

Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development: The Human Activity Zone

维果茨基的最近发展区：人类活动之域

Lois Holzman, Ph. D.
洛伊丝·霍尔兹曼 博士

East Side Institute for Short Term Psychotherapy
短期心理治疗东区研究所

I want to thank Tom Strong for organizing this symposium, which has given me the opportunity and challenge of addressing--from a social therapeutic perspective--the themes of this symposium. For those of you unfamiliar with social therapy, it is a group therapy that engages clients in the collective activity of creating their therapeutic environment and, in that process, they create new emotional-social learning and growth. In the language of the symposium title, social therapy can be described as the continuous construction of construction sites. If that sounds dialectical, it is. Dialectics, in our activity-theoretic sense (and in contrast to the more traditional, modernist interpretive sense) is the activity of transforming existing environments. This is the methodology of social therapy.

Social therapy has been around some twenty-five years. Its founder, Fred Newman, is a philosopher, playwright and political activist as well as a psychotherapist, and he has brought these sensibilities to the practice and teaching of social therapy. For those interested in social therapy and its relationship to other philosophical and psychological traditions, its links to postmodernism, its critique of mainstream psychology, and its utilization in the fields of education, youth development, medicine, organizational and professional development, I refer you to books and articles by Newman and myself (see references) and to our website (www.eastsideinstitute.org).

In developing social therapeutic practice and articulating it to professional and academic colleagues and audiences, Newman and I have found the writings of Lev Vygotsky, the key founder of activity theory, to be invaluable (Vygotsky, 1978, 1987, 1993, 1997a, 1997b). Vygotsky's work was carried out in the early years of the Soviet Union, but did not become well known in the U.S. until the 1970s. Over the ensuing decades, Vygotsky has served as the major inspiration for a sociocultural approach to education and cognition. Yet his methodological insights and

我要感谢汤姆·斯特朗组织本次研讨会，他给了我一个机会，也抛给我一个挑战：从社会疗愈的视角来谈本次研讨会的主题。在座的诸位若不熟悉社会疗愈，它其实是一种团体治疗，它让来访者共同投入到“创造其治疗环境”这一集体活动之中；而正是在这一过程中，他们创造出新的情感—社会性学习与前行的成长。用本次研讨会题目的话来说，社会疗愈可以被描述为“对施工现场的持续建造”。如果这听起来很辩证，那是因为它本就如此。在我们这种活动理论的意味上（有别于更传统的、现代主义的解读意味），辩证法是改造既有环境的活动。这便是社会疗愈的方法论。

社会疗愈迄今已走过约二十五年。它的创始人弗雷德·纽曼，既是一位心理治疗师，也是哲学家、剧作家和政治行动者，他把这些禀赋带进了社会疗愈的实践与教学之中。如果诸位对社会疗愈，以及它与其他哲学与心理学传统的关系、它与后现代主义的关联、它对主流心理学的批判，还有它在教育、青年发展、医学、组织与专业发展等领域的运用感兴趣，我建议你去读纽曼和我撰写的书籍与文章（见参考文献），并访问我们的网站（www.eastsideinstitute.org）。

在发展社会疗愈实践、并向专业同仁与学界听众阐述它的过程中，纽曼和我都发现，活动理论的关键奠基人列夫·维果茨基的著述具有无可估量的价值（Vygotsky, 1978, 1987, 1993, 1997a, 1997b）。维果茨基的工作开展于苏联初年，但直到二十世纪七十年代才在美国为人熟知。在随后的几十年里，维果茨基成了教育与认知之社会文化取向的主要思想源泉。然而，他的方法论洞见与发现远不止于此；事实上，它们挑战了整个心理学、心理治疗及其哲学预设。我在本次发言

findings are far wider; indeed, they challenge the entirety of psychology, psychotherapy and their philosophical assumptions. Part of my goal in this presentation is to entice you to become familiar with Vygotsky's work and to seriously consider what activity theory has to offer.

Vygotsky saw human growth as a cultural activity that people engage in together, rather than as the external manifestation of an individualized, internal process. For Vygotsky, development does not happen to us--from the inside, from the outside, or from any combination of inside and outside. In both his research and theorizing, he attempted to articulate a new understanding of development tied to a new methodology for understanding human life as socially and actively created and lived.

It is Vygotsky's concept of zones of proximal development that is most relevant to a discussion of therapeutic relationships as construction sites. Moreover, Newman's and my modification (advancement, utilization, or distortion--depending on your point of view) of Vygotsky's concept and our understanding of how zones of proximal development are constructed in social therapy groups provide new ways to think about power, self and identity--issues central to ethical and multicultural concerns about psychotherapy.

中的部分目标，就是吸引你们去熟悉维果茨基的工作，并认真考量活动理论所能提供的东西。

维果茨基把人的成长视为一种人们共同投入的文化活动，而非某种个体化的内在过程之外在显现。对维果茨基而言，发展并不是“发生在我们身上”的——不是来自内部，不是来自外部，也不是来自内与外的任何组合。在他的研究与理论化工作中，他都试图阐明一种对发展的新理解，这种理解连着一一种新方法：把人类生活理解为社会性地、能动地创造出来并活出来的。

在把治疗关系比作“施工现场”的讨论中，最贴切的莫过于维果茨基的“最近发展区”概念。此外，纽曼和我对维果茨基概念的改造（推进、运用，或扭曲——取决于你怎么看），以及我们对“最近发展区如何在社会疗愈小组中被建构出来”的理解，为我们思考权力、自我与身份认同提供了新路径——而这些正是心理治疗中伦理与多元文化关怀的核心议题。

What are zones of proximal development?

何为最近发展区？

Vygotsky coined the term (usually shortened to *zpd*s) to capture the dialectical and sociocultural nature of human learning and development. He was troubled by the accepted belief that development is a key determinant of learning and teaching (a belief that dominates to this day); it was too simple, too linear, too causal. He reasoned that learning/instruction (in Russian, there is but one word) would be "completely unnecessary if it merely utilized what had already matured in the developmental process, if it were not itself a source of development" (Vygotsky, 1987, p. 212). To Vygotsky, learning was both the source and the product of development, just as development was both the source and the product of learning. As activity, learning and development are inseparably intertwined and emergent, best understood together as a whole (unity). Their relationship is dialectical, not linear or temporal (one doesn't come before the other) or causal (one isn't the cause of the other).

维果茨基创造了这个术语（通常缩写为 *zpd*）来把握人类学习与发展之辩证的、社会文化的本性。当时一种被普遍接受的信念令他不安：发展是学习与教学的关键决定因素（这一信念至今仍占主导）；它太过简单、太过线性、太具因果色彩。他推理道：学习/教学（在俄语中，二者本就是一个词）若“仅仅利用发展过程里已经成熟的东西，而自身并非发展的一个源泉，那就完全没有必要了”（Vygotsky, 1987, p. 212）。对维果茨基来说，学习既是发展的源泉、也是发展的产物，正如发展既是学习的源泉、也是学习的产物。作为活动，学习与发展不可分割地交织在一起、并不断生成，最好作为一个整体（统一体）来理解。它们的关系是辩证的，而不是线性的、时间先后的（并非一者先于另一者），也不是因果的（并非一者导致另一者）。

And as activity, the unity learning and development is fundamentally a social (joint, interpersonal, collective), not individualistic, construction. People construct "zones"--the space between who they are and who they are becoming--that allow them to become. What is new here relative to mainstream psychology is the acceptance of, and attempt to understand, human beings as both being and becoming. From this perspective, the zpd is the ever emergent and continuously changing "distance" between being and becoming. An important feature of zpd is that in constructing them, we do things we don't yet know how to do; we go beyond ourselves. This capacity of people to do things in advance of themselves, Vygotsky discovered, is the essence of human growth. Children learn and develop, he said, by "performing a head taller than they are" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 102).

As Newman and I see it, the zpd is nothing less than the rejection of the individuated learning and development model that dominates psychology. More than deconstruction, however, it offer a positive alternative reconstruction. In the terms of developmental psychology (which is my training), Vygotsky's zpd transforms stage theory. In my view, stages OF development--the idea that individuals go through a linear, teleological progression--is a distortion of the life process and has done little to advance our ability to support people's continued development. It is stages FOR development--the idea that groupings of people engage in the ensemble, dialectical, performatory activity of developing--that holds great promise (Holzman, 1997a).

Newman and I coined the term emotional zpd to refer to the "therapeutic stages for development" that are social therapy groups (Newman and Holzman, 1993). These groups are typically comprised of 10-25 people, a mix of women and men of varying ages, ethnicities, sexual orientations, professions and "problems." Most groups are ongoing (although we do some time-limited groups) and meet weekly for 90 minutes. Members' length of time in group varies; some people remain for years, others leave and new members join. People come into social therapy groups individuated (which is no different from how they come into any therapy or any group) and wanting help individualistically. This is perfectly understandable, given that in our culture people are socialized to an individuated learning and development model. But in order for people to grow

而作为活动，学习与发展这一统一体在根本上是一种社会性的（共同的、人际的、集体的）、而非个体主义的建构。人们建构出“区”——介于“他们之所是”与“他们之所将成为”之间的空间——而这空间使他们得以成为。相对于主流心理学，这里的崭新之处在于：接纳并尝试理解人既是“存在者”也是“生成者”。从这个视角看，最近发展区就是存在与生成之间那不断生成、持续变化的“距离”。最近发展区的一个重要特征是：在建构它的过程中，我们去做那些自己还不会做的事；我们超越了自己。维果茨基发现，人先于自身去行事的能力，正是人类成长的本质。他说，儿童正是通过“表演得比他们实际高出一头”来学习与发展的（Vygotsky, 1978, p. 102）。

在纽曼和我看来，最近发展区无异于对主导着心理学的那种“个体化的学习与发展模型”的拒绝。然而，它提供的远不止于解构，更是一种积极的、替代性的重建。用发展心理学（这是我受训的领域）的话来说，维果茨基的最近发展区改造了阶段理论。在我看来，“发展的阶段”——即认为个体要经历一种线性的、目的论式的进阶——是对生命过程的扭曲，对提升我们支持人持续发展的能力助益甚少。真正大有可为的，是“为了发展的阶段”——即一些人聚成群体，投身于整体的、辩证的、表演性的发展活动这一理念（Holzman, 1997a）。

纽曼和我创造了“情感最近发展区”一词，用来指称作为“为了发展的治疗性阶段”的社会疗愈小组（Newman and Holzman, 1993）。这些小组通常由 10 至 25 人组成，男女混合，年龄、族裔、性取向、职业与“问题”各不相同。多数小组是长期持续的（尽管我们也办一些限时小组），每周聚会 90 分钟。成员留在小组的时间长短不一；有人待上数年，有人离开、又有新成员加入。人们带着个体化的状态走进社会疗愈小组（这与他们走进任何治疗或任何群体并无不同），并期望以个人主义的方式获得帮助。这完全可以理解，因为在我们的文化里，人们被社会化进了一种个体化的学习与发展模型。但为了让人们在情感上得以成长，我们相信这一模型必须受到挑战。社会疗愈正是为此而存在的方法论；

emotionally, we believe that model must be challenged. Social therapy is a methodology for doing that; what we refer to as "building the group" is the practical-critical activity that challenges the individuated model through the creating of a new socialized helping environment.

The individuated members of social therapy groups come together week after week and participate in building the group (constructing emotional zpd's) as a bi-condition of their learning and development. Social therapy is not designed to help individuals with their individual problems. It is, rather, a re-learning of how to learn: Vygotsky showed that we learn collectively and through our inter-relationships with others at varying levels of skill, knowledge, expertise and ability. Most of us haven't done that since we were very young, and so we have to relearn how to do it (in ways appropriate to being adults). Similar to early childhood, the re-education in social therapy is active, ensemble and performatory, rather than didactic.

The social therapist works with the group (not the individuated selves that, reductionistically speaking, comprise the group) to organize itself as an emotional zpd. The various members, each at different levels of emotional development, are encouraged to create a new unit with a new level of emotional development, i.e., the group's level of emotional development. This ongoing and ever-changing activity is developmental for all—even those who are most "individually" developed.

Members of the group raise whatever they want and however they want (how they're feeling, an emotional problem, a relationship going bad, something that happened to them, etc.). The work of the group is figuring out how to talk about what they want to talk about--How can we talk so that our talking helps build the group? This--not the substance of talk (its aboutness)--is the focus of the group's activity. And it's hard work! The authority of language (as expressive of truth, reality and self) is challenged explicitly as people falteringly attempt to converse in this new way, to create meaning together and, in that process, they come to see that what they are saying to each other has no meaning other than what they create.

We focus on teaching people how to make meaning together because we believe that is what makes it possible to exercise the power of creativity required for developmental transformation. What we are working on is creating and building with people's

我们所称的“建设小组”，就是通过创造一个新的、社会化的助人环境，来挑战那一个体化模型的实践—批判活动。

社会疗愈小组里那些个体化的成员，一周又一周地聚到一起，参与到“建设小组”（建构情感最近发展区）之中，而这正是他们学习与发展互为条件的一面。社会疗愈并非 designed 用来帮个体解决他们的个人问题。它更像是一种对“如何学习”的重新学习：维果茨基指出，我们是集体地学习的，是通过与技能、知识、专长与能力各不相同的他人之间的相互关系而学习的。我们大多数人自从幼年之后便不再这样做了，因此必须重新学习怎么做（以配得上成年人的方式）。与幼年类似，社会疗愈中的再教育也是主动的、整体的、表演性的，而非说教式的。

社会疗愈师与整个小组（而不是还原论意义上构成小组的那些个体化自我）一道工作，使小组把自己组织成一个情感最近发展区。形形色色的成员，各自处在不同的情感发展水平上，被鼓励去创造出一个具有新层次的情感发展单位，亦即小组自身的情感发展水平。这一持续不断、时刻变化的活动，对所有人来说都具有发展性——即便是那些在“个体”意义上发展得最充分的人。

小组成员提出任何他们想提出的、以任何他们想要的方式提出（他们的感受、一个情感问题、一段变坏的关系、发生在他们身上的事，等等）。小组的工作，是琢磨出“如何去谈论他们想谈论的东西”——我们怎样才能这样去交谈：让我们的交谈有助于建设小组？这一点的焦点所在，而非谈话的实质内容（它所关乎的东西）——才是小组活动的重心。而这是件艰难的事！当人们磕磕绊绊地尝试以这种新方式交谈、共同创造意义时，语言的权威（作为真理、现实与自我的表达）被明确地挑战了；在这一过程中，他们逐渐明白：彼此所说的那些话，除了他们自己所创造的，别无他意。

我们把重心放在教人们如何共同建构意义上，因为我们相信，正是这一点，使得发挥发展性转化所需的创造之力成为可能。我们所做的，是带着人们最初那种个体化的、以问题为导向的陈述，

initial individuated, problem-oriented presentations. The social therapists' task is to lead the group in the activity of discovering a method of relating to talk relationally rather than individualistically. In this process people come to appreciate what-and that--they can create, and simultaneously to realize the limitations of trying to learn, grow and create individually. If the group comes to understand this collectively, social therapy goes on to teach people how to build the group and to realize that growth comes from participating in the process of building the groups in which one functions. This new learning, in Vygotskian, zpd-like fashion, rekindles development--development by virtue of the group growing. With the change in therapeutic focus--from the individuated self who discovers deeper insights into his or her consciousness to the collective engaged in the continuous activity of creating a new social unit (the emotional zpd)--the therapeutic question transforms as well--from "How is each individual doing?" to "How well is the group performing its activity?"

Power, Authority and Identity

权力、权威与身份认同

Vygotsky's zpd, coupled with the social therapeutic emotional zpd, makes possible a fresh engagement of the issue of power and, more specifically, provides new thinking and new language for addressing what is traditionally referred to as "power relations" in therapy. As we understand it, the concern with power in group therapy is two-fold: first, that the therapist is in a privileged position and has power over her/his clients, who are in a vulnerable position; and second, that certain group members, because of their privileged social location, have power over other group members. This concern is premised on an individuated learning, development and therapeutic model. The presumed connection between therapy and vulnerability--which is either that people in therapy are more vulnerable than those who are not in therapy, or that being in therapy somehow makes you more vulnerable than you were before you came to therapy--rests not only on the primacy of the individual but also on a Freudian-based fear of the group. "Power" is a characteristic of individuals, and a negative one to boot.

Let us first give new meaning to "power." More than twenty years ago, in a re-examination and "therapeutization" of Marxism, Newman brought to

去创造并与其共建。社会疗愈师的任务是：带领小组去发现一种“关系性地、而非个体主义地”对待言谈的方法。在这个过程中，人们既体会到自己能够创造什么、也体会到自己确实能够创造，同时意识到：试图以个体方式去学习、成长与创造，是有其局限的。如果小组集体地理解了这一点，社会疗愈便进一步教人们如何去建设小组，并让人领悟到：成长源自参与“建设那个你置身其中的小组”这一过程。这种新的学习，以维果茨基式的、类似最近发展区的方式，重新点燃了发展——因小组成长而生的发展。随着治疗重心的转移——从那个“发掘出对自身意识更深洞见”的个体自我，转向那个“持续投身于创造新社会单元（情感最近发展区）”的集体——治疗性的问题也随之转化：从“每个个体过得怎么样？”变为“小组把它的活动开展得怎么样？”

维果茨基的最近发展区，加上社会疗愈的情感最近发展区，使得我们能够重新触及权力问题；更具体地说，它为我们处理治疗传统上所称的“权力关系”提供了新的思考与新的语言。在我们的理解中，团体治疗中对权力的关切有两层：其一，治疗师处于特权位置，对其处于脆弱位置的来访者拥有权力；其二，某些小组成员因其享有的社会位置之特权，而对其他成员拥有权力。这一关切，是建立在一个个体化的学习、发展与治疗模型之上的。那种被认为存在于治疗与脆弱性之间的关联——要么是“接受治疗的人的脆弱性超过未接受治疗的人”，要么是“接受治疗在某种意义上让你比来治疗前更脆弱”——不仅建立在个体的优先性之上，也建立在一个以弗洛伊德为基础的、对群体的恐惧之上。“权力”被看作个体的一种特征，而且还是一种负面的特征。

让我们先给“权力”赋予新的含义。二十多年前，在对马克思主义的一次重审与“治疗化”中，纽曼揭示了“权力”与“权威”之间的关键

light a critical distinction between "power" and "authority" (Newman, 1974). Power, he said, is the creative capacity of the group--by the exercise of its emotional labor--to generate new environments; authority is the societally overdetermined predisposition of the individuated members of the group to passively accept class-dominated, patriarchal emotive environments. Conflict between the two gets played out in group therapy. In social therapy groups, where the unit of transformation/change/growth/learning is the group, the therapist is the organizer of the group's emotive labor power and, at the same time, the potential--or even actual--repository of the group members' "authoritarian instincts." The ongoing process of social therapy is the working out this relationship; as the group engages in the activity of building the group, it is changing its relationship to power and to authority. Hopefully, it becomes more powerful.

Over the past year, I have been working to better understand social therapy through a study of how Newman teaches it. I've just completed a book-length manuscript (Holzman and Mendez, in press). Power, authority, identity, self and the ethics of therapy come up frequently in dialogues Newman has with therapists and therapists-in-training. Here is one excerpt, entitled "The Oppression of Identity," which provides a new understanding of identity as an authority--not a power--relation.

The Oppression of Identity (excerpt)

身份认同的压迫（摘录）

Therapist-in-training: I have been wondering how a person's social location might affect the way that they come to be engaged in social therapy. By social location, I mean the set of over-determining factors, such as race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, etc. that comprise a person's identity or sense of themselves, especially in relation to others. In my group facilitation work, I notice that social location often influences the participation of group members. Because identity in our culture is a hegemonic construct, with certain reference groups privileged over others, certain group members have described feeling "disempowered" from participating as much as others in the group and, consequently, feel alienated. How does one address these issues as they arise in the context of the social therapy group?

Fred: In some respects, that is pretty much all we

区分 (Newman, 1974)。他说，权力是小组的创造能力——通过行使它的情感劳动——去生成新环境；而权威，则是小组中那些个体化的成员被动接受“阶级主宰的、父权制的情感环境”的一种被社会过度决定的倾向。两者之间的冲突在团体治疗中上演。在社会疗愈小组里，转化/改变/成长/学习的单位是小组本身，治疗师是小组情感劳动力的组织者，同时又是小组成员“权威主义本能”的潜在的——甚至是实际的——存放处。社会疗愈持续推进的过程，就是去厘清这一关系；当小组投身于建设小组的活动时，它就在改变自己与权力、与权威的关系。但愿，它会变得更有力量。

过去这一年，我一直在通过研究纽曼如何教导社会疗愈，来更深入地理解它。我刚完成了一部长达一本书篇幅的手稿 (Holzman and Mendez, in press)。在纽曼与治疗师及受训治疗师的对话中，权力、权威、身份认同、自我与治疗伦理频频出现。下面是一段摘录，题为“身份认同的压迫”，它提供了一种新的理解：身份认同是一种权威关系——而非权力关系。

受训治疗师：我一直在想，一个人的社会位置会如何影响他走进社会疗愈的方式。我所说的社会位置，是指那一整套过度决定的因素，比如种族、族裔、性取向、性别等，它们构成了一个人的身份认同或自我感，尤其是在与他人的关系之中。在我做小组引导的工作里，我注意到社会位置常常影响着小组成员的参与。因为在我们的文化里，身份认同是一种霸权性的建构，某些参照群体被赋予高于他者的特权，于是一些小组成员形容自己感到“无力”，无法像其他人那样充分地参与小组，并因此感到疏离。当这些问题在社会疗愈小组的情境中浮现时，该如何去应对？

弗雷德：在某些方面，这几乎就是我们在社会疗

address in social therapy. We certainly don't address people's emotional problems. We much more address those constructs and how they function. As you point out, in some ways they function socially to privilege certain people over others. Psychologically, they function to keep people locked into their identity locations, which often makes it very difficult for people to grow. Many people, by virtue of their identities, won't even come into therapy; it's simply not within their frame of reference. They aren't ready to accept the public image that is associated with being in therapy.

Identity is hurtful as a sociological construct, and it's also inhibiting as a psychological construct. It's oppressive in both ways. In both our practice and theoretical writings what we regularly engage is not simply particular identities, but the whole concept of identity and why we need, how we use, and how we've been imposed upon by an identity understanding of self. It's fundamental to our work of reinitiating growth.

One of the ways that we try to deal with the identity understanding of self is to work hard to do what we call "building the group." The reason the building of the group is so important in social therapy is that it is the counter force to breaking down individuated identity. You can't simply work in a deconstructive way to break down identities; people clutch them too dearly. But what we have seen in practice over many years is that working together to create a social construct--namely, the group--is a way for people to take a look at, engage, and reconsider--not simply intellectually but in practice--the isolation of their own private identity, whatever that identity might be.

Now, along the way lots of people are, in varying ways, resistant to that. They either want to hold onto the privilege of their identity or--not surprisingly, but in some sense paradoxically--they want to hold onto the victimization of their identity. Both things happen all the time. People cling to identity on both sides of the social spectrum. We're all acculturated to hold onto our identities, much the way we're acculturated to a glorified sense of self. The social therapeutic approach attempts to deconstruct the sense of self in favor of a concept of social relationship, which we think comes, not from some abstract ideological commitment, but from a participatory process in which people actually construct something together--namely, the group. The key focus is building the group.

愈中所处理的全部。我们当然不处理人们的情感问题。我们更多处理的是那些建构，以及它们如何运作。正如你指出的，在某些方面，它们在社会的层面上运作，使某些人优于他人。在心理的层面上，它们把人们锁进他们的身份位置之中，这常常让人极难成长。许多人，由于其身份，根本不会走进治疗；这根本不在他们的参照框架之内。他们还没准备好去接受“接受治疗的人的公开形象”。

作为一种社会学建构，身份认同是有害的；作为一种心理学建构，它同样是一种束缚。它在两种方式上都是压迫性的。在我们的实践和理论著述中，我们所持续触及的，不只是特定的身份，更是身份认同这一概念整体，以及：我们为何需要它、我们如何使用它、我们又如何被一种“以身份认同来理解自我”的方式所强加。这对我们重启成长的工作而言，是根本性的。

我们试图应对那种“以身份认同来理解自我”的方式之一，就是努力去做我们所称的“建设小组”。建设小组在社会疗愈中之所以如此重要，是因为它是瓦解个体化身份认同的反向力量。你不能仅仅以解构的方式去拆解身份；人们把它们抓得太紧了。但我们在多年实践中看到的是：共同去创造一个社会建构——亦即小组——是一种方式，让人们得以审视、触碰并重新考量——不只是智识上，而是在实践中——他们自己那私人身份的孤立状态，无论那身份是什么。

然而在此过程中，许多人都以各不相同的方式对此抵触。他们要么想紧抓住自己身份的特权，要么——这并不令人意外，但在某种意义上又显得矛盾——想紧抓住自己身份中的受害者地位。这两件事随时都在发生。在社会光谱的两端，人们都紧抓着自己的身份不放。我们都被文化塑造成要去紧抓身份，就像我们被塑造成去紧抓一种被美化的自我感。社会疗愈的取向，试图解构那种自我感，转而支持一种社会关系的概念；我们认为这种概念并非来自某种抽象的意识形态承诺，而是来自一种参与性的过程——在其中人们真正地共同建构出某物——亦即小组。关键的重心，就是建设小组。

A lot of people think that the way to deal with social problems is to work on the problems as part of building community. We feel it's exactly the other way around. We think you build community, and in creating that community, you deal with social differences and social problems. In our work, we are always oriented toward creating the social environment as part of the complex dialectic of breaking down the individuated self-identity. We've found that makes a huge difference in people's ability to deal with their emotional difficulties. It's a fascinating irony. My experience has been that the more people participate in the creation of group, the deeper is their understanding of who they are individually--not the other way around. Creating the group curiously enhances who they are individually. Part of what keeps us so unable to know who we are is that we're too close to ourselves. We're so intimate with ourselves that we often don't know what we're about. As we participate in the process of creating something bigger than ourselves, we actually come to get a view of who we are and what we're about--even as we transform. That's the general framework. It's right at the core of what the social therapeutic activity is about. It's an engagement of identity. (Holzman and Mendez, in press)

In preparing this talk, I had a conversation with Newman in which he commented, "Why bother doing group therapy if you want to help individuals grow?" I think that's a really good question. The power of group therapy, it seems to me, resides in its potential as human activity zone--more specifically, its capacity to replicate the non-authoritarian (non-individuated, non-epistemological) learning-and-development of early childhood through the social construction of zpbs and, thereby, the creation of emotional growth.

许多人认为，处理社会问题的方式，是把这些问题作为“建设社群”的一部分来解决。我们觉得恰恰相反。我们认为你是先建设社群，而在创造那个社群的过程中，你才去处理社会差异与社会问题。在我们的工作中，我们始终着眼于创造社会环境，把它作为“瓦解个体化自我身份”这一复杂辩证过程的一部分。我们发现，这给人们应对自身情感困难的能力带来了巨大不同。这是个迷人的反讽。我的经验是：人们越是参与小组的创造，他们对“自己作为个体是谁”的理解就越深——而不是相反。创造小组，奇妙地增强了一个人作为个体的样子。让我们如此难以认清自己是自己的部分原因，是我们离自己太近了。我们与自己太过亲密，以至于常常不知道自己究竟在做什么。当我们参与创造那个大于我们自身的事物之过程时，我们反倒真正获得了一个视角，去看清自己是谁、自己在做什么——即便我们同时在转化。这就是总体框架。它正处在社会疗愈活动之所关乎的核心。它是一场对身份认同的触碰。

(Holzman and Mendez, in press)

在准备这次发言时，我与纽曼有一次对话，他说：“如果你想帮个体成长，何必费劲去做团体治疗？”我觉得这是个非常好的问题。在我看来，团体治疗的威力，就在于它作为“人类活动之域”的潜能——更具体地说，在于它通过最近发展区的社会建构，去复刻童年早期那种非权威的（非个体化的、非认识论的）学习与发展，并由此创造出情感的成长。

References

参考文献

Holzman, L. (1997a). The developmental stage. *Special Children*, June/July, 32-35.

Holzman, L. (1997b). *Schools for growth: Radical alternatives to current educational models*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Holzman, L. (Ed.), (1999). *Performing psychology: A postmodern culture of the mind*. New York: Routledge.

Holzman, L. (2000). *Performative psychology: An untapped*

Holzman, L. (1997a). 发展阶段。《特殊儿童》，6/7 月号，32 - 35。

Holzman, L. (1997b). 成长之学：对现行教育模式的激进替代。Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Holzman, L. (编), (1999). 表演心理学：一种后现代的心灵文化。New York: Routledge.

Holzman, L. (2000). 表演性心理学：教育者尚未开

- resource for educators. *Educational and Child Psychology*, 17(3), 86-103.
- Holzman, L. (in press). Lev Vygotsky and the new performative psychology: Implications for business and organizations. To appear in D.M. Hosking and S. McNamee (Eds.), *Organisational behaviour: Social constructionist approaches*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Holzman, L. and Mendez, R (in press). *Psychological investigations: A clinician's guide to social therapy*. New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Holzman, L. and Morss, J. (Eds.) (2000). *Postmodern psychologies, societal practice and political life*. New York: Routledge.
- Newman, F. (1974). *Power and authority: The inside view of class struggle*. New York: Centers for Change.
- Newman, F. (1996). *Performance of a lifetime: A practical-philosophical guide to the joyous life*. New York: Castillo.
- Newman, F. (in press). Undecidable emotions (What is social therapy? And how is it revolutionary?) *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*.
- Newman, F. and Holzman, L. (1993). *Lev Vygotsky: Revolutionary scientist*. London: Routledge.
- Newman, F. and Holzman, L. (1996). *Unscientific psychology: A cultural-performatory approach to understanding human life*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Newman, F. and Holzman, L. (1997). *The end of knowing: A new developmental way of learning*. London: Routledge.
- Newman, F. and Holzman, L. (1999). Beyond narrative to performed conversation ('In the beginning' comes much later). *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 12,1, 23-40.
- Newman, F. and Holzman, L. (2000). Against against-ism: *Theory & Psychology*, 10(2), 265-270.
- Newman, F. and Holzman, L. (2000). The relevance of Marx to therapeutics in the 21st century. *New Therapist*, 3, 24-27.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky*. Vol. 1. New York: Plenum.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1993). *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky*. Vol. 2. New York: Plenum.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1997a). *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky*. Vol. 3. New York: Plenum.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1997b). *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky*. Vol. 4. New York: Plenum.
- 发的资源。《教育者与儿童心理学》，17(3)，86 - 103。
- Holzman, L. (待出版). 列夫·维果茨基与新的表演性心理学：对商业与组织的启示。将收于 D.M. Hosking 与 S. McNamee (编)，《组织行为：社会建构主义取向》。Amsterdam: John Benjamins。
- Holzman, L. 与 Mendez, R (待出版). *心理学探究：社会疗愈临床指南*。New York: Brunner-Routledge。
- Holzman, L. 与 Morss, J. (编) (2000). *后现代心理学、社会实践与政治生活*。New York: Routledge。
- Newman, F. (1974). *权力与权威：阶级斗争的内在视野*。New York: Centers for Change。
- Newman, F. (1996). *一生的表演：通往喜悦生活的实践—哲学指南*。New York: Castillo。
- Newman, F. (待出版). 不可判定的情绪（何为社会疗愈？它又何以是革命的？）《建构主义心理学刊》。
- Newman, F. 与 Holzman, L. (1993). *列夫·维果茨基：革命性的科学家*。London: Routledge。
- Newman, F. 与 Holzman, L. (1996). *非科学的心理学：理解人类生活的一种文化—表演性取向*。Westport, CT: Praeger。
- Newman, F. 与 Holzman, L. (1997). *认知的终结：一种新的发展性学习方式*。London: Routledge。
- Newman, F. 与 Holzman, L. (1999). 超越叙事，走向被表演出来的对话（“起初”来得晚得多）。《建构主义心理学刊》，12(1)，23 - 40。
- Newman, F. 与 Holzman, L. (2000). 反对“反主义”：《理论与心理学》，10(2)，265 - 270。
- Newman, F. 与 Holzman, L. (2000). 马克思对二十一世纪治疗学的现实意义。《新治疗师》，3，24 - 27。
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *社会中的心智*。Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press。
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). *维果茨基全集（第一卷）*。New York: Plenum。
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1993). *维果茨基全集（第二卷）*。New York: Plenum。
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1997a). *维果茨基全集（第三卷）*。New York: Plenum。
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1997b). *维果茨基全集（第四卷）*。New York: Plenum。