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Partnerships are often optimal processes for interpersonal growth. The ability to have and keep a partner in mind should, therefore, be thought about and learnt. Although reciprocity, some symmetry, and mutual “give and take” are important aspects of partnerships, this article emphasizes a partner’s ability to process difficulties for the other as an aid to growth. The containment and elaboration of distress in partnerships is discussed using three examples of such potential relationships. The emotional beginning of a partnership, whether starting from love, working relationship or from hate, is the focus of the article. Individual, dyadic, and group aspects as separation-individuation and containment processes are described as contributing to partnership-building. The ability of a therapy group to process splitting and projecting phenomena are discussed. Co-therapists seem to have to work through painful conflicts between themselves to develop the therapist’s containment abilities inside a functional partnership. Supervision may help process these emotional hardships. Within families, mothers could contribute to a better processing of their sons’ violence shared through infant dreams, which represent an effort to cope with inner and outer aggression. Growth-promoting aspects of dream telling as potential partnerships in families and groups are discussed. Finally, partnership building between hating foes is exemplified by the efforts made by participants in Israeli and Palestinian peace dialogues. In groups, interpersonal development may be furthered by helping participants mutually contain and be contained, enabling partnership opportunities to grow after love and sympathy are over.

Key words: conflict (psychology); dreams; interpersonal relations; projection; psychotherapy, group; psychoanalysis

I will outline below the process of building a partnership, a relationship with developmental difficulties and possible advantages, which may be the best and often the only way to continue an arrested development.

Definition

The concept of partnership is far from clear, even for those who have had partners, who consider colleagues to be partners, or have lived with them. The Oxford Concise Dictionary (1) defines a partner as “1) a person who shares or takes part with another or others, esp. in a business firm with shared risks and profits; 2) on the same side of the game; 3) a player on the same side in a game; 4) either member of a married couple, or of an unmarried couple living together.”

These definitions seem to fall short of many relationships I would call partnerships. The first problem in these definitions is that they refer to concrete states, whereas partnerships should also be considered mental processes, requiring sequences and movies to describe and define them correctly. For example, parties in conflict, rivals, foes, and even enemies may eventually end up “on the same side”, and be joined “in a game”, thus meeting the challenge we are talking about: becoming partners. Oddly, I could find almost no psychoanalytical literature about partnerships. There is abundant material about how to negotiate, how to avoid win/lose situations, and about what kind of decisions we take, but little has been written about what it means to have and keep a partner in your mind.

I agree with the suggestion that partnerships deal with a “game” or, better still, a “transitional space” (2). But questions of reciprocity and of mutual give and take are not included in the Oxford Dictionary entry. Partnership implies a gain for everyone involved, though not necessarily simultaneous or symmetric. The concept of partnership suggests some measure of symmetry, although in specific moments – perhaps even most of the time – they are mainly asymmetric. As a matter of fact, the inability to cope with frustrations caused by asymmetry often seems to be the major obstacle for the establishment and maintenance of a partnership. These considerations help include two kinds of relationships that have a partnership potential: the parent/child and the patient/therapist relationships. These relationships may not be symmetric for long, but their (partly unconscious) potential reciprocity is obvious. Both include “moments of partnership” and distinct “feelings of partnership”, which may become increasingly significant in the
process of the two sides eventually becoming co-operating partners.

Another feature of partnership is the concept of relinquishing – giving up – ownership. It is common knowledge to group therapists that sharing is always a form of giving up ownership (of what we think and feel) – a difficult but worthwhile investment. Relinquishing ownership, accepting mutuality, and long term symmetry processes, is sowing to reap later. The knowledge that partnerships demand concessions is as old as the hills.

We will focus on the perspective of partnership development – specifically any relationship’s partnership potential – the interpersonal links at the outset of partnerships. On one hand, there are those partnerships born out of choice and even love, exemplified by the co-therapist couple. The other end of a possible continuum is exemplified by the group-dynamics of negotiations towards establishing partnerships between “enemies”. In Israeli-Palestinian meetings, like the recent Oslo conference – the so-called “Swedish Track” (May-June 2000), partnerships were born out of enmity, hatred, and necessity. Such relationships often have to go through hell to be able to establish at least a productive dialogue with reasonable output. I interviewed participants in these dialogues, in which the fate of millions were decided, in an investigation of inter- and intra-group processes. The negotiators’ dialogue ability are the “Formula I” of their trade, and seem to possess (in their non-psychological hands) tools to become partnership that we should study and acquire. Usually, they had to become team-partners before building a partnership with the enemy.

An example will be given from midway on the partnership-beginning continuum, between birth out of choice and birth from necessity and hatred. This example touches group as well as family life. I will try to show in this second example how possible male-female partnerships, and specifically the mother-son potential relationship, may have a unique developmental function in a certain aspect of the processing of aggression, thus making possible a less violent future.

**Partnership Potential and Difficulties**

For a therapist conducting the group alone, his or her partner is the group. But on a deeper level, partnerships exist only as part of a complex social configuration. Partners usually have other partners, and should be able to have them. This relationship concerns not only the “couple” or an isolated group “on the same side” because partnership with significant “others” includes triangular and group aspects. It also develops notions about preconscious and unconscious partnerships. When something “happens”, “partnership feelings” surprise us, as they become known and thought. Both sides – group and therapist – often have to go through thick and thin, stay allied, and work things out, even when they are hurt, or despise each other.

The group conductor’s other partner is his or her supervisor, with whom he or she has also to build an alliance, a so-called working or supervisory alliance (3). Therapists understand that alliances are tested during conflict by sticking to a partnership-covenant. A continuous bond to a part of the partner’s matrix has to be established, so that some of the supervisor’s or supervisee’s opinions or feelings must continuously be felt as belonging “to the same side” – to one’s self. Subjectively and unconsciously, partners feel permanently internally connected and ready to keep working together in spite of difficulties.

Why should the effort of establishing a covenant within difficult situations and relationships – and supervision may sometimes be such a situation – be worthwhile? Why are mental partnerships often the only way to grow? The early human tendency towards growing autonomously (4) results, with some cultural divergence, in attaching conscious and unconscious negative emotional connotations to dependence. Consequently, inter-dependence, so important for the continuation of growth, is also shied away from, starting in our childhood. It may well be said that many of us evolve into partnership-phobic states, which often become chronic. Therefore, even before starting to understand what can be gained from a partner and how this happens, it must be clear that the move towards a partnership is full of fears and inhibitions. It may thus be quite difficult to teach and help people to take such a step. The baby (of growth through inter-dependence) is thrown out with the (dependency) bath water.

The ability to be helped by a partnership is not an easy accomplishment, although partnerships start when a request for containment meets ability for containment. In Bion’s sense (5), containment means the capability to process some difficulty for the “other”. Partnership development depends on its containment ability. People are usually ready to develop inside a partnership only when their situation becomes unbearable. Psychic development essentially occurs in two steps. The first is the autonomous step referred to above, in which we want to act on our own, at least until we reach our limits and our growth is impeded. Only then may a second, interdependent, inter-subjective step start in which we, or something in us, look for a partner who can help us beyond the developmental point reached. It is only in this “depressive” position that real mental intercourse with a partner becomes feasible (6). Acknowledging that only some external processing might give us what we lack internally may be a condition to start a partnership – lest development is arrested. We have to need a significant other’s help for our further growth – this may be the essence of the group matrix (7).

**Co-therapy as a Process of Becoming Partners**

Choosing a co-therapist is an example that could help elucidate the “loving” pole on the partnership continuum outlined above. In our common domain of interest, the conduction of groups, this is an important category of partnerships.

A man asks a friend: “Why have you never married?” “Well, I searched for many, many years for the perfect woman. But when I finally found her, we didn’t marry”. So the man asks: “Why didn’t you?” And
the friend answers: "Because she was looking for the perfect man" (8). The moral of the story is that you never enter into a co-therapy relationship unless you give up perfection. Imperfection means coping with frustrating divergences from the ideal. A partner is always different in some essential characteristics – especially in what she or he has to offer and the partner lacks. To choose co-therapy, one must feel some kind of drive, need, or fear; or, on the contrary, affinity, attraction, friendship, or even love. As long as disappointing differences are denied, such a connection should be called a love relationship, and the definition of partnership should be saved for a later (and maybe more mature) stage. Love relationships seem to possess precisely that interesting ability to negate divergences in a mood that Kleinian terminology would define as a schizo-paranoid position (6). Only when these primal and very strong feelings (love or anxious and dependent friendships) give way to other, more separated – and mature – forms of emotional togetherness, differences seem to become salient. Only in this "depressive" position, and only then, can a love relationship potentially evolve into a partnership, which seems a necessary development for a co-therapist couple (and possibly that of any love relationship).

Sometimes, as in the case of two female co-therapists I supervised, a once close and almost symbiotic relationship turns into a terrible one. This couple went through some of the processes often observed in co-therapist relationships, which may further our understanding about "becoming partners". At the beginning, the love relationship absorbed all potential anxiety arising from their therapeutic group. What Bion (9) describes as "pairing" defended them from insecurity and other obstacles therapists encounter at the beginning of a group. Communication between them was experienced as direct and easy, and had an almost telepathic flair to it. Nonverbal messages were readily received and understood and the few real differences in perspective were considered learning opportunities. But when the process of separation started, love, friendship, and sympathy turned into strong feelings of distance, estrangement, and disapproval. After a while, the other (who was still not a partner) seemed to become almost a stranger. Her interventions were gradually felt as totally different and as "eye-openers" about her "real" professional and personal identity. The second general process consists of a growing criticism and envy of the other's place in the group. Both processes – estrangement and envy – are usually evidence of an evolving differentiation, which is a most important development for co-therapists. Co-conductors participating in supervision groups must work on at least two kinds of fears on their way to separation and individuation: the fear of the partners' otherness and divergence, and the fear of the self's envious and aggressive reaction to the other's place (10).

The processing of such evolving interpersonal feelings is best described by Bion's container/contained model (11), which sees it as both a curative agent and a main growth-promoting potential. It may well be the big potential advantage of partners that in their significant relationship one party, A, holds for the other, B, some of B's unacceptable feelings (such as anxiety or inferiority). A partnership starts only after A has coped with B's emotion within himself, and A helps B in the next step, which is to better cope with his previously unacceptable parts, thus enriching him by enabling re-ownment.

In Bion's theory (11) the mother takes in the child's unbearable, dreadful, and unthinkable emotions – called "beta elements" – and transforms them through a wonderful processing apparatus she possesses, called "alpha function". Now changed, so-called alpha elements are thinkable, may be made rationally operational, and are also eventually available for the child. This transforming apparatus is the essence of intra- and inter-personal mental development in partnerships – and may be the answer to the question: why not immediately quit the couple when co-therapy becomes bad? In Bion's model, both the container and the contained change through their mutual influence. This explains the partners' opportunity to grow in a mutual containment process, both sides benefiting from mutually containing and being contained. It is not only "giving" and making concessions, it is "taking" through giving and getting it back, processed and better digested by the partner. This is not a fiction: when there is resonance and mirroring between partners, there is nothing quite like this experience of growth.

One group co-therapist in supervision, who will be called A, was unable to feel afraid, weak, not understood, stupid, or rejected. Only after her co-therapist, B, took these "roles" on himself, did their partnership seem to start. B, the partner of such a love-seeking hero, suffered from narcissistic injuries, could not bear being central, or accept his significance for the group. B would later grow into a healthier narcissistic position, having learned from A's model. A learned from B those characteristics she hadn't been able to usually bear – the ability to feel inferior and mistaken without panic.

Co-therapists encounter very difficult times when they stop simply loving, liking, and complementing each other; when they have to bear with each other's projections, feelings of envy, inferiority or contempt, and cope with an new, unfamiliar distance. Thus my supervisees began to experience the usual strong unwillingness to come to the co-therapy sessions, which, until the "crisis", were felt to be the most interesting hours in the week. B, the "insignificant", feeling co-therapist, started to regard his partner's facade of strength as pathetic and macho. A felt an ever-growing feeling of rancor and contempt for her "weaker" co-therapist, who seemed to flee responsibility and conflicts.

To build a partnership, they needed some basic trust (12) and a strong sense of responsibility for the other (partner). The difficult relationship between co-therapists was also externally contained by the supervision-partnership, an alliance that held together throughout, despite difficult emotions. The co-therapists had to reach a "good enough" relationship in the supervision to be able to address differences and dis-
agreements in a context of commitment. This also required their therapy group to be mature enough to evolve from a kind of “orphans-cohesion” into a degree of individuation. Their patients had probably gotten enough support during the first group stages to achieve some differentiation, and be able now to tolerate the unconscious tension created by their co-leaders’ disagreements, without experiencing unworkable levels of fear and unbearable vulnerability. I thought that a hidden, known but until then unthought kind of alliance between all parties (their group, the supervision group, and the supervisor) enabled the co-therapists to establish a partnership in which container and contained emotions were transformed.

If co-therapists cannot achieve individuation (13), e.g., because of fear of conflict, they will fail to contain and elaborate the group’s difficult emotions. These partners were initially so defensively enmeshed with one another that they could not separate enough to bear a triadic relationship with the therapy group. Remaining partners “in the presence” of the partner’s other partners was their most difficult endeavor, both in their therapy group and in supervision. Supervisors have to help the co-therapists’ love relationship separate and individuate for them to become partners. A failure of these processes is probably the cause of arrest in the development of so many couples that have a potential to grow.

To summarize this example: a good partnership starts as a continuation of dependent love relations, and only after some differentiation and a separation/individuation process has taken place. A partnership is established both when there is a will to process difficulties for the other, or to give, and when the other is in a position to be helped, or to receive, without destructive envy. Moments and feelings of partnership, along with some basic trust and responsibility, have to exist to deal with hate in a productive container/contained relationship. The evidence is growth.

Partnership as a Potential Container of Aggression

The change experienced within the container/contained model is also at the heart of the second example, which deals with potential partnerships in families and groups, capable of processing male aggression. My understanding of this special relationship comes from conducting a dream-group, which is an ongoing analytic group stressing the elaboration of dreams.

Friedman defines dreaming and dream telling as two different and complementary steps in processing preoccupations that are coped with during sleeping, as well as during our wake life (14). A dream told is always a request for containment and, as such, an appeal for partnership around the processing of the dream contents and emotions. A dream has to be related inside a secure setting that has to agree to contain difficult, projected emotions. The mostly unconscious identifications are made available to the group by all participants sharing personal resonance to the dream told – the emotional “echoes”, which amplify split-off emotions carried in the dream material. The shared contributions help to “dream the dream” and, moreover, to “think the dream”. This creates an emotional narrative that usually concerns the participants as well as the dreamer, his relations with the group, and the group as-a-whole (14).

The therapist, however, has to prepare “the container” for the difficult emotions. He or she has to help the group build a secure space for the dreadful dream material requesting to be contained – which means being tolerated, borne, and elaborated. The following clinical material shows the difficulties encountered by female participants to contain male aggression. In this group the women had to learn to become containers for extreme violence, but by assisting the male participants, they subsequently experienced themselves empowered through their re-ownment of former rejected aggression.

After a summer break, the group of seven women and a man became a five-women and three-men group. Although the group had hoped for more male participants, the female participants, to everyone’s surprise, initially rejected the new members. Only later did we understand that tension, insecurity, and hostility were the female sub-group’s unconscious reactions to the newcomers’ threatening aggression (applying to groups Bollas’ “unthought known”, ref. 15). Until the newcomers joined, the aggression manifest in the group, expressed either between participants or through the dream material, took a mild, non-violent form, which I considered “feminine”.

Four months later, the quality of dreams in the group began to change: the participant who had previously been the only man (whom we shall call David) in the group, started by lifting the aggression threshold, as if (unconsciously) a supportive male subgroup now permitted it. He told a dream in which he was part of a terrorist group that wanted to take over a house in a village and murder the family living there. Bombing and blowing up a youngster resulted in a chase by the army and police. He was being hunted to the point of finally feeling: “This is the end”. More “army” dreams followed from the other men in the group, which, contrary to expectation, are not often aired in my country. Once these dreams started, they started pouring in. Dreams of venomous snakes, of one’s own children falling out of the window, and of getting involved in violent fights culminated in a dream called “the Nazis in the kibbutz”.

This dream was told by David, who had dreamt it a year earlier, when he was already participating in the group. Though the dream had been a shock to him, he could not bring himself to tell it to the group in real time. Later, we understood that he had considered the “feminine” container not (yet) ready to help him cope with his aggression. The subjects of the dream were an escape with his girlfriend, a crowded hideout, and a dangerous encounter with a male and a female Kapo (Jewish police in the concentration camps). After miraculously being saved from a Nazi soldier and his barking dog, David ended up in an orphanage as an unidentified fetus. The now “prepared” container facilitated immediate emotional re-
sponses to the dream, which seemed to bear witness to a better integration of aggression and less distance between subgroups. What was it a year later that offered a new opportunity to tell this dream? I considered the clue to be the unprotected orphan fetus, now both a possible “new beginning” (16) and a request for a better partnership. It was the group, and especially its female participants, that could better attend and help integrate aggression, making it more available to all concerned. As in the previous example, it may have been the women’s secure place in the group, not being dominated by the male newcomers, along with an alliance with the group’s conductor, who legitimized whatever feelings came up, including aggression, which made containment possible.

Having repeatedly witnessed similar group processes, I wish to further consider the potential containing relationship. I believe that this early relationship between men and women replicates what usually happens in families between boys and their mothers. There, too, aggression is rejected and is left split-off, largely unattended and nonintegrated, because the container (mother) is not “prepared” for his function. For a while, a great partnership exists between toddlers and their well-attuned mothers, who wonderfully contain their children’s emotional difficulties. Boys, after having had the favor of parental “container-on-call” (17) for their nightmares, and the benefit of a partnership, or a first work-group (18) for fears and stress, are later left with their (partly unconscious) aggressive feelings, to undergo repression or acting out. In spite of the mother’s ability to stay attuned and contain her daughters’ dream-material, this partnership does not seem to hold for boys’ aggressive contents.

Why do the requests for containment not meet a prepared container? Investigations show that boys’ dreams significantly more active aggressive contents than girls do (19). I suspect that because of women’s own aggression-forbidding and aggression-denying upbringing, their ability to process their sons’ dreams is reduced. This is too bad because it is my belief that mothers of violent boys are usually the only potential containing and transforming agent in the family for the boys’ aggressive material. Without a “well-enough prepared” container, the boys’ readiness to tell more dreams is extinguished. But a lack of dream telling – representing a significant opportunity to process male aggression – may also have possible frightening consequences because aggressive split-off feelings will be acted out at the first opportunity. It is my experience that dream telling stops very early for boys, and goes on for life for girls.

The children’s fathers, traditionally not having worked through their own aggression, are usually unable to process their sons’ violence. In the best case, they exert a limited punishing function on inter-family aggression. Moreover, fathers are often the first to react without containment to violence, modeling “action-dialogues”. It is important to stress that in my dream-telling group, the male subgroup’s important and only function was to help their male colleagues overcome rejection and loneliness to share the aggression. It was the containment of the entire group, especially with the help of female participants, that facilitated access to the causes of violence, such as vulnerability and relevant narcissistic and conflictual sources. Later, the feminine sub-group also visibly changed. Under the influence of the newly available aggressive components, female participants became freer, more open and decisively more assertive.

At the risk of sounding accusing or sexist, which I am not, I suggest a potential partnership between violent men, on the one hand, and women who are willing to help contain aggression as one possible contribution to stopping the vicious circle of violent acting-out. Through a change from the mothers’ ignoring or rejecting attitude towards their young sons’ hatred, aggression and retaliation to a containing one – women could contribute to the development and maturing of the violent masculine part of the family in order for everyone to better cope with aggression.

**Becoming Partners out of Hatred**

My third example includes the application of some of the preceding thoughts on partnerships born out of the Israeli and Palestinian hate-relationship. Both peoples feel they “own” the same country and by now have been enemies for more than a century. They are unable to feel only “belonging” to the same country, which would not pose such a big problem, but obsessively claim “ownership”. As mentioned above, partnerships always have to include some giving up of exclusive ownership. Exclusive ownership causes a fight/flight atmosphere in which there is no dialogue, no real thinking. Where violence and bloodshed prevail, there is no thinker to think the thoughts, and therefore a transforming partnership cannot take place. The lack of partnership feelings and thinking makes it difficult for rival parties everywhere to start negotiations.

When some of the Israeli negotiators with the Palestinians (“Oslo” or the “Swedish Track”) described these very complex processes, they often spontaneously defined their relations as “becoming partners”. I tried to understand what they considered to be the main intra- and interpersonal principles of the establishment of a partnership with an enemy. Similar to the co-therapists, if the rivals were to become partners in spite of their hatred, they often needed an external-containing agency. Whereas for the co-therapists this agency was the partnership in supervision, here it was variously Norway, Sweden, or other mediator who allowed dialogue along with a continuing commitment to process the unbearable for the other. Often some “peace-crazy” private figure, like Austria’s Waldheim or a senior Israeli politician, backed by an organization like a Foreign Office, offered personal containment or a holding function.

In order to even start to be willing to enter a partnership and admit the need for external help for transformation, the negotiators had to first accomplish a difficult internal transformation. Such a process seemed to happen in those more able to emotionally cope in a mature way with becoming partners them-
selves inside the negotiation team, and maturely process the division of "us" and "them" (20). This split is a basic structure in the social organization of human beings; it seems to be almost a given of human nature and reminds us of the alienated states in the co-therapy couple. The “us” and “them” division precedes content, ideas, and ideologies, and is a result of a natural and healthy emotional separation in order to create identity. But if in the process boundaries are completely sealed, communication between rival sub-groups and sub-ideas may stop (21). It is interesting to note that some of the negotiators, those especially able to cope with splits caused by rejection and denial, also described affinity to some subgroup of the “others” while negotiating. It was as if considering oneself inside the negotiation team, and maturely processing former accords and adding difficulties by making polygamous moves towards to the Syrians. The negotiators often used terms like monogamy, polygamy, etc., hinting at the dyadic and Oedipal aspects of partnerships. As in the co-therapists’ relationship and even more so in these difficult-to-start relationships, it is usually difficult to bear too much triangulation with “other partners”, even when consciously there seemed to be an exceptional lowering of the expectations for partnership.

Equality had an important place in these partnerships. Barak’s tone, his autocratic attitudes and tendency to unilaterally set impossible dates and targets, was (often wrongly) interpreted by all negotiators as not having treated his partners as equals. Inequality cannot be part of these partnerships, even when the partners possess different strengths. On the contrary, the (momentarily) stronger partner’s task is to create some transitional space where both partners are equally included and respected and in which positions may develop and change. This shared equal attitude alone has the potential to eventually transform many asymmetrical relationships (e.g. the parent-child relationship) into partnerships. In partnerships born out of enmity and necessity, where power dynamics seem the strongest, a unique continuous latency and manifest “threatening equality” is active, whose function may be to compensate for the asymmetry and inequality. It was expressed in these partnerships by the principle: “You always have to be able to get up from the negotiation table.” The negotiators felt that their partnership could bear some of these threats, but again only if balanced by the triad of “credibility, reliability, some monogamy”, along with the shared equality.

Finally, another dominant partnership element in Oslo was the effort to step into the other’s shoes. Partners from the opposing sides helped each other “sell to their people” the concessions made in the negotiations. This “empathic” policy seems to have had an important harmonizing influence, and was central in promoting “feelings of partnership”. This kind of attunement (22) seems very important in order to be able to process the other’s difficult material and promote growth.

In the “Swedish” track, which was also a secret negotiation during the spring of 2000, a playful attitude to all contents emerged as an important variable in the evolving partnership. In my view, the mutual processing by the container/contained mechanism in a partnership resulted in the ability to “play” even with an almost taboo concept like ownership. Negotiators took a playful position, in the Winnicottian (23) sense, towards enormously cathexed notions like “let’s suppose you have east Jerusalem”. This quite incredibly flexible fantasy partnership was achieved by unconsciously agreed upon reciprocal and mutual positions. It was limited during the negotiations only by a single taboo principle – that things agreed upon were not to be challenged again. Interestingly enough, the moment one party was too threatened to “play”, or suggested a “frish-mish” (new shuffle of the cards), the negotiations got stuck. It seems that even this kind of partnership needs some measure of security and constancy – and if over – threatened, stops being functional.

Furthermore, I wish to make it clear that in spite of negotiations being successful, the implementation of agreements proves difficult, sometimes impossible. It strongly depends on “the other partners”, and on the willingness of the wider community to learn the skill of partnership from the negotiators. The present state of affairs in the Palestinian-Israeli relationship speaks for itself.

Conclusion

I have tried to show that partnership is an important way to co-exist and grow. In our changing society, partnerships may take the place of some existing relationship settings. In groups, partnerships may be furthered by helping participants learn how to “use” and “be used” by other participants, and to mutually contain and be contained in order to grow. As a consequence, there could be less phobia, less paranoia, and even better difficulty-processing opportunities after love and sympathy are over. Interpersonal development can be achieved by becoming partners.
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