

'Creativity lies at the edge of disintegration: Addressing the shadow of power and leadership within psychotherapy training organisations'

Rupert Kinglake Tower

'One does not become enlightened by imagining figures of light, but by making the darkness conscious. The latter procedure, however, is disagreeable and therefore not popular'

(Jung, CW13, par. 335)

'We of the ministering professions shall not be delivered from evil. But we can learn to deal with it.'

(Guggenbuhl-Craig, 1971, p. ix)

'Tis dangerous when the baser nature comes between the pass and fell incensed points of mighty opposites'

(Hamlet, Act V, Scene 2)

'Loving the shadow may begin with carrying it, but even that is not enough. At one moment, something else must break through, that laughing insight at the paradox of one's own folly which is also everyman's. Then may come the joyful acceptance of the rejected and inferior, a going with it and even a partial living of it. This love may even lead to an identification with and acting out of the shadow, falling into its fascination. Therefore the moral dimension can never be abandoned. Thus is cure a paradox requiring two incommensurables: the moral recognition that these parts of me are burdensome and intolerable and must change, and the loving laughing acceptance which takes them just as they are, joyfully, forever. One both tries hard and lets go, judges harshly and joins gladly.'

(James Hillman, Insearch: Psychology and Religion, Spring Publications, p. 76)

THIS PAPER REFLECTS my ongoing quest to understand the personal and collective Shadow, how it manifests within individuals and groups in psychotherapy training organisations, and in what

circumstances it can tend to erupt into consciousness, thereby causing adverse disruption to individual relationships and group dynamics within organisational life. As a psychotherapist myself, I struggle constantly

to maintain a dialogue with my personal Shadow, a relationship which more often than not is uneasy and difficult, and sometimes painful when I am particularly resistant to its advances for acceptance and recognition. I have also recently assumed a role of responsibility within a psychotherapy training organisation, which has motivated me to ask more searching questions of myself and others about the role and nature of Shadow processes both individually and collectively within an organisation. What is asked of those who choose to take leadership roles in psychotherapy training organisations, and what is their relationship to power and authority? What qualities of leadership are required during periods of crisis and breakdown within organisations? And more generally, what are the dangers that can ensue when the Shadow remains unnamed and unacknowledged, and what methods can be addressed to maintain a model of healthy as opposed to pathological functioning in a psychotherapy training organisational setting?

Collectively European psychotherapy literature seem to be replete with well documented stories of conflict, splits, schisms, and struggles for power within analytical training organisations. These originate with the early history of the conflict between Freud and Jung and the formation of Freud's 'Secret Committee' to displace Jung (Grosskurth, 1991), and by Jung's need to exert sole control over his 'Psychological Club' by the cultivation of his special, idealised, and self-protective position, an apparently 'cosy club setting' undoubtedly riddled by unresolved transferences and counter-transferences (Samuels, 1994). Acrimonious splits and identity crises have been highly visible in more recent decades, occurring between London Jungians and Zurich Jungians. Within the UK, the Association of Jungian Analysts split off from the Society of Analytical Psychology, soon to be followed by the split between the Association of Jungian Analysts and the Independent Group of Analytical Psychologists (see Casement, 1995; Eisold, 2001). Historically such

splitting has been widespread within other psychotherapy institutions and across humanistic, integrative and psycho-spiritual modalities. Splitting represents a fundamental problem of human nature and will naturally occur in group environments.

A colleague expressed the view in conversation that 'Jung and Freud are both theologians in disguise' which struck a chord with me. The template of their own split has in some sense been bequeathed to the psychotherapy profession. Psychotherapy organisations do frequently engage in internal and internecine conflicts that closely resemble interfaith struggles and theological disputes, where individuals denounce others as heretics. In similar fashion, we psychotherapists can be rather 'preachy' about owning Shadow projections, and yet it is tragically ironical that although we can display deep thoughtfulness about the Shadow in relation to our clients, within our own professional organisations we can be astonishingly cruel, destructive and wanting of understanding or compassion for our colleagues. Re-enactments of family and power dynamics manifest powerfully in Shadow projections and in the denigration of the other.

My aims in this paper are fourfold: firstly to introduce the theme of the Shadow and Power with a Russian fairytale, *The Black Magician Czar*; secondly, to discuss briefly my understanding of Jung's ideas about the personal and archetypal Shadow; I will then go on to explore the tensions that manifest in psychotherapy training organisations between holding a vision and organisational practice, with particular reference to the relationship between founders and later generations. I have drawn upon qualitative data from six informal interviews that I conducted with experienced, senior psychotherapy colleagues who represent their training organisations within the humanistic and integrative section (HIPS) of the UKCP. Based in large part on their experiences of encountering the Shadow during difficult transitions and periods of conflict within

their organisations, I shall discuss the question of power and leadership and how these are held, and how later generations may unconsciously carry the Shadow for the founders.

Finally, I address the issue of finding frameworks that can welcome Shadow dynamics and more creatively manage the tensions and engage with them, that can allow for difference, resolve long-standing conflicts, and contain such naturally occurring splits as will inevitably emerge, without being torn apart by them. I assess ways and processes of surviving, confronting, naming and owning the Shadow within organisational life, and suggest some innovative forms of holding authority and leadership for the 21st century.

A Russian fairytale about overcoming the shadow

I want to begin by telling a Russian fairytale called *The Black Magician Czar*, loosely taken from Marie-Louise Von Franz (1987, pp. 236–9, which I have much abbreviated), which describes an encounter with the Shadow and how to cope with it.

The Black Magician Czar

There was a czar who was a black magician and a very powerful ruler. One day he gave a dinner party for all his subjects, and said to them: 'Whoever can run away and hide himself from me shall have half my kingdom and my daughter as his wife, and after my death he can rule over my whole empire'. Everybody who sat there remained silent and turned pale. But a very bold young man got up and said, 'Czar, I can hide from you and escape.' And the czar answered, 'All right, bold young man, hide yourself. Tomorrow I will hunt for you and if you don't succeed in hiding yourself, your head must come off!' The bold young man went off to hide, but the czar read his book of magic and found out where the youth had gone, and sent his servants to find him and bring him before him. The czar then said to the hapless youth, 'Since you didn't succeed in hiding yourself from me your head must come off.' And the czar himself took a sharp sword and cut off the youth's head (and

found great pleasure in his evil game).

The next day the czar issued the same challenge and again a bold young man suffered the same fate.

On the third day there was another dinner party and the czar made the same offer. There was a third bold young man who said he could escape him, but only on the third attempt. He went out of the city and shape-changed into a weasel, drill, and then a falcon and flew in front of the czar's daughter's window. She saw him and opened the window and he flew in. Inside her room he turned himself back into a young man and had a nice private dinner with the czar's daughter. Then he turned himself into a ring she put on her finger.

However, the czar again consulted his magic book and discerned the youth's hiding place. 'So,' he said, 'now your head must come off your shoulders!' But the youth replied that it had been arranged that he should have three tries, and the czar let him go.

The youth departed once more, shape-changing into several animals, and was again admitted to the czar's daughter's room where he turned into his own form. They had a nice feast and spent the night together and tried to plan a way to escape the czar. The next day he went to open fields and turned himself into a blade of grass. But once again the czar consulted his magic book, found the youth and demanded that his head must come off his shoulders, but the youth said no, he still had another chance to hide, the last one, and the czar agreed. The youth left the palace, and shape-changed into a gray wolf, a pike, and then a falcon. Flying over mountains and cliff, he saw the nest of the magovei bird (a magic bird in Russian fairy tales) on a green oak tree and dropped down into her nest. The bird was not there at the time, but when she came back and saw the bold youth sitting there, she said, 'What impertinence!' She seized him by the collar and flew with him out of the nest, across the blue sea and put him on the magician czar's window. The youth changed himself into a fly, flew into the palace and then became a piece of flint, a fire stone, and lay down by the fireplace.

Meanwhile the black magician began to read and search his magic book which told him the youth was in the magovei bird's nest. His servants found the nest but no youth. The czar looked in his book and thought that he must be there. The czar

himself joined in the hunt. They hunted and hunted. The czar thought that even if he had not found the youth he could no longer be alive on the earth. So they went back to the empire. The second and third day passed. One morning the maid got up and started to lay the fire. She took the flint stone and rubbed it on some steel; the stone flew out of her hand and there stood the youth.

‘Good morning, mighty czar’, he said.

‘Good morning, bold young man. Now your head must come off your shoulders.’

‘No, mighty czar,’ the youth said, ‘you have sought me for three days and had given up the search. I have now come voluntarily. Now I should have half the kingdom and your daughter as my wife!’

The czar could do nothing so the two were married and had a wonderful wedding feast. The youth became the czar’s son-in-law and got half the empire, and on the death of the czar he was to ascend the throne.

This fairytale raises several helpful aspects for relating to the Shadow and Evil. *The Black Magician Czar* describes a kind of incestuous situation between the father and the daughter where the feminine principle is a captive of the masculine principle. The czar is a diabolical ‘Negative Shadow’ figure possessed by a complex whose primary drive is to dominate and retain power. Those young men who also attempt to adopt a power attitude are swiftly beheaded.

The hero in this tale succeeds because he is able to receive knowledge directly from its natural source which cannot be misused by evil forces. He also knows a way to approach the feminine principle so that he is helped three times by the czar’s daughter, the female magovei bird that lives outside of the paternalistic structure, and the maid, because he chooses to relate to the creative, instinctual spontaneity that springs from the Self rather than believing in the inflated omnipotence and power of ego desires.

This ‘magical competition’ is an archetypal image. We can observe this in Russia in shaman rivalries, each challenging the other to discover who is more adept in the use of

magic. The black czar’s magical book seems to represent a closed system of magic which misinterprets the way of the feminine, misuses power, and seeks possession through personal will alone. It is also possibly a symbol of the czar’s unconscious inflation, as he attempts to harness unconscious processes in an omnipotent fashion to achieve ego ambitions.

The hero is saved by an ordinary flint stone which produces fire, and was known by Western alchemists to have a spirit within it. This stone, in which dwells a spiritual power, is associated with the Philosopher’s stone and the Holy Grail as ‘stone from heaven’ (Clarke, 2001), and is a widespread symbol of Jung’s archetype of wholeness and totality of the psyche, the Self. There is an idea here that whoever can dwell within the Self, and place ego concerns in relation and in alignment with the Ego-Self axis rather than being driven by the need for wilful, heroic action, is more likely to remain inaccessible (invisible) to subjugation by Shadow enactments and compulsions.

The personal and archetypal shadow

What does Jung mean precisely by the Shadow? For Jung at a fundamental level ‘*the Shadow is simply the whole unconscious*’ (Von Franz, 1987, p. 5) and therefore from the perspective of the Self it is a morally neutral and natural phenomenon, our psychological nature, as epitomised by the ambiguous Russian nature goddess Baba-Yaga; in other words, neither good nor bad, but a mixed bag of contents. Put simply, those aspects that we are unable to accept, own or acknowledge within ourselves. As an archetype, this is represented by ‘*the Mercurius duplex who on the one hand is Hermes the mystagogue and psychopomp and on the other hand is the poisonous dragon, the evil spirit and “trickster”*’ (Jung, 1959, par. 689).

Jung differentiates between two distinctive dimensions of the Shadow, its individual, personal manifestations and its collective, archetypal manifestations. Individually, the pressure to adopt a socially acceptable ‘persona’ in the face of parental and environmental demands, named after the Roman

term for an actor's mask, requires us to deny or forsake expression of some of our essential attributes, qualities and values. These rejected elements constitute our personal shadow, and are experienced as our counter-persona and awkward, dark side. Typically the Shadow appears in our dreams *'as a "shady" character of dubious integrity, possessing the same sex as the dreamer and displaying characteristics customarily regarded as disreputable and inferior'* (Stevens, 2002, p. 251). We defend against 'Negative Shadow' recognition of our dark brother or sister with intense ferocity, by denial, projection, repression and so on; often unaware that also residing therein is 'Positive Shadow', encompassing concealed creative potentialities of the greatest dynamism (Firman & Gilda, 1997).

The Collective, Archetypal Shadow, by contrast, can be described *'as the darkness that may be found as an undercurrent in all human groups, whether families, tribes, organisations, movements or large civilisations, as well as in human nature generally'* (Daniels, 2000, p. 30). We now encounter the archetype of the enemy, the treacherous stranger, the thieving intruder, and the trickster of myth and fairytale, and importantly the human engagement with Evil and the terrifying potential for human atrocity. Jung is uncompromising about this: *'we are always, thanks to our human nature, potential criminals ... None of us stands outside humanity's ... collective shadow'* (Jung, 1958, p. 96). He writes elsewhere that the archetypal shadow is *'an ethical problem of the first magnitude'* (Jung, 1960, par. 410). In other words, this becomes an integral dilemma in which we are being invited to accept moral responsibility for the projection of shadow onto the collective in its many forms. The leaden footedness of George Bush and his inability to react to the human tragedy of Hurricane Katrina may be an example of the Collective Shadow of racism playing into his Personal Shadow so that aid could not be brought to the dispossessed.

There is also a link here with a similar

paradigm, that of the creative ambiguity of the daimonic (May, 1969), the urge or *'force which shapes life ... the mysterious something that drives the individual from within to fulfil a unique pattern'* (Greene, 1985, pp. 167–8). As with the Shadow, the main theme is that personal responsibility for integrating one's own unconscious Shadow and evil requires wrestling consciously with inner conflicts and *'recognising the all-important part played by personal choice in the mitigation and perpetuation of one's own pathological symptoms'* (Diamond, 1996, p. 102).

Kalsched (1996, p.12) goes further to suggest that within the inner world of trauma, the daimonic is also a duplex figure, an *'archetypal self-care system'* that is alternatively Protector/Persecutor, either protecting an innocent, childlike part of the Self like a guardian angel, or dissociating and dismembering it by inner persecution. Building on Jung's writings that the Self is also duplex, he reflects that the Self must be distinguished as embracing both a light and dark side, either as a beneficent *individuating* Self found in psychological health, or as an archaic, ambivalent *survival* Self when faced with an apparent disintegrative urge within the psyche. The developmental challenge, therefore, is how does the ego separate from the dark side of the numinous energies of the Self, while still retaining a connection to the Self? Ego growth may thus entail a dual sacrifice of both infantile and inflated energies.

Within society and organisations, the refusal to acknowledge personal responsibility frequently is enacted by 'scapegoating', where individuals are identified with the scapegoat archetype and are accused of causing misfortune, blamed for it, and cast out of the community, allowing the remaining members to feel guiltless (Brinton Perera, 1986). Here is a razor's edge – it is fear that lies at the root of the shadow problem, further inducing guilt. We can go to extreme and often self-deceiving, devious lengths to reject and repress acceptance of our own Shadow and Evil in order to avoid suffering

personal guilt, and in so doing, participating in the guilt of humanity.

Wellings (2001) throws up a particular challenge to psycho-spiritual organisations, by suggesting that *'we ourselves make evil when we try to be wholly on the side of the good. That all attempts to exclude from consciousness that part of our nature that is aggressive, hungry and scared, will inevitably constellate it outside of us where we will be compelled to persecute it. However if we give up on perfect goodness and instead recognise that we are mixed beings who have a life long responsibility to recognise and be responsible for our own darkness then there is a chance that we will avoid mass destruction'*.

I will now explore the dilemma of power and leadership, one of five shadowy themes that surfaced from my interviews which bears an uncanny reflection with the archetypal issues contained within the Russian fairytale. The other themes, which are not explored in this paper, included Basic Assumption Dependency (Bion, 1961) and a fourth basic assumption, 'Oneness' (Torquet, 1974, cited in Stacey, 2003, p. 143), where the group will join in a powerful union with some omnipotent force allowing the group to assume safe passivity; the 'primal scene' of Family Systems dynamics, demonstrating how the imprinting of a primal trauma can indelibly mark organisations and affect and contaminate the experiences of community members; the guru phenomenon and the seduction of gurudom; and the Archetypal Puer-Senex split exemplified by Chronos devouring his children.

The abuse of power and authoritarian leadership

The tale of *The Black Magician Czar* expresses the debilitating effects of the ruthless drive and desire for power, and in social/organisational terms the regressive process described by Bion (1967) in which undigested 'Beta Type elements', where thought is not possible, are unable to be transformed into 'Alpha Type elements' that can allow for imagination, dialogue, sublimation, creativity and a more collaborative organisational process. Instead, as in this tale, there is the constant

threat of a primitive, repetitive cycle of violence that remains entrenched as the pervasive rule of the kingdom.

The czar's willingness to kill the bold freshness of ardent youth reflects a drama prevalent with an omnipotent fantasy of omniscience, and his primary motivation to possess power. He is unable to recognise the limits of reality or the existence of the other. His power drive is focused on annihilation of any potential challenger to his rule for fear of being deposed by generative youth, a resistance to sharing power, and possibly the intolerance of accepting his own ordinariness or fear of personal annihilation by another. Adopting a narcissistic position of superiority where weakness and inferiority are projected onto the youths, any possibility of dialogue is prevented through an atmosphere of terror and dehumanisation (Biran, 2003).

An organisation is also an ongoing drama enacted by fallible players, where the idea of the organisation as a unity (the ego ideal) contrasts radically with reality, where the character of organisational life more viscerally resembles a 'snakepit'; for *'... there must be for each of us, individually and collectively, a shameful, secret underside to organisational life'* (Schwartz, 1990, p. 10). *'Power tends to corrupt; absolute power corrupts absolutely ... Great (to be read powerful?) men are almost always bad men,'* famously wrote Lord Acton (1948, p. 364). Do we become bad, like the czar, because power makes us arrogant and unfeeling towards other people, or do individuals seeking greatness, such as the legacy of a manifested vision, carry fatal flaws that corrupt power?

Experience of power dynamics within psychotherapy organisations seemed to indicate that more often than not leaders promoted initially a visionary drive towards personal and professional excellence and integration, which contained many inherent strengths, but over time this gradually tipped over into a narrow form of perfectionism and inflated 'magnificence', with an exaggerated focus on an organisational ideal that denied and became rapidly out of step with

reality, eventually in some cases leading to organisational decay and breakdown.

What seemed increasingly to be held in the Shadow in these instances were the qualities of ordinary humanness – the permission to express fallibility, fragility, or vulnerability, to be unsure or unclear sometimes about where the project was going, and to acknowledge limitation – and a degree of trust in staying with the mess and chaos of a creative, processing space of not knowing, where it felt safe enough to question, debate, disagree and voice criticism. Alongside this, there was a loss of recognition that a necessary part of being human was the acknowledgement and ownership of one's own capacity for envy, competitiveness, nastiness and destructiveness. It was this reality, the recognition of faults within themselves and the fantasy of the organisational ideal that was increasingly being denied that caused a rot to gain hold from within. Typically, any perceived challenge to the leaders' authority, or anyone who dared to hold a different vision to the status quo would be isolated, and these shadow qualities would be projected onto the imagined perpetrators. They would be victimised, undermined, intellectually intimidated or pathologised, and subjected to virulent forms of intolerance, sanctioned by those leaders wishing to maintain control and impede change. Anyone that metaphorically speaking wished to grow up and assume responsibility for new ideas and new input that deviated from or appeared to threaten the organizational norm was likely to be cut down in czar-like fashion.

There was also a transitional stage that emerged in an organizational process during the vacuum and chaos opened up by the demise or departure of a founder before an organization had gone through the process of finding its feet and forming a re-framed identity, which the Jungian analyst Robert Hobson calls the '*therapeutic community disease*' (Hobson, 1979, p. 232). He outlines three phases: (1) the coming of the Messiah; (2) the Enlightenment; and (3) the Catastrophe. A gifted, individual steps for-

ward within the vacuum with revolutionary ideas opposed to the original vision and is experienced by self and others as magical, a potential saviour hero who will bring revitalizing purpose to the organization. Initially a period of intellectual stimulation follows, there seems to be inner cohesion but outer groups are constellated, individual differences and anxieties are denied and the Shadow goes underground. However, inevitably the pain, death, rage and mourning for what was lost with the original founder has to be faced, and disillusionment, breakdown and usually unnamed destructive components of the process force themselves into consciousness (Perry, 1991). The Saviour fantasy must be relinquished, and only then can the organization begin to remain present with what Nigel Wellings and Elizabeth McCormick refer to as '*Fallow Chaos*', by facing the unpalatable but unavoidable journey that '*to do or be something new we must first let go of something or some part of ourselves that is old*' (Wellings & McCormick, 2005, p. 98).

And there was also a passive, collusive yet subtly insidious power dynamic – leaders that doubted their legitimacy as power-holders, and the tendency of people to give over or not take responsibility for their legitimate power as organisational members. Fears of being ostracised or rejected from the 'family community', or a lack of belief in their own competency and vision, caused some people to compromise their integrity and to project responsibility onto 'powerful' others through the twin poles of idealisation and denigration, even when deep inside this went against what their heart prompted them to say and express.

There is an African proverb that holding power is like holding an egg. Hold it too loosely, and it may drop and fall; hold it too tightly, and it may break. It is in the holding of the tensions of these polarities that the 'unthought known' (Bollas, 1987) of the transcendent function can reveal itself. In my concluding remarks I will also suggest methods and ways that may begin to help us

to own, name and respect the destructive and creative forces of the personal and archetypal Shadow that will always be present in some form or another within our organisational life.

Conclusions – Organisational strategies for integrating the shadow

This inspirational fairytale brings up for me the whole question as to how much a psychotherapy training organisation can tolerate an openness to alternative ideas and influences outside of its own vision, as opposed to resisting or defending against this and becoming a closed organisational system. The subtle controls exerted by powerful lineages and pairings between therapists, supervisors and trainees within organisations elicit continuing transference issues, evoking loyalties, passionate, destructive and rivalrous feelings about sharing therapists/supervisors, which get displaced and potentially wreak havoc within the organisation. Yet it can feel dangerous and unsafe to seek therapy/supervision/ideas outside the organisation as this may be perceived as disloyal or heretical. The creative edge may reflect an organisation that is confident enough in its own philosophy and vision that it can genuinely support and encourage its students to seek alternative visions elsewhere, with the freedom to return and introduce new ways which can be received, thought about, and debated, and possibly can be incorporated within the system, further enriching it.

I feel an organisation that truly wishes to acknowledge and own its naturally occurring shadow side should resolve to include within its working infrastructure creative space for all its members for constant, committed psychological exploration of its existing myths and unconscious processes, which are regarded as centrally important and worthy of time and energy by the organisation as a whole. There are several methods for mediating with shadow influences of which I am aware that can aid such a process of internal self-examination: **Surviving breakdown to**

break through (McCormick, 1988); **Social Dreaming; Mindfulness and Unconditional Presence**; and the introduction of new models of leadership, **Servant-leadership** and **Collective leadership**. I wish to explore just some of these.

(1) Social Dreaming

‘Social Dreaming’ is a method which is being increasingly used within analytical training institutes and mainstream organisations to build a communal relationship with the shadow and unconscious processes (Gordon-Lawrence, 2005). Its role is to transform and enlarge the space of the possible for thinking through exploring the dreams of a group of people in a structured space known as the matrix. This reflects both a physical space as container, and a systemic, holistic thinking space as a representation of the infinite, of not knowing, where a pattern of common themes emerges from the links and connections to be found among the dreams of all participants. Social Dreaming can awaken awareness to an organisation’s unconscious life as it ‘*directs attention to shared culture and knowledge and takes us beyond personal, selfish, ego-centric preoccupations*’ (p. 15). The dream matrix becomes a transitional object, a safe, shared space where transference issues, group tensions and inter-group dynamics are focused on the dreams themselves. This can forge ‘*the possibility of new insights, new views and different senses of connectedness between people present in the matrix*’ (p. 92).

(2) Mindfulness and unconditional presence

The Buddhist practice of ‘Mindfulness’, also known within Transpersonal Psychology as ‘bearing witness’ (Glassman, 1998), ‘bare attention’ (Epstein, 1995), the ‘transpersonal witness’ (Wilber, 1999) and ‘unconditional presence’ (Welwood, 2000) is an orientation toward life that is also becoming increasingly relevant as a way of mediating and managing conflict within organisations. The act of bearing witness and difference by remaining unconditionally present in each successive moment without defensive closure

or identification with the contents of consciousness enhances our capacity to listen accurately in difficult circumstances and to embrace all parts of ourselves. By '*paying attention in a particular way: on purpose, in the present moment, and non-judgementally . . .*' (Kabat-Zinn, 1994, p. 4), we can begin to take responsibility for our personal and collective Shadow aspects and find our capacity to be generous and loving towards others. In bearing witness to our own aggression and love and everything in-between, within the spaciousness of such bare attention, in that moment there is no separation between self and other. In that inviolable place, subtle shifts in consciousness can begin to emerge.

(3) Servant-leadership

Models of leadership within organisations are now appearing that attempt to move away from the myth of organisation as ideal parent to more collective, democratic forms of leadership where responsibility is increasingly shared within a community. Holding a position of power demands integrity and humility, and at a profound level power can be construed as a form of service, an inner commitment to our own authenticity and the development of human heart informed by something greater than our personal aspirations. One emerging approach to leadership and service is 'servant-leadership' which emphasises an ethical awareness and appropriate use of power by the encouragement of a long-term, transformational philosophy to life and work – in essence a way of being – that is committed to an individual's personal growth within organisations and promotes a sense of community. Greenleaf (2003)³⁷ describes true servant-leaders as portrayed in the character of Leo in Hermann Hesse's story 'Journey to the East', as '*the servant who, by acting with integrity and spirit, builds trust and lifts people and helps them grow, and the leader who is trusted and who shapes others' destinies by going out ahead to show the way*' (p. 32). He perceives that the core strength of servant-leaders is to be '*artists in the deep meaning of*

being open to chaos . . . that . . . set a limit on the logic of the spirit and acknowledge a threshold beyond which all is mystery' (p. 73).

(4) Collective leadership

Another paradigm is the increasing call for collective leadership. Durham (2004) revisits the legend of King Arthur, seeing him as a figure that inspires those around him to undertake the quest for spiritual fulfilment and thus 'growing' leadership in others, in comparison to the Wounded Fisher King who is viewed as tyrannical, self-serving, encouraging ambition without responsibility and inhabits the Wasteland. She addresses the symbolism of the Grail Quest and King Arthur's Round Table as representing the possibility of shared leadership by a circle of peers that acknowledge and align their lives to the central presence of the Self, and yet who also take individual responsibility for their inner spiritual journey to the centre of themselves to find the source of their own authority. It is this mutual individual and collective process of connection that will configure the presence of collective leadership, where difference, messiness and diverse ideas remain and flourish but are held, becoming differentiations of '*one-mindedness*' (Bohm, 1982, p. 72), a new level of communication that can build and be experienced by individuals within the group. The nature of leadership is no longer that of a spiritual parent to a child, but of peer to peer, allowing leadership to shift, devolve, and be shared by individuals that are able to provide many differing qualities of leadership in differing circumstances according to their particular style, strengths and personal attributes. The grail quest story is also uncompromising in stating that the broken sword can only be strong and reforged by finding the grail.

Understanding of the mind can only be found by restoring and healing the heart. Collective leadership within organisations needs the dynamic tension of the feminine principles of the heart as container, bearer of creative chaos, spontaneity, and inclusivity with

the masculine principles of one-pointedness, initiation, direction, mental clarity and differentiation. We return full circle to the promise of integration expressed in our fairytale.

A contemporary tale for our time

This Russian fairytale not only speaks to me and has helped my own process of understanding the workings of the Shadow within psychotherapy organisations. I also believe that it reflects an archetypal level of the psyche that is very prevalent in the world today. It is probably no coincidence that three successful contemporary film series have struck such an archetypal chord in our cultural life – The *Lord of the Rings* trilogy, *Star Wars* and *Harry Potter* – which through their symbol and myth all depict heroes and heroines who must come to terms with dark figures with religious/magical powers – Saruman, Count Dooku, and Voldermort respectively. These ‘black magicians’, like the black magician czar, would wreak destruction and havoc on any and all who would oppose them. Each of them has been consumed by the corruptive power of ego inflation (the dark side) that has lost connection with the Self, and it is the task of those who face each of them to struggle with avoiding being gripped and possessed by the same dark energies. It is Gandalf’s wisdom

that encourages Frodo, bewailing the cruel fate thrust upon him as the bearer of the ring (the archetypal symbol of Shadow and evil), to hold a transitional space while all around seems hopeless, by offering this perspective: ‘*So do all who live to see such times, but that is not for them to decide. All we have to decide is what to do with the time that is given us*’ (Izod, 2001).

It is interesting to note that it is hobbits, simple folk much like the ordinary flint stone with no claims to being great warriors or sages, that alone have the fortitude and forbearance to resist the destructive power of the ring, whereas those that hold power are so easily corrupted by the desire for ever greater power. In living with the personal and the archetypal Shadow in our everyday lives, perhaps what we seem to be consistently invited to do to survive the intensive heat and rawness of our Shadow contents is to keep our hands immersed in the rich, loamy soil of our own ordinariness and humanity. I suspect, as with hobbits, it is within the oft unspoken, unnoticed, unassuming acts of determination to bear difference, and in open-hearted gestures of kindness and the courage of forgiveness, that will enable us to co-habit more fruitfully with our Shadow sides and remain open to our unruly complexity amidst all its savagery and beauty.

References

- Brinton Perera, S. (1986). *The scapegoat complex: Toward a mythology of shame and guilt*. Toronto: Inner City Books.
- Bion, W. (1961). *Experiences in groups and other papers*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Bion, W. (1967). *Second thoughts*. London: Maresfield Reprints.
- Biran, H. (2003). The difficulty of transforming terror into dialogue. *Group Analysis*, 36(4), pp. 490–502.
- Bollas, C. (1987). *The shadow of the object*. London: Free Association Books.
- Casement, A. (1995). A brief history of Jungian splits in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 40, pp. 327–342.
- Clarke, L. (2001). *Parzival and the stone from heaven*. London: HarperCollins.
- Dalberg-Acton, Lord E. (1948). *Essays on freedom and power (1861–1910)*. Selected and with an introduction by Gertrude Himmelfarb. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Daniels, M. (2000). The shadow in transpersonal psychology. *Transpersonal Psychology Review*, 4(3), pp. 29–43.
- Diamond, S. (1996). *Anger, madness and the daimonic*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Eisold, K. (2001). Institutional conflicts in Jungian analysis. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 46, pp. 335–353.
- Epstein, M. (1995). *Thoughts without a thinker*. New York: Basic Books.
- Firman, J. & Gila, A. (1997). *The primal wound: A transpersonal view of trauma, addiction and growth*. Albany, New York: University of New York Press.

- Glassman, B. (1998). *Bearing witness: A Zen master's lessons in making peace*. New York: Bell Tower.
- Gordon-Lawrence, W. (2005). *Introduction to social dreaming: Transforming thinking*. London: Karnac.
- Greene, L. (1985). *The astrology of fate*. London: Unwin.
- Grosskurth, P. (1991). *The secret ring*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hobson, R. (1979). The messianic community. In R. Hinshelwood & N. Manning (Eds.) *Therapeutic communities*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Izod, J. (2001). *Myth, mind and the screen: Understanding the heroes of our time*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jung, C.G. (1958). *The undiscovered self*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Jung, C.G. (1959). *The collected works*, Vol 9 ii. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Jung, C.G. (1960). *The collected works*, Vol 8. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Kalsched, D. (1996). *The inner world of trauma: Archetypal defenses of the personal spirit*. Hove & New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- May, R. (1969). *Love and will*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- McCormick, E. (1988). *Surviving breakdown: A positive approach to coping, healing and rebuilding your life after a nervous breakdown*. London: Vermilion.
- Perry, C. (1991) *Listen to the voice within: A Jungian approach to pastoral care*. London: SPCK Publishing.
- Samuels, A. (1994). The professionalisation of Carl G. Jung's analytical psychology clubs. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 34, p. 139.
- Schwartz, H. (1990). *Narcissistic process and corporate decay: The theory of the organisational ideal*. New York & London: New York University Press.
- Stacey, R. (2003). *Complexity and group processes: A radically social understanding of individuals*. London: Brunner-Routledge.
- Stevens, A. (2002). *Archetype revisited: An updated natural history of the self*. London: Brunner-Routledge.
- Von Franz, M-L. (19087). *Shadow and evil in fairytales*. Dallas, Texas: Spring Publications.
- Welwood, J. (2000). *Towards a psychology of awakening*. Boston & London: Shambhala.
- Wellings, N. (2001). *Evil in transpersonal psychology*. Conference on evil.
- Wellings, N. & McCormick, E. (2005). *Nothing to lose: Psychotherapy, Buddhism and living life*. London: Continuum.
- Wilber, K. (1999). *One taste*. Boston & London: Shambhala.