: "...properties are not determined until the moment of these interactions; they exist only in relation to something else. Everything is what it is only with respect to something else [italics added]" (2021, p. 199). We draw on Rovelli to deepen the Newman Holzman articulation of being/becoming. It occurs in relation to others. We are a social species. In relation to others in the moment, is when our "properties" emerge. Social therapeutics goes off the modernist grid. The answer to who we are/who we are becoming is not to be found within our selves, but rather, in relation to others.

### Table 3.1. Differences between relationship-centered and client-centered approaches

Relationship-centered approach | Client-centered approach  
The relationship is primary (client/coach; couple/coach; group including coach) | The client's individual identity is primary  
Client and coach create/lead with what emotional development work to tackle | Client sets objectives of work  
Client and coach relationship is key | Client's thoughts, actions and emotions are key  
Coach asks, "What are we creating together when you say..." | Coach says, "I am here for you"  
Coach asks, "What's important to you in saying this to me?" and follows the activity of creating the conversation together | Coach asks more questions on the content or how client might arrive at their desired goal, follows the content and client's individual emotional expression

It is outward facing and does not seek to find a universal truth or core essence. Rovelli goes further and debunks his long held story of himself of being a "solitary and rebellious 'I'...independent and totally free." He instead points to humans as a rippling network of networks, it is our relational activity that "make(s) up our 'I', as our society, our cultural, spiritual and political life" (2021, p. 200). Individuals are inseparable from the group and the world. Our relational activity makes our world. This is hard to see. Multi-national companies, media giants, DSM-IV, political parties, and the makers of personality and love categories are all deeply invested in having us believe that what is important is to describe the world with the labels they have pre-packaged for us, usually in the name of making a buck for themselves.

If what occurs is in relation to something/someone else, then humans become empowered to create meaning out of that

(如心理学)更积极地转向循证模型时,最先进的硬科学(如量子物理)却正在作出一些发现,而这些发现只有通过放弃传统科学方法才可能达成。容纳悖论,是扎根于一种更新的科学形式之中的。

## 量子物理与关系性

量子物理建立于 20 世纪 20 年代,当时亚原子粒子首次能够被研究。这些粒子并不遵循通常的物理定律。例如,粒子可以在与其他粒子的关系中,同时既存在又不存在。科学家试图解释他们所看见的现象时,“非此即彼”的二元论并没有帮助。由此,现代科学的根基立刻显得过时。

“A”和“非 A”如何能够同时存在?只有在与他者的关系中才被带入存在,这意味着什么?世界著名理论物理学家 Carlo Rovelli 在谈及人类以及我们目前所“知道”的现实之时,优美地表达了这种矛盾性的未知:“.....属性只有在这些互动发生的瞬间才被确定;它们只在与某物的关系中存在。万物之所以为其所是,只是相对于某个他者而言[斜体为原文强调]”(2021,第 199 页)。我们借助 Rovelli,深化 Newman 与 Holzman 对“存在/生成”的表述。它发生在他者的关系之中。我们是一个社会性物种。在当下与他人的关系中,我们的“属性”才会涌现。社会疗愈离开了现代主义的网格。我们是谁/正在成为谁的答案,并不在我们的自我内部,而是在与他人的关系之中。

### 表 3.1 关系中心取向与来访者中心取向的差异

关系中心取向 | 来访者中心取向  
关系是首要的(客户/教练;伴侣/教练;包括教练在内的群体) | 客户的个体身份是首要的  
客户与教练共同创造/共同引领要处理的情感发展工作 | 客户设定工作的目标  
客户与教练之间的关系是关键 | 客户的思想、行动和情绪是关键  
教练问:“当你这样说时,我们正在共同创造什么.....” | 教练说:“我在这里支持你”  
教练问:“你对我说这句话时,对你来说重要的是什么?”并跟随共同创造谈话这一活动 | 教练就内容或客户如何抵达其期望目标提出更多问题,跟随内容以及客户的个体情感表达

它面向外部,并不寻求发现某种普遍真理或核心本质。Rovelli 进一步拆解了他长期持有的关于自己的故事:一个“孤独而叛逆的‘我’.....独立且完全自由”。相反,他指出,人类是一个层层涟漪般的网络之网络;正是我们的关系性活动“构成了我们的‘我’,也构成了我们的社会、文化、精神和政治生活”(2021,第 200 页)。个体与群体和世界不可分割。我们的关系性活动创造我们的世界。这很难被看见。跨国公司、媒体巨头、DSM-IV、政党,以及人格类型和爱情类别的制造者,都深深投注于让我们相信:重要的是用他们预先为我们包装好的标签来描述世界,而通常这也是为了让他们自己赚钱。

如果发生的一切都是在与某物/某人的关系中发生,那么人类就被赋权,能够从这种关系性中创造意义(这不同于被刚才列举的那些

relationality (an alternative to the passive consumerism shaped by the types of entities just listed). If we are in relation to each other, and the meaning of those relations are constructed—built—by us in the moment then we humans have the capacity to transform emotionally, socially, culturally, politically, etc.

### <Box 3.4 >

#### Relational dialogue

The following interchanges attempt to put the spotlight squarely on what acts of relationality can look like in the coaching session. These will feel weird to the reader. Often it feels weird saying lines like these to a client. What we are doing is breaking out of the disassociation that occurs in our relationships. We are simultaneously creating the conversation and the relationship (tool-and-result). The how we are doing together—how am I impacting on you/the group right now—is integral to social therapeutic. Seeing, embracing, expressing our relationality as it emerges in the moment is important material to be built with. In group work, the coach or a group member might ask the questions we are about to present. For simplicity purposes, these are examples from individual and couples work.

#### Example #1

Client: I can never make up my mind and procrastinate making decisions all the time.

Coach: What is it like to say that to me?

Client: It's a relief. I do not usually talk about this with anyone.

The emotionality came into existence in relationship to the coach, in the moment of the coach asking the question and the client responding to the question (rather from inside of the client). It becomes material to build with.

#### Example #2

Partner 1: My partner shuts down when we have a fight. It drives me crazy. He won't say what he wants. He won't say what he feels.

Coach: Partner 2, what is it like for you to hear Partner 1's experience of you two having a fight?

Partner 2: I don't shut down.

Coach: Well, I appreciate your giving that. I am actually asking a different question. When you hear Partner 1 describe their experience, what's that like for you?

Partner 2: It's hard to hear.

Coach: What's hard about it?

Partner 2: I try so hard to be a good partner so that we don't have fights. I hate fighting. And I get frozen when Partner 1's blood starts to boil. I can tell she's pissed when I won't talk.

Coach: How is it for both of you to give your experiences of each other when you are having or about to have a fight?

These relational questions bring/keep the focus in the coaching room, on their activity in the moment (rather than explaining, labelling or describing situations in the past). Inviting clients to give what is going on for them in the moment in relation to the other is important for creating the emotional zpd.

实体塑造出来的被动消费主义)。如果我们彼此处在关系中，而这些关系的意义又是在当下由我们建构——建造——出来的，那么我们人类就具有在情感、社会、文化、政治等层面转化的能力。

### <框 3.4 >

#### 关系性对话

以下几组互动试图把聚光灯直接打在教练会谈中关系性的行动可能是什么样子上。读者可能会觉得这些对话很奇怪。通常，对客户说出这样的句子也会让人觉得奇怪。我们正在做的，是突破关系中发生的解离。我们同时在创造谈话和关系（工具—结果）。我们共同如何做——此刻我如何影响你 / 影响小组——是社会疗愈不可分割的一部分。看见、拥抱并表达当下正在涌现的关系性，是可以用来建构的重要材料。在群体工作中，教练或某位小组成员可能会提出我们即将呈现的问题。为简洁起见，以下例子来自个体工作和伴侣工作。

#### 例 1

客户：我从来拿不定主意，总是一再拖延做决定。

教练：对我说出这句话，对你来说是什么样的体验？

客户：是一种松了一口气的感觉。我通常不会和任何人谈这个。

这种情感性是在与教练的关系中、在教练提出问题并且客户回应问题的那个瞬间进入存在的（而不是从客户内部出来的）。它成为可以共同建构的材料。

#### 例 2

伴侣 1：我们吵架时，我的伴侣就会关上自己。这让我抓狂。他不会说自己想要什么，也不会说自己的感受。

教练：伴侣 2，听到伴侣 1 描述你们两个人吵架时的经验，对你来说是什么样的？

伴侣 2：我没有关上自己。

教练：好的，我感谢你给出这一点。其实我问的是另一个问题。当你听见伴侣 1 描述他们的经验时，那对你来说是什么样的？

伴侣 2：很难听。

教练：难在哪里？

伴侣 2：我非常努力想做一个好伴侣，好让我们不要吵架。我讨厌吵架。而当伴侣 1 开始火冒三丈时，我就僵住了。当我不说话时，我能看出来她很生气。

教练：当你们正在吵架，或即将吵架时，彼此给出对对方的经验，对你们两个人来说是什么样的？

这些关系性问题把焦点带到 / 留在教练室里，放在他们当下的活动上（而不是解释、贴标签或描述过去的情境）。邀请客户给出此刻他们在与对方关系中正在发生的東西，对于创造情感最近发展区非常重要。它打开了一种可能：他们能够体验到，自己所给出的东西可以被共同建构、共同创造，并得

It opens the possibility that they can experience that what they give can be built with, created with, responded to.

#### Example #3

Client: (speaking for 10 minutes)...My professors don't like me. I raise my hand and they don't call on me. The other students are so confident. I am always worried I am going to say something stupid.

Coach: Are you wondering what it's like for me to hear you giving all this?

Client: Yes. with an uncomfortable smile

Coach: Oh, ok. Maybe you could ask me, "What's it like for you to hear me saying all this?"

Client: "What's it like for you to hear me say this?"

Coach: enthusiastically Thank you for asking! Before I answer you. How was that for you to ask me that question?

Client: Uncomfortable, weird, good. I have never asked that before. I don't usually think about the other person's experience when I am talking.

Coach: What a wonderful discovery. I invite you to keep getting uncomfortable with all of this! I would like to answer your question of my experience of you talking about school. I experienced boredom, I didn't know where to focus. I had a hard time following you and wasn't sure where you wanted me to look. How is that to hear from me?

Client: It's hard to hear. Extended pause. When I am unsure of what to do or what is expected of me, I just keep talking.

The coach takes the risk of being ridiculous in asking a question to the client's question (that the coach directed them to ask). The coach also gives something that is difficult to hear—that the client's internal loop is getting in the way of the two of them connecting and building together. The coach's performance is one of "Hello, we are here together, you can be an active participant in building our relationship. We impact on each other and we are allowed to invite and be curious about our responses to each other." Many clients have no idea that this is possible. Thus the encouragement to the client to actually speak aloud (perform) the new lines. The growth that emerges is experiential and highly impactful.

Relational awareness is the activity of attending to the relationship. How is our relationship doing? How is the group doing? What is it like to hear what Joanna gave to the group? How was it for you, Joanna, to give it? To hear the group's response? These are all questions that point people toward each other (the group), and away from what is happening in their heads. Clients quickly experience the relief of having tools to do something other than be stuck with the tape in their mind that loops with knowing certainty of what is really going on, what others are thinking, etc.

Taken as a whole, social therapeutics offers a practice that is group-focused, performance-based, relational activity-over-content focused, non-knowing and attentive to the emergent. Social therapeutic practitioners lead their groups in "the activity of discovering a method of relating to emotional talk relationally rather than individualistically and as activist rather than representational" (Holzman, 2017, p. 36). With this, we believe social therapeutics can solve the "conundrum" of group coaching work as noted by Manfred F. R. Kets de Vries (2014), Distinguished Clinical Professor of Leadership Development and Organizational Change at INSEAD. Bringing Vygotsky back into the picture can help. Seeing the group is inseparable from the tool-and-result activity of creating the group. Building the group is a self-conscious, creative, relational activity. Here is how Newman put it in a supervisory session with practitioners:

There is a recognizable activity called building the group. It's as much a building activity as building a bridge. You have to help a grouping of people do that together as the creating of the conditions for their emotional growth. That is a Vygotskian concept. The creating of the zpd is best understood as a developmental rejection of individuated growth. It is saying, in effect, that people do not grow individually. They grow as a social unit. And so in social therapy, we have to create the appropriate social unit for emotional growth

到回应。

#### 例 3

客户：（说了 10 分钟）.....我的教授不喜欢我。我举手，他们也不叫我。其他学生都那么自信。我总是担心自己会说出很蠢的话。

教练：你是不是在想，我听你给出这些内容是什么样的体验？

客户：是的。带着不自在的微笑。

教练：哦，好。也许你可以问我：“听我说这些，对你来说是什么样的？”

客户：“听我说这些，对你来说是什么样的？”

教练：（热情地）谢谢你问我！在我回答之前，你问我这个问题，对你来说是什么样的？

客户：不舒服、奇怪，也挺好。我以前从来没有这样问过。我说话的时候通常不会去想对方的经验。

教练：多么棒的发现。我邀请你继续对这一切感到不舒服！我想回答你刚才问我的问题，也就是我听你谈学校时的经验。我感到有点无聊，不知道该把注意力放在哪里。我很难跟上你，也不确定你希望我看哪里。听我这样说，对你来说是什么样的？

客户：很难听。长时间停顿。当我不确定该做什么，或别人期待我做什么时，我就会不停地说话。

教练冒着显得可笑的风险，对客户的问题（而且是教练引导客户问出来的问题）再提出一个问题。教练也给出了某种难以听见的东西——客户内部的循环正在妨碍他们两个人连接并共同建构。教练的表演是这样的：“你好，我们此刻在这里一起，你可以成为建构我们关系的主动参与者。我们会彼此影响，也被允许邀请并好奇我们对彼此的回应。”许多客户并不知道这是可能的。因此，要鼓励客户真正大声说出（表演）新的台词。由此涌现出的成长是经验性的，并且极具影响力。

关系性觉察，是关注关系的活动。我们的关系进展如何？小组进展如何？听见 Joanna 给小组的东西，是什么样的体验？Joanna，你给出它是什么样的？听到小组的回应又是什么样的？这些问题都把人们指向彼此（指向群体），并让他们离开头脑里正在发生的事情。客户很快会体验到一种松动和宽慰：他们拥有了一些工具，可以做点别的，而不是被困在脑海中的录音带里——那盘录音带不断循环，带着确定地“知道”到底发生了什么、他人在想什么等等。

整体来看，社会疗愈提供的是一种以群体为焦点、以表演为基础、以关系性活动而非内容焦点、非知道并且关注涌现的实践。社会疗愈实践者带领他们的小组进入“发现一种方法的活动：以关系性的方式，而不是个人主义的方式，去关系化于情感性谈话；并把它作为行动性的，而不是表征性的”（Holzman, 2017, 第 36 页）。由此，我们相信，社会疗愈能够解决 INSEAD 领导力发展与组织变革杰出临床教授 Manfred F. R. Kets de Vries (2014) 所指出的群体教练工作的“难题”。把 Vygotsky 重新带回图景会有所帮助。看见群体，与创造群体的工具——结果活动不可分割。建构群体是一种自觉的、创造性的、关系性活动。Newman 在一次与实践者的督导会谈中这样说：

有一种可识别的活动叫作建构群体。它与建造一座桥一样，都是一种建构活动。你必须帮助一群人共同去做这件事，把它作为创造他们情感成长条件的过程。这是一个维果茨基式的概念。ZPD 的创造，最好被理解为一种发展性的、对个体化成长的拒绝。它实际上是在说，人并不是以个体方式成长的。他们是作为一个社会单位而成长的。因此，在社会治疗中，我们必须为情感成长创造适当的社会单位（Holzman & Mendez, 2003, 第 70 页）。

(Holzman & Mendez, 2003, p. 70).

Much of this quote encapsulates what we have covered to date. The additional element, emotional growth and how to relate to emotional talk relationally, is the final area we wish to explore in social therapeutics.

## EXERCISES

Go through a day asking people you are close with, “What’s it like for you to hear me say that?” and discover what it is like for you to do so. Notice if people’s responses to you are any different, and if so, how.

Notice when you make dualistic separations: mind/body; inside/outside; thought/emotion. Try seeing (holding) both at the same time.

Try telling a story by using ‘we’ as the regular pronoun, rather than I or me.

## REFERENCES

Agazarian, Y. M. (2018). *The Visible and Invisible Group*. Taylor & Francis.

Ahmad, F. B. & Anderson, R.N. (2021, March 31). The Leading Causes of Death in the US for 2020. *JAMA* doi:10.1001/jama.2021.5469

Brock, V. (2014). *Sourcebook of Coaching History*.  
<https://libraryofprofessionalcoaching.com/wp-app/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/SOCH-2nd-Edition-Free-2021-01-31-Secure-1.pdf>

Brooks, D. (2019, February 18). A Nation of Weavers. *The New York Times*.  
<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/02/18/opinion/culture-compassion.html>

Brooks, D. (2019, July 3). The lies our culture tells us about what matters --- and a better way to live. TED. Retrieved November 27, 2022 from  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iB4MS1hsWXU&t=4s>

Cigna. (2022). Retrieved December 27, 2022.  
<https://newsroom.cigna.com/loneliness-epidemic-persists-post-pandemic-look>

Dobbs, D. (2013, September 3). The Social Life of Genes. *Pacific Standard*.  
<https://psmag.com/social-justice/the-social-life-of-genes-64616>

Dockray, H. (2019, May 24). Self-care isn’t enough. We need community care to thrive. *Mashable.com*. Retrieved January 15, 2022.  
<https://mashable.com/article/community-care-versus-self-care>

Eubanks, V. (2022, July 5). His PTSD, and My Struggle to Live With It. *The New York Times Magazine*. Retrieved July 27, 2022 from  
<https://www.nytimes.com/2022/07/05/magazine/ptsd-trauma.html>

Gergen, K. (1991). *The Saturated Self: Dilemma of Identity in Contemporary Life*. Basic Books.

Giamatti, A. B. (1990). *A Free and Ordered Space: The Real World of the University*. W.W. Norton and Company.

Grant, A. (2019, May 2). Mentors are Good. Coaches are Better. *LinkedIn*. Retrieved August 2, 2022 at <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/mentors-good-coaches-better-adam-grant/>

Grant, A. (2021, July 10). There’s a Specific Kind of Joy We’ve Been Missing. *The New York Times*.

Hall, J. A. (August 11, 2022). The Price We Pay for Being Less Social. *The Wall Street Journal*. [https://www.wsj.com/articles/price-we-pay-for-being-less-social-11660068416?mod=Searchresults\\_pos1&page=1](https://www.wsj.com/articles/price-we-pay-for-being-less-social-11660068416?mod=Searchresults_pos1&page=1)

Hari, J. (2018). *Lost Connections: Why You’re Depressed and How to Find*

这段引文的许多内容概括了我们迄今为止所讨论的东西。另一个元素——情感成长，以及如何以关系性的方式关系化于情感性谈话——是我们希望在社会疗愈中探索的最后一个领域。

## 练习

用一天的时间，向与你亲近的人提问：“听我这么说，对你来说是什么样的？”并发现你这样做，对自己来说是什么样的。留意人们对你的回应是否有所不同；如果有，是如何不同。

留意你什么时候会做出二元分割：心 / 身；内 / 外；思想 / 情感。尝试同时看见（并容纳）两者。

尝试讲一个故事，并把“我们”作为常规代词，而不是使用“我”或“我自己”。

## 参考文献

Agazarian, Y.M. (2018). 《可见与不可见的群体》。Taylor & Francis。

Ahmad, F.B. 与 Anderson, R.N. (2021年3月31日)。《2020年美国主要死亡原因》。JAMA。doi:10.1001/jama.2021.5469

Brock, V. (2014)。《教练史资料手册》。  
<https://libraryofprofessionalcoaching.com/wp-app/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/SOCH-2nd-Edition-Free-2021-01-31-Secure-1.pdf>

Brooks, D. (2019年2月18日)。《一个编织者的国家》。《纽约时报》。<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/02/18/opinion/culture-compassion.html>

Brooks, D. (2019年7月3日)。《我们的文化告诉我们的关于重要之事的谎言——以及一种更好的生活方式》。TED。2022年11月27日检索自  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iB4MS1hsWXU&t=4s>

Cigna. (2022)。2022年12月27日检索。  
<https://newsroom.cigna.com/loneliness-epidemic-persists-post-pandemic-look>

Dobbs, D. (2013年9月3日)。《基因的社会生活》。Pacific Standard。  
<https://psmag.com/social-justice/the-social-life-of-genes-64616>

Dockray, H. (2019年5月24日)。《自我照护还不够。我们需要共同体照护才能茁壮成长》。Mashable.com。2022年1月15日检索。  
<https://mashable.com/article/community-care-versus-self-care>

Eubanks, V. (2022年7月5日)。《他的创伤后应激障碍，以及我与之共同生活的挣扎》。《纽约时报杂志》。2022年7月27日检索自  
<https://www.nytimes.com/2022/07/05/magazine/ptsd-trauma.html>

Gergen, K. (1991)。《饱和的自我：当代生活中的身份困境》。Basic Books。

Giamatti, A. B. (1990)。《自由而有序的空间：大学的真实世界》。W. W. Norton and Company。

Grant, A. (2019年5月2日)。《导师很好，教练更好》。LinkedIn。2022年8月2日检索自 <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/mentors-good-coaches-better-adam-grant/>

Grant, A. (2021年7月10日)。《有一种具体的喜悦，是我们一直缺失的》。《纽约时报》。

Hall, J. A. (2022年8月11日)。《我们为减少社交所付出的代价》。《华尔街日报》。[https://www.wsj.com/articles/price-we-pay-for-being-less-social-11660068416?mod=Searchresults\\_pos1&page=1](https://www.wsj.com/articles/price-we-pay-for-being-less-social-11660068416?mod=Searchresults_pos1&page=1)

Hari, J. (2018)。《失去的连接：你为什么抑郁，以及如何找到希望》。

Hope. Bloomsbury.

Hobsbawm, E. (1962). *The Age of Revolution: 1789-1848*. Vintage Books.

Hobsbawm, E. (1975). *The Age of Capital: 1848-1875*. Vintage Books.

Holzman, L. (2015). Relating to people as revolutionaries. In Loewenthal, D. (Ed.), *Critical Psychotherapy, Psychoanalysis and Counselling: Implications for Practice* (pp.125-137). Palgrave MacMillan.

Holzman, L. (2017). *Vygotsky at Work and Play*. Routledge.

Holzman, L. (2020). Constructing Social Therapeutics. In McNamee, S., Gergen, M., Camargo-Borges C. & Rasera, E. (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Social Constructionist Practice* (pp. 171-182 ). SAGE Publications Ltd.

Holzman, L. & Mendez, R. (Eds.). (2003). *Psychological Investigations: A Clinician's Guide to Social Therapy*. Brunner-Routledge.

International Coaching Federation. (2020). *ICF Team Coaching Competencies: Moving Beyond One-to-One Coaching*. v 13.11. Retrieved December 27, 2022 from <https://coachingfederation.org/app/uploads/2021/01/Team-Coaching-Competencies-4.pdf>

Kets de Vries, M. F. R. (February 2014). The Group Coaching Conundrum. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*. Vol. 12, No. 1. (pp. 79-91).

Newman, F. (1991). *The Myth of Psychology*. Castillo International.

Newman, F. & Holzman, L. (1996). *Unscientific Psychology: A Cultural - Performatory Approach to Understanding Human Life*. Praeger.

Newman, F. & Holzman, L. (1997). *The End of Knowing: A new developmental way of learning*. Routledge.

Newman, F. & Holzman, L. (2004). Power, Authority and Pointless Activity (The Developmental Discourse of Social Therapy). In T. Strong & D. Pare (Eds.), *Furthering Talk: Advances in Discursive Therapies* (pp. 73-86). Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Platt, M. as quoted in Sukel, K. (2019, November 13). In Sync: How Humans are Hard-Wired for Social Relationships. Dana Foundation Report from Neuroscience 2019 <https://dana.org/article/in-sync-how-humans-are-hard-wired-for-social-relationships/>

Poulain, M., Pes, G. M., Grasland, C., Carru, C., Ferrucci, L., Baggio, G., Franceschi, C. & Deiana, L. (2004). Identification of a geographic area characterized by extreme longevity in the Sardinia island: the AKEA study. *Experimental Gerontology*, 39 (9), pp.1423-1429.

Putnam, R. D. (2001). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. Simon & Schuster Paperbacks.

Real, T. (2022). *Us: Getting Past You and Me to Build a More Loving Relationship*. Rodale.

Rød, A. & Fridjhon, M. (2020). *Creating Intelligent Teams: Leading with Relationship Systems Intelligence*. Independently Published.

Rogers, C. (1961). *On Becoming a Person: A Therapist's View of Psychotherapy*. Houghton Mifflin.

Rovelli, C. (2021). *Helgoland: Making Sense of the Quantum Revolution*. Riverhead Books.

Roy, A. (2020, April 3). The Pandemic is a Portal. *Financial Times*. Retrieved June 6, 2021 at <https://www.ft.com/content/10d8f5e8-74eb-11ea-95fcd274e920ca>

Bloomsbury.

Hobsbawm, E. (1962). 《革命的年代：1789-1848》。Vintage Books.

Hobsbawm, E. (1975). 《资本的年代：1848-1875》。Vintage Books.

Holzman, L. (2015)。《把人作为革命者来关系化》。载于 Loewenthal, D. (编), 《批判性心理治疗、精神分析与咨询：对实践的启示》(第 125-137 页)。Palgrave MacMillan.

Holzman, L. (2017)。《工作与游戏中的维果茨基》。Routledge.

Holzman, L. (2020)。《建构社会疗愈》。载于 McNamee, S.、Gergen, M.、Camargo-Borges, C.与 Rasera, E. (编), 《SAGE 社会建构论实践手册》(第 171-182 页)。SAGE Publications Ltd.

Holzman, L.与 Mendez, R. (编) (2003)。《心理学探究：社会治疗临床指南》。Brunner-Routledge.

International Coaching Federation. (2020)。《ICF 团队教练能力：超越一对一教练》。v 13.11。2022 年 12 月 27 日检索自 <https://coachingfederation.org/app/uploads/2021/01/Team-Coaching-Competencies-4.pdf>

Kets de Vries, M. F. R. (2014 年 2 月)。《群体教练的难题》。《国际循证教练与辅导期刊》，第 12 卷第 1 期(第 79-91 页)。

Newman, F. (1991)。《心理学的神话》。Castillo International.

Newman, F.与 Holzman, L. (1996)。《非科学的心理学：理解人类生活的文化—表演取向》。Praeger.

Newman, F.与 Holzman, L. (1997)。《知道的终结：一种新的发展性学习方式》。Routledge.

Newman, F.与 Holzman, L. (2004)。《权力、权威与无目的的活动(社会治疗的发展性话语)》。载于 T. Strong 与 D. Pare (编), 《推进谈话：话语法的新进展》(第 73-86 页)。Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Platt, M., 引自 Sukel, K. (2019 年 11 月 13 日)。《同步：人类如何天生为社会关系而连接》。Dana Foundation, Neuroscience 2019 报告。 <https://dana.org/article/in-sync-how-humans-are-hard-wired-for-social-relationships/>

Poulain, M.、Pes, G. M.、Grasland, C.、Carru, C.、Ferrucci, L.、Baggio, G.、Franceschi, C.与 Deiana, L. (2004)。《撒丁岛上以极端长寿为特征的地理区域识别：AKEA 研究》。《实验老年学》，39 (9)，第 1423-1429 页。

Putnam, R. D. (2001)。《独自打保龄：美国共同体的崩塌与复兴》。Simon & Schuster Paperbacks.

Real, T. (2022)。《我们：超越你和我，建构更有爱的关系》。Rodale.

Rød, A. 与 Fridjhon, M. (2020)。《创造智能团队：以关系系统智能领导》。独立出版。

Rogers, C. (1961)。《成为一个人：一位治疗师的心理治疗观》。Houghton Mifflin.

Rovelli, C. (2021)。《赫尔戈兰：理解量子革命》。Riverhead Books.

Roy, A. (2020 年 4 月 3 日)。《疫情是一道门》。《金融时报》。2021 年 6 月 6 日检索自 <https://www.ft.com/content/10d8f5e8-74eb-11ea-95fcd274e920ca>

Skiffington, S. & Zeus, P. (2003). Behavioral coaching: How to build sustainable personal and organizational strength. McGraw-Hill.

Surowiecki, J. (2005). The Wisdom of Crowds. Anchor Books.

Trust for America's Health. (2022). Pain in the Nation: The Epidemics of Alcohol, Drug, and Suicide Deaths [https://www.tfah.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/TFAH\\_2022\\_PainInTheNation\\_Fnl.pdf](https://www.tfah.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/TFAH_2022_PainInTheNation_Fnl.pdf)

Weave: The Social Fabric Project. (2019, February 13). The Relationalist Manifesto. <https://www.aspeninstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Weave-Relationalist-Manifesto.pdf>

Weissbourd, R., Batanova, M., Lovison, V., & Torres, E. (2021, February 9). Loneliness in America: How the Pandemic Has Deepened an Epidemic of Loneliness and What We Can Do About It. Harvard Graduate School of Education & Making Caring Common Project. Retrieved January 15, 2022.

[https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5b7c56e255b02c683659fe43/t/6021776bdd04957c4557c212/1612805995893/Loneliness+in+America+2021\\_02\\_08\\_FINAL.pdf](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5b7c56e255b02c683659fe43/t/6021776bdd04957c4557c212/1612805995893/Loneliness+in+America+2021_02_08_FINAL.pdf)

Wootton, D. (2015). The Invention of Science: A New History of the Scientific Revolution. Harper.

Yalom, Y. (1985). Theory and Practice of Group Therapy. Basic Books.

#### FOOTNOTES

2. Address to incoming class of 1984, Yale University.

3. In 2020, 186,763 Americans died by suicide, alcohol and drug use (Trust for America's Health, 2022, p. 24). This accounts for 5.6% of total deaths and represents the 5th most common cause of death (Ahmad & Anderson, 2021).

4. For more on the breadth of Newman's work, visit [www.frednewmanphd.com](http://www.frednewmanphd.com).

5. For an excellent source on group therapy overall, see Yalom (1985). See Agazarian (2018) for a psychotherapeutic understanding of the importance of attending to the group unit. See Rod & Fridjhon (2020) for systems-oriented couples work which also attends to the importance of the total relationship.

Skiffington, S. 与 Zeus, P. (2003)。《行为教练：如何建构可持续的个人与组织力量》。McGraw-Hill。

Surowiecki, J. (2005)。《群体的智慧》。Anchor Books。

Trust for America's Health. (2022)。《国家之痛：酒精、药物与自杀死亡流行》。[https://www.tfah.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/TFAH\\_2022\\_PainInTheNation\\_Fnl.pdf](https://www.tfah.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/TFAH_2022_PainInTheNation_Fnl.pdf)

Weave: The Social Fabric Project. (2019 年 2 月 13 日)。《关系主义宣言》。<https://www.aspeninstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Weave-Relationalist-Manifesto.pdf>

Weissbourd, R.、Batanova, M.、Lovison, V. 与 Torres, E. (2021 年 2 月 9 日)。《美国的孤独：疫情如何加深孤独流行，以及我们可以对此做什么》。哈佛大学教育研究生院与 Making Caring Common Project。2022 年 1 月 15 日检索。

[https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5b7c56e255b02c683659fe43/t/6021776bdd04957c4557c212/1612805995893/Loneliness+in+America+2021\\_02\\_08\\_FINAL.pdf](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5b7c56e255b02c683659fe43/t/6021776bdd04957c4557c212/1612805995893/Loneliness+in+America+2021_02_08_FINAL.pdf)

Wootton, D. (2015)。《科学的发明：科学革命新史》。Harper。

Yalom, Y. (1985)。《团体心理治疗的理论与实践》。Basic Books。

#### 脚注

2. 致耶鲁大学 1984 届新生的讲话。

3. 2020 年，186,763 名美国人死于自杀、酒精和药物使用 (Trust for America's Health, 2022, 第 24 页)。这占总死亡人数的 5.6%，并构成第五大常见死因 (Ahmad & Anderson, 2021)。

4. 如需了解 Newman 工作的广度，请访问 [www.frednewmanphd.com](http://www.frednewmanphd.com)。

5. 关于团体治疗整体情况的优秀资料，参见 Yalom (1985)。关于从心理治疗角度理解关注群体单位的重要性，参见 Agazarian (2018)。关于系统取向的伴侣工作 (同样关注整体关系的重要性)，参见 Rod & Fridjhon (2020)。