# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# Editorial

In this issue, we present a festschrift to the life and work of Malcolm Pines in collaboration with Group Analysis, the Journal of the Society, in the year of his 85th anniversary. Malcolm is and has been an important ambassador for Group Analysis, promulgating and promoting Group Analytic ideas and practice, and also creating bridges into different worlds of discourse, such as Self Psychology and the influence of early experience.

But GA is not only theory, it also concerns people and most of all, relationships. So we have several personal testimonies, from people who knew, related to and worked with Malcolm.

Congratulations Malcolm.

We also have a further report from the Research Conference held earlier this year and a report about a climate change event that was held the same weekend but had to be cancelled due to lack of interest. Food for thought there – the difference, perhaps, between a more immediate vs. a more distant threat to our health and economic survival but both phenomena driven by similar economic, political, and social underpinnings.

Malcolm also contributes two pieces about David Clark, one an obituary, the other a reflection on the memorial meeting.

Paula Carvalho and Terry Birchmore

# President's Page

Malcolm Pines reached the high age of 85 this year. In this issue of Contexts several people give voice to what he has meant to them personally and professionally. He has been associated with and working for Group Analysis for many years, almost from its beginnings, as one of the members of Foulkes' group of professionals and he was present when Foulkes died in the group. For many years he personified Group Analysis. He has promoted Group Analysis all over the world and has been a cherished guest speaker, conductor and supervisor in many countries and a cherished guest in many homes. Congratulations from Contexts and wishes for a continuous full life for years to come.

This year the Foulkes lecture "Islands of the Blest, Group Analysts and their Groups", was given by Jane Campbell, UK with Sue Einhorn, UK as the respondent. At the Study Day the following day Bente Thygesen (Denmark) and Steinar Lorentzen (Norway) each gave their understanding of the lecture and the thoughts it had provoked in them. Both events attracted many people. When the waiting list moved up to about thirty, we decided to move to the Tavistock nearby which luckily was free on that date. The lecture was, as Sue Einhorn aptly said, a love letter to Group Analysis and as I understood it also a commentary on the Research Day, where the final report of the joint IGA/GAS research project was presented. Jane Campbell's lecture was also, among other things, about the language of Group Analysis. Are we setting off on the road to Orwell's 1984, where everything is controlled even the language, shall we use the language of RCT trials or a more humanistic qualitative approach and a more poetic language. These approaches can be combined, it is not an either or, but a both and. The right balance between tradition and renewal is extremely important.

The discussion about research and the kind of research has been a subject of discussion at events for quite some time and also occupies space on our internet forum, provoked as it is by the demands of evidence from the NHS authorities. It is indeed a very important discussion and its sometimes passionate and heated form is evidence to its centrality. It will probably take on more speed after the next joint IGA/GAS event "Group Psychotherapy for our Evidence–Based Times: Research and Service User Perspectives" that will take place

on the 12th November 2010. For further information please view our website: www.groupanalyticsociety.co.uk

The International Development Sub-committee has sent out a questionnaire to all members to ascertain the degree of satisfaction with the work of the Society. The results are being worked on and thought about at the moment and will be presented at the Annual General Meeting (AGM) this year.

The AGM is taking place on 23rd October 2010. As mentioned earlier, we have experimented with the form of the AGM and have decided to make it into a whole day event, so it hopefully will attract more people. There will be a full program to include the results from the just mentioned survey. The full final program will be announced in advance.

Once again it is a pleasure to remind you of the 15th European Symposium in Group Analysis "Cultures, Conflict and Creativity", St Mary's College, Twickenham, London, UK, 29th August-2nd September 2011, chaired by Kevin Power, UK and with John Schlapobersky (UK) as chair of the Scientific Program Committee. The triannual Symposium is the great event of Group Analysis. It attracts several hundred Group Analysts and other interested. Last time in Dublin the number of participants was over five hundred. It is an excellent opportunity to update your theoretical knowledge, to take part in experiental groups, to meet new and old colleagues and to get inspiration for your daily work with groups.

Gerda Winther
President, GAS

## Be a Contexts Writer!

Contexts welcomes contributions from members on a variety of topics:

- Have you run or attended a group-analytic workshop?
- Are you involved in a group-analytic project that others might want to learn about?
- Would you like to share your ideas or professional concerns with a wide range of colleagues?

If so, send us an article for publication by post, e-mail, or fax. Articles submitted for publication should be between 500 and 2,500 words long, or between one and five pages.

Writing for Contexts is an ideal opportunity to begin your professional writing career with something that is informal, even witty or funny, a short piece that is a report of an event, a report about practice, a review of a book or film, or stray thoughts that you have managed to capture on paper. Give it a go!

The deadline for each issue of Contexts is about three months before the publication of a specific issue. The deadline for publication in the June issue, for example, will therefore be early March.

### Editor's e-mail addresses:

Terry Birchmore: birchmore@yahoo.com
Tel. 0191 3826810 (UK)
Paula Carvalho: paulateresacarvalho@sapo.pt

### GAS Postal Address:

Group_Analytic Society
102 Belsize Road
London NW3 5BB
Tel: +44 (0)20 7435 6611
Fax: +44 (0)20 7443 9576
e-mail: admin@groupanalyticsociety.co.uk

## New Members

We welcome the following new members of the Society:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Dr Antonis Kelakis | Full Member | Athens, Greece |
| Mr Derek Love | Full Member | London, UK |
| Mr John Nicholls | Full Member | London, UK |
| Dr Roberto Schoellberger | Full Member | Bolzano, Italy |
| Dr Christine Anne Vickers | Associate Member | Victoria, Australia |

---

## Malcolm's Help in Rebuilding the Bombed Bridges: His Support to Group Analysis in Serbia

Malcolm Pines is a very important figure for the development of group psychotherapy in Serbia, not only because he is among the most significant authors in the regular lectures within our trainings, but also as a brave and supportive teacher-visitor to Serbia which was at the time in the middle of terrible socio-political turmoil. It was as if a professional 'father' figure showed us courage in coming even then, and his capacity to deeply empathise, find attunement and wide-ranging understanding with traumatized and 'difficult' persons, groups and social environments was impressive. Therefore, he was of great help in rebuilding bridges, which had in many concrete and symbolic ways been bombed, between the international arena and the abandoned, isolated and vastly fragmented pieces of our professional matrices. He showed us how in such circumstances, even very small and rare islands of unique group analytic experience, like some relational diamonds, may bring long lasting powerful shining.

My very first encounter with Malcolm was just shortly after the final separation from our trainers from the British Overseas Training in Group Analysis, when it was very uncertain if we would meet them ever again. Probably because of that, the contact with Malcolm had even greater significance. It was in the early nineties at a group analytic workshop in Athens, interestingly again the main theme about 'group analysis with difficult patients'. We met as peer-members of a

small group. The sharing was touching for me, among everything else, due to his insight into aspects of the social unconscious dimensions of our professions. I identified easily with the situation of having parents who are physicians, who moved from Eastern to Western countries handing over to the child specific aspects of knowledge and the world view; as if they were inscribing notes for the child's path into medical, psychiatric and psychoanalytic fields, including dreams about creating bridges over socio-cultural gaps, which seemed unbridgeable. As if this first shared dream space was really holding some important contents for the times to come.

The next encounter was during Malcolm's professional visit to Belgrade together with Jeff Roberts, when they held an impressive group analytic workshop. Many of our Serbian colleagues and teachers in psychiatry and psychotherapy were present. The current dynamics of the society, of our professional organizations and fields was mirrored, especially in the large groups. It was an extremely difficult workshop and large group dynamics with a lot of projections of despair, anger and other difficult feelings onto the leaders within a heavy dense silence of the group matrix. It seemed as if the leaders became representatives of our bad political leaders, but also of the international context, which had at those times been experienced as rejecting, punishing and abandoning towards our society. Handling all those situations warmly and skilfully with the clear group analytic techniques was a most valuable immediate learning opportunity for many of us.

During the following years he visited Serbia a few more times in spite of all the obstacles, each time surviving a lot of projections and other burdens connected to involvement in our specific type of 'difficult society'. Meeting him at EATGA and workshops in other ex-Yugoslav countries, always authentically concerned about how things were going, and supportive to any reconciliation spaces, could also be experienced as a kind of his rebuilding-bridges role.

In recent years, he generously encouraged creativity, helping us develop further in writing and applying psychoanalysis and group analysis, in understanding the psychodynamics of institutions, organisations and societies, and forming a section in that field within our Belgrade Group Analytic Society.

So, it is a great gift to have had Malcolm, a unique warm and erudite man who has provided much support for our learning, and as a model of how powerful in many ways group analysis can be even in dark historical times.

Marina Mojovic

# Malcolm Pines and Denmark: 1976–1986

"You may think he dozed off,
but just be aware he did catch what was actually there
the nightingales singing
or the emperors sad clinging
were treated with equal respect."

*Quotation from a farewell dinner speech to our British therapists, supervisors, lecturers and colleagues in the early eighties at Klarskovgaard, in Korsoer Denmark.*

Psychoanalytic psychotherapy, individually and as group-analysis had for some years been taught to and practiced with Danish psychiatrists and psychologists by Malcolm and colleagues. It all began in 1976 when we phoned Malcolm: will you come to Copenhagen and train 30 of us in group analysis?

In January 1977 Malcolm came and with him Liesel Hearst and the late Colin James. They came once a month, Friday and Saturday. As Malcolm later said to me, we laid an acorn!

In 1978 he suggested that we should house the VII INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS of GROUP PSYCHOTHERAPY in 1980. I became Chairwoman of the Congress Committee and Malcolm himself would chair the Programme Committee, and he became the Programme Committee. 1400 participants, four languages simultaneously translated, the excess funds transferred to the next congress in Mexico City.

In 1982 Proceedings from the congress appeared: volume 1 Theory, and volume 2 Practice. In 1982 the "INSTITUT for GRUPPE ANALYSE," in Copenhagen was founded. A basis of group analysis had been established and we could take over the training roles with our good British colleagues and friends as invaluable consultants.

The knowledge, wisdom, skill and generosity of Malcolm, Liesel, Colin and later Meg Sharpe and Harold Behr were the core of this first recognized (by the University of Copenhagen and the Danish Medical School) analytic psychotherapy training.

The oak has been growing ever since and one of its acorns, Gerda Winther, is today President of "INSTITUTE of GROUP ANALYSIS", London.

Lise Rafaelsen
August 2009

# Malcolm Pines, the Synthesizing Analyst

An invitation to participate in an honoris causa volume for a teacher and now a friend is not an easy task; for this I will rely on the patchwork of my recollections from my training in London with the leading masters S.H. Foulkes, Robin Skynner and Malcolm Pines.

My theoretical sessions during the first year of my training were with Foulkes, which, alas, was his last one ... Foulkes was a calm and very polite gentleman, slightly eager of course to transmit his theory but at same time very open, encouraging the discussion of other ideas, as he was enjoying not only the free dialogue with us but also the gossiping! I remember his ironic attitude towards Melanie Klein, whom he was praising, but only for her ... cooking ability, while he was very sarcastic when narrating an incident around a discussion of a dream; it included among other things, a mouse to which Klein was giving the usual symbolic interpretation, and Foulkes was trying to imitate Klein's voice in her triumphing reaction, exclaiming: "A mouse? A mouse? Was really a mouse?"!

I have been indeed exceptionally lucky to be treated (as much as this was feasible!) in Robin's group, a period from which, among many other things, I also cherish. We kept the unofficial extension of the meetings, accompanied by beer, in the nearby bar "The Beehive", with the frequent participation of Robin himself! These sessions had for me a radically demystifying impulse on the concept of abstinence to which I retain a very repugnant attitude.

During those valuable years in London, supervision proved to be one of the most important parts of my training with Malcolm as my teacher; I remember our supervision sessions which were held in the afternoon, in Bickenhall Mansions; Malcolm was interfering very rarely and he was leaving the students of the group to take full responsibility of the work, to the extent that sometimes he was giving the impression of falling asleep, though his interventions were quite effective when it was necessary! To this trusty attitude, my own "Group Analytic Supervision" or the "Greek model of Supervision" (M. Sharpe, 1995) owes a lot.

My training with Malcolm has never quite ended; it continues today in several meetings and group-analytic events in different places in Europe and particularly during his visits to Athens. When I sometimes try to explain how a psychoanalyst became an enthusiastic and a very active group analyst, I ascribe it to Malcolm's erudition

and deep knowledge on several disciplines: history, philosophy, biology, the history of ideas, music and arts. With such polymathy it is not surprising that he is not a devotee of the linear approach of thinking but of the circular one; he rarely uses interpretations but instead prefers to synthesize and to syncretize.

Malcolm has been the editor of several books, co-editor of international libraries and initiator of book series; also, an author of introductions in several books and particularly an irrigator to several authors in Britain and abroad. He has given special attention to several notions of psychoanalysis and group analysis and he has also underlined the absence of some in established previous publications. He has differentiated Shame and Guilt, he has focused on In-Between, the concept of mirroring, dreams etc. and also in certain clinical categories as the Difficult Patient, the Bordeline and Narcissistic patient etc, etc. At the same time, he has had a distinguished career as he held important positions at the Maudsley, St. Georges, Cassel and the Tavistock Clinic; he also served as president of G.A.S. and I.A.G.P. and also editor of Group Analysis.

Malcolm refers with pride to his father, Noe Pines, a distinguished oculist. Whenever I expose some of my impious free associations towards orthodox psychoanalysis, I always mention Malcolm and arbitrarily ascribe his enthusiasm of group analytic mentality to his origins; more particularly to the fact that he is luckily the son of an ophthalmologist and not of an ear specialist .... This arbitrary connection occurs when I wish to emphasize the differences between psychoanalysis and group analysis and particularly on the importance of the concept of person. I argue that person is best expressed by the Greek word "prosopon", which has a visual etymology whereas "person" has an acoustic one. Of course this attribution includes a remote and uncertain heredity but when I once mentioned it to Malcolm, he responded with a pleasant expression.

Malcolm is very well known not only as an indefatigable traveler but also as a man of culture. In one of his visits to Athens I thought it would be a great opportunity for us both to visit the exhibited treasures of the Athens Archeological Museum, as I was sure that he had not been there before! However, when I hesitantly made the humble confession that I was going to be a rather insufficient guide to him due to the fact that I had never visited the museum before, things turned out dramatically different, as Malcolm reassured me that there was no problem as this would be his third(!) visit to the particular museum! Thanks to him then, I enjoyed a wonderful and informative tour in the chambers of the museum...

When I proposed the creation of a network of group-analytic institutions, while being a member of the European Working Party, the idea was met with a wide positive response from group-analytic training groups all over Europe. However this initially enthusiastic response had not the same appeal to everyone; some short-sighted members of GAS London, who are probably entertaining some kind of a colonialist mentality towards any innovation not deriving from London, responded with apprehension and even suspicion and mistrust (Voyatzaki, 2006). This sparked a prolonged correspondence which is now kept in the archives of E.G.A.T.I.N. During the International Congress in Zagreb, after a heated discussion about E.G.A.T.I.N. Malcolm made a tranquil but crucial intervention and spoke very positively, arguing that such a development as E.G.A.T.I.N. was very much within a very group-analytic spirit! His intervention functioned as a kind of a ceasefire command.

Through these recollections and rather sketchy descriptions of those valuable years of my training during the '70s, I feel that these three figures particularly, had an intense impact on my personal and professional development with their ideas, approaches and beliefs and also their strong presence. Of course as a student and later on as a graduate I had the opportunity to meet and learn from several other senior colleagues. However these three were indeed exceptional individuals, though as such they were treated by some with a particularly unfriendly way. Skynner and Pines never became the heirs of Foulkes, although they deserved it, and this is infallible evidence that group analysis is not a "church" but an organization which functions according to group-analytic ideas.

Malcolm and Robin where relentless friends and colleagues, and I would like to complete my memories with a very pleasant dinner on a Sunday evening at our house in Athens, in the April of 1995 when they were attending the 4th European Meeting on Group Analysis which was organized by I.G.A. Athens.

The atmosphere was a little tense since the family was somehow … divided; Eleni and myself were looking forward to enjoying the company of two old and dear friends, whereas our daughters, Alkyoni and Amaryllis, besides a certain anxiety concerning the use of English, had the yearning to lead the conversation to English cinema and especially to John Cleese, as they knew that he was a friend, co-author and an ex-patient of Robin. The girls were also interested in contemporary English bands, although their hopes were rather low, due to the age of the two «grandfathers», as they called them!

Both Robin and Malcolm however responded very well to the expectations despite being bombarted by questions, which filled the parents with silent pride but also turned them into passive and watchful listeners in case any of the questions got out of hand.

Therefore the question of how long Robin and John had been friends for was followed by what was wrong with him! Robin did not answer immediately, but started telling this story about a tour in the Nile which was offered by Cleese to his friends (about 40 of them) in a chartered river boat. During this tour, Steven Fry had organised a "This is Your Life" type of show, inviting each guest to say something original or revealing about the host.

When it was my turn, I said: "I'm sure all of you would want me to violate my oath to Hippocrates and tell you what was wrong with John: well, there was nothing wrong with John! The reason I kept him as a patient is that you don't dismiss someone who is convinced he is sick. I'll tell you a story so that you understand what I mean: someone goes to the psychoanalyst complaining that he has a bee stuck in his rectum and he can't get rid of it. The psychoanalyst, after taking his medical history and reassuring him that such thing is impossible, he provides some interpretative sessions; finally he sends him to a surgeon friend of his, to examine and reassure him about the non-existence of the insect. Indeed the patient goes to the surgeon, who after an assiduous examination pronounces that the bee has left. The patient goes home but after a few days he goes back to the psychoanalyst telling him that another bee has entered his bottom! These are the kind of matters I tried to avoid with John".

The sensation was in proportion to the narration, and when fruits and dessert were served, Malcolm and Robin were already recalling childhood memories, and at some point singing nursery songs or miming types of the English light theatre of that period. It was such a moment of happiness for me: to be hosting an extremely joyful dinner for my masters, and to get to discover another ability of Malcolm's. That of the singer!

## References

Tsegos I.K. (1995) "A Greek Model of Supervision. The Matrix as Supervisor - A Version of Peer Supervision Developed at I.G.A. (Athens)". In: M. Shape (ed.) *The Third Eye: Supervision of Analytic Groups*. London: Routledge, 117–29.

Voyatzaki Z. (2006) "On the History of EGATIN". *Group Analysis* 39(1): 108–120.

Ioannis K. Tsegos, psychiatrist, group analyst (I.G.A. London), is director of the Training and Research Department of the Open Psychotherapy Centre and president of I.G.A. Athens and G.A.S. Greece. He is the founder of the European Group-Analytic Training Institutions Network (E.G.A.T.I.N.) and since 2000 he is the director of the book publication series in Greek, entitled "Contemporary Psychotherapy". He is also in private practice.

---

## Ti Ricordo: Bringing Back Our Memories to Our Heart …

I still remember when I met Malcolm … it was in Amsterdam … it was the 1983 IAGP Symposium … and I was touched by the following question: "How important is culture in group dynamics?" The question now seems to be naïve and it is so now, but not so much then in 1983! 1989??? It was more or less when EATGA had been founded shortly before and I was invited by him to take part in the next study day in Paris. It was very interesting then to be there with so many distinguished colleagues that I began to know.

Dennis Brown one of them … We still remember that terrible dish made out of pig feet that was supposed to be a great French delicacy! Could have been better! Since then Malcolm has been my most inspiring older brother friend colleague! The one who takes your hands when you want to take a risk and helps you! With this support I started my UK group analytic adventure throughout winter workshops, conferences, symposiums and all group analytic events.

During the second GAS Symposium in Oxford, the organization of the 1st EATGA Symposium took place in Bologna but with a great deal of conflict … as we know, our poverty often is the result of sibling rivalry transferred between colleagues and this was the case. I still remember Malcolm trying to console me regarding these dynamics and helping French/Belgian colleagues to give trust to a "poor southern European Mediterranean woman" that, by definition, had to be taught.

The Symposium was a success but something happened that traditionally is related to the rivalry between France and England,

something that you can perceive through the linguistic struggle of an English person talking French and a French person speaking English where the articulation of "R" becomes a humorous struggle between teeth and tongue.

Again Malcolm in Louvain … hosted in a hostel where we could enjoy the exceptional chance to save half a Belgian Frank by choosing an uncomfortable phone call from the downstairs corridor in front of anyone, instead of the privacy of your room! It was another way to learn about culture either individual or national … not clear enough yet … where such a little saving could prevail on the pleasure of a good conversation…

Again Malcolm supporting me in front of a kind of "jury" where the sin was not to have given enough honour to the Constituted Authority! The chair of an Association of Colleagues that I had believed could be a peer aggregation where the Presidency should have been seen as a "primus inter pares" function instead of a hierarchical position.

I'm sure that it was not a pietistic reaction towards me but something that I felt as a real affectionate participation to my efforts to grow, to take part in, to give my contribution to a world; that of GAS that I was feeling as a real fantastic discovery throughout the vast range of colleague aggregations that I had met previously in my country.

Since then a lot of interesting initiatives have taken place in the various Associations we were part of, in which we shared several commitments: EATGA, IAGP, besides the beloved GAS, London.

Köszeg, in Hungary … was another beautiful experience with Dennis Brown, Gerald Wooster and others.

In Venice we started the main confluence of our shared interest. Werner Knauss was with us and helped in developing a new way to open up interesting speculations in the field of Group Analysis: "The emergence of relational goods in Society, Mind and Brain" that became the title of the XY GAS Symposium in Bologna with IGA Bo.

Malcolm and others had developed in Bologna a new group of Italian colleagues chaired by me but having in Malcolm, Ivan Urlic, Estela Welldon and other inspiring and trustful colleagues great support.

The concept of "the economy of the group" that started from the research on efficacy/efficiency in the field of group psychotherapy stimulated in the wider scheme of the "managed care system" became an interesting and inspiring issue that became a sort of turning point

for our mutual interest, that of the intertwining of group analysis and economics that relates to civil society, something that further got the title of "relational economics".

Some dearest people that have physically disappeared, but not from our hearts, were enriching our collaboration … a major role was played by the sweetest strongest person, half Italian, that helped the written transmission of our work: Maureen Spurgeon.

And more dearest friends in other ways, Elisabeth Foulkes, Dennis Brown, Pat De Maré, and others.

Still alive, but lost in terms of friendship, some more colleagues that had played a meaningful role in this scenario. I am talking of one of the more painful situations that can happen: that of the breaking of friendships … they still remain in the "screen of the memories" with some hope of overcoming and recovery…

I do not think I was able to reciprocate totally my support when some conflicts appeared around Malcolm. Something that I still consider an expression of a malaise in our institutions.

But around all this, the sweet, tender and strong nest created with Iris and the new generation of Pines…. for ever!

I still remember when, in San Petronio, in Bologna, Malcolm decided to light a candle.

I was surprised and, he, in reply, said that this was a way to remember Iris that, being Catholic, should have done the same there ….

I would like to propose to celebrate Malcolm and his work trying to find ways of looking, of mirroring one another, for peace and reparation of our wounds.

I understand that, in talking about Malcolm, I have focused on my own life. This could be seen as an egocentric perspective. And this could be, in fact.

However, I prefer to see this as an expression of the importance that the presence of Malcolm has meant in my life.

So that, Malcolm, thank you to exist as you are.

Luisa
Bologna, January 2010

# Personal reflections on what I learned from Malcolm Pines

I first met Malcolm Pines when I was training in adult psychotherapy at the Tavistock Clinic in the early 80s. We discovered a shared interest in the work of Heinz Kohut, the Chicago psychoanalyst who developed the approach called 'self psychology', which explored the role of shame, narcissistic injury, and the child's (and patient's) search for validating and development-enhancing responses from the parent, and later from the analyst (Kohut 1971; Mollon in press). Kohut's emphasis upon the centrality of empathy melded well with Malcolm's own style of work, contrasting markedly with the prevailing psychoanalytic culture of the Tavi at that time.

Although the adult department of the Clinic did contain a range of psychoanalytic perspectives, Kleinian influences were strong. These were manifest in two main ways. First, there was a tendency to view the patient in very negative terms, giving priority to a focus on destructive, perverse, and deceptive motives. Patients were commonly regarded as 'tricky', and as engaging in 'attacks' on the psychoanalytic work. The psychoanalyst was seen as heroically embattled against the forces of malevolence and 'perversion' within the personality, the psychic bastions of envy and of hatred of reality and truth (e.g. Steiner 1993). A second, related, emphasis was upon continually addressing the negative 'transference' – the supposed continual unconscious expression of destructive motivations in relation to the analyst. Elaborate formulations of perverse structures of the personality and their expression within the 'transference' were common features of this particular psychoanalytic culture. Any exploration of matters outside the 'transference', including childhood history, would be regarded as a collusive escape from the emotional heat of the here-and-now.

A brief juxtaposition of the modern 'here-and-now' approach to transference and Freud's view will illuminate the difference. Thus, the modern view, held by many psychoanalysts, is outlined by Ruth Malcolm (1986) as follows:

"The transference is an emotional relationship of the patient with the analyst which is experienced in the present, in what is generally called 'the here-and-now' of the analytic situation.... so-called 'genetic interpretations', that is, interpretations that refer to the patient's past history, are not the aim of analytic work … what should

be the centre of the interpretation .. [is] the immediate relationship between analyst and patient, with its verbal and non-verbal expressions" [p 73-74].

By contrast, Freud considered the transference to be an illusion caused by the intrusion of infantile memory into the present image of the analyst:

"The danger of these states of transference evidently lies in the patient's misunderstanding their nature and taking them for fresh real experiences instead of reflections of the past … It is the analyst's task constantly to tear the patient out of his menacing illusion and to show him again and again that what he takes to be new real life is a reflection of the past" [1940 p 176-7 italics added]

This builds upon his earlier position, where he stated the task as one of minimising transference and transforming it as far as possible into memory:

"It has been the physician's endeavour to keep this transference neurosis within the narrowest limits: to force as much as possible into the channel of memory and to allow as little as possible to emerge as repetition" [1920 p 18]

Often the exponents of the 'here-and-now negative transference' could be persuasive, charismatic even. As trainees, it was easy to feel shame if one failed to grasp adequately the destructive motives and actions of the patient as these were played out in the consulting room. Malcolm Pines presented a refreshing contrast. His formulations would be simple and plausible, and based on an empathic grasp of the patient's state of mind, usually finding and validating the patient's positive strivings. Malcolm did not go in for long and over-elaborate interpretations, but would present an idea succinctly and clearly. He was never overly wordy. His considerable intelligence was apparent, although worn lightly. One sensed his impatience with some of his more verbose and pompous colleagues.

On one occasion I spoke to him in supervision of how I had explored aspects of the patient's history in an effort to understand the present interaction in the consulting room. It had seemed useful, yet I felt uneasy because it was at odds with the prevailing view, apparent in other seminars and supervisions, that attention to the patient's history per se, rather than its expression in the 'here-and now', was likely to be a defensive avoidance of some difficult issue in the transference active in the room at that moment. On disclosing these concerns to Malcolm he responded with (what I perceived to be) mild irritation, and made a comment of startling simplicity. He said

"Well if you are stuck in the present, go to the past, and if you are stuck in the past, go to the present". I found this formula immensely helpful. It formed the basis of how I later came to think of the analytic space, as constituted from the continual movement between past and present, between 'here-and-now' and 'there-and-then'.

In a discourse that is so often pervaded by muddle, obscurity, and pretension, Malcolm's simple clarity was refreshing. His economy of expression would puncture bubbles of hubris. Supervision did not need to be prolonged or tortuous. Malcolm would seemingly effortlessly sift through a mass of clinical detail and accurately highlight a central issue, bring it into clear focus – and this would leave me with more than enough to think about.

Of course, Malcolm was sensitive to group and organisational processes – but again his touch was light. His teaching and supervision of group psychotherapy was outstanding. He would facilitate but never humiliate. His deep fascination with the life of the group was always apparent.

My four years at the Tavistock Clinic were filled with learning from many gifted supervisors. Whilst I am grateful to them all, Malcolm's teaching has remained as a particularly lasting and benign influence – not only for its valuable content, but for his clarity, tact, empathy and humour. When I thanked him at the end of my time there, he told me to pass on to those whom I would supervise what I had found helpful in my experience with him. I hope I have done so.

## References

Freud, S. 1920. Beyond the pleasure principle. Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud. XVIII. London. Hogarth.

M Freud, S. 1940. An outline of psycho-analysis. Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud. XXIII. London. Hogarth.

Kohut. H. 1971, The Analysis of the Self. New York. International Universities Press.

Malcolm, R. 1986. Interpretation: the past in the present. International Review of Psycho-Analysis, 13 433-443. Reprinted in E. Bott Spillius Ed. Melanie Klein Today Volume 2. 1988. London. Routledge.

Mollon, P. [in press] A Kohutian perspective on the foreclosure of the Freudian transference in modern British technique. Psychoanalytic Inquiry.

Steiner, J. 1993 Psychic Retreats. Pathological Organisations in Psychotic, Neurotic and Borderline Patients. London. Routledge.

Phil Mollon

# Malcolm Pines: An appreciation

I first met Malcolm in 1971/2 at the Atkinson Morley Hospital, part of St Georges Hospital in South West London, where I was on a three-month placement as a young clinical psychology trainee. Following my interest in collective psychopathology (having left South Africa in 1969), I had opted, where possible, for therapeutic community style training placements. The Atkinson Morley at that time was run on therapeutic community lines, with large group community meetings which Malcolm conducted (Earl Hopper was there too), twice-weekly small group-analytic groups, and various other group activities and individual work. The patients constituted a very mixed group including those with severe eating disorders (an occasional bandaged head, indicating a recent a leucotomy, would be apparent in the large group), personality disorders, anxiety and depression.

In his role as conductor of the large group I experienced Malcolm as a very powerful integrating intelligence and containing presence. My experience in both the large and small groups had the most significant influence on the direction taken in my working life and Malcolm was the key figure pointing me towards group analysis – a path that I have followed for more than 35 years. Without being able to recall his words verbatim, I have a pervasive memory of Malcolm synchronising, linking and integrating across different levels, persons and contexts, in a manner that was erudite, humane and benevolent. For me this was inspiring (but given that Malcolm looks more like my father than anyone else I have come across, it is possible that some transference effects were in play). I remember particularly Malcolm commenting that he was touched by a spontaneous gesture of mine (my reaching out to a very distressed/depressed patient sitting next to me in the large group) and my feeling that it was a bit like being noticed by royalty!

By the end of this placement I had decided to pursue group analysis and approached Malcolm for an assessment for joining a group-analytic therapy group at the group analytic practice. He then referred me to Robin Skynner's once-weekly group. In a second psychiatric assessment with Malcolm in the early 80's (which was part of my application for the London group-analytic qualifying training), I was impressed that he was able to refer to his notes from so many years ago, and feed back to me how I had changed!

When later I entered the training, Malcolm was one of our senior teachers. The extraordinary breadth of his knowledge meant that he was the obvious teacher for the then newly developed module on "Mind Self and Society". He also led the seminars on our theory paper presentations and I remember feeling deeply honoured when, after qualifying, Malcolm invited me to collaborate with him on writing a chapter on group analysis for an American textbook on group psychotherapy (edited by Anne Alonso and Hiller).

Not only was Malcolm the most prolific author disseminating group analysis all over the world, but he also, more than anyone, provided encouragement, support and influence to trainees and neophyte group analysts in the UK and abroad. I have been amazed, in my experience at EGATIN and GAS symposium events, to discover the extent of Malcolm's influence abroad and how he has inspired a whole generation of group analysts. He has a quality of generosity that is quite exceptional.

Sylvia Hutchinson

---

## Our Work Means a Lot to Both of Us

About 30 years ago towards the end of the 70's I met Malcolm for the first time at the Group Analytic Practice where I had come to make contact with current Foulkesian Group Analysis. I started conducting groups six or seven years ago after having worked for 15 years with training sessions in group dynamics. I had undergone a psychoanalysis and had started my analytic training, I wanted to bring together my experience of conducting groups and of psychoanalysis had already some knowledge of the works of Foulkes, Anthony and Bion. From when they first appeared I studied them with a degree of passion having already some knowledge of the English language which came about from several holidays after the war and I had also finished my philosophical sessions at the French Lyceé in London. I had even hesitated for a while between going either to Oxford or to the Sorbonne for my studies in psychology.

So this meeting with Malcolm was also a return after a long absence to Great Britain where I felt myself to some extent at home. However,

the emotion of finding myself again in London led to my feeling a little lost and the meeting was cut short even though Malcolm had given me a warm welcome. I sought out this contact because though I was part of the organising committee of the French Society for Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy of groups (SFPPG) I felt to some extent isolated from my French colleagues. The authoritative works were those of D Anzieu and R Kaës which had recently appeared; I agreed with them on many points but their research was based on training experiences and not through the experience in psychotherapeutic groups. It was that approach that I wanted to develop for myself, to connect with these great British ancestors who had opened this new field of analysis where there was much still to be explored.

This was the beginning of many later meetings with members of the Group Analytic Society, Malcolm having invited me to take part in the meetings around the annual Foulkes Lecture and at other opportunities to meet and to appreciate and to develop friendships with Dennis Brown, Elizabeth Foulkes, Colin James…

Then in 1980 there was the Copenhagen Congress of IAGP where I presented my work for the first time and at the same time that of Didier Anzieu who had been my professor for four years at the Sorbonne. It was a very fine Congress which Malcolm and Lise Rafaelson conducted with charm and brio. Raymond Battegay handed on the Presidency of IAGP to Malcolm.

Certainly it was at Copenhagen that I met for the first time my friend Juan Campos for whom it was also his first participation in an IAGP congress. We warmed very well to each other and our exchanges revived every time that we met though unfortunately these occasions were far apart. I have been very moved by his loss for I had never thought that his warm presence would ever leave us.

From the IAGP congresses and the GAS meetings notably in London and Zagreb, from visits from Malcolm to Paris to the meetings of the SFPPG, the exchange of articles which were published in Group Analysis and Connexions, then in the Revue de Psychotherapie Psychanalytique de Groupe founded in 1985 from the exchange of ideas, discussions of concepts and working methods in analysis, undoubtedly Malcolm and I did much to bring together without confusion the British and French approach to the analysis of groups.

When I became President of SFPPG at the beginning of 1982 I didn't take forward the idea of creating a training in France for group analysis by the Institute of Group Analysis. Hanne Campos was to

have come to conduct a group to initiate a course of four years from the Institute.

My idea was that our connection should be built more upon scientific exchange and co-operation rather than of training. We were somewhat backward in France in developing our own ways of working and theorisation and we didn't see ourselves becoming affiliated to the school of Foulkes. So, the Council of the SFPPG agreed with me in putting aside that idea and putting into place projects which would lead us to engage not only with the British, but also with the Italians (notably Il Poiaillolo which had a Bionic orientation with Corrao, Neri, Corrente… with whom R Kaës, Resnik and myself had taken part in a meeting in Rome), the Belgians, the Swiss, the Argentineans, etc.

So it was with this frame of mind that I came to London in May 1982 to a meeting of the Group Analytic Society to which I had been invited. What was in question then were the relationship between the overseas members and the British members, to be unified under one set of regulations. On this occasion there was the idea of founding a European society for the analysis of groups, or a European association of training institutes. So rather than founding a new society or a European association of an academic nature both traditional and global, I put forward the idea of an association which would have, as its objective, working on cultural differences and upon the cultural bases of the psyche, which structure the individual both intrapsychically and in relationship to others.

Thus this led us in July 1982 on the initiative of a French Society for Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy of groups to propose an inaugural meeting with the aim of forming a European working group. So in November 1982 there was a meeting of a dozen or so persons at Salpetriere, in a hall that was rich in history as this was the sale Charcot. Amongst the people there were: Elizabeth Foulkes (London), Edmond Gilleron (Lausanne), Kurt Husemann (Dusseldorf), Rene Kaës (Lyon), Ursula Keller-Husemann (Dusseldorf), Jacques Le Roy (Maastricht), Enrico Pozzi (Rome), Malcolm Pines (London), J C Rouchy (Paris) and Roger Snakkers (Brussels). Also present at the beginning of the work were Genevieve Testemale and Claude Pigott who had shown an interest in the context of the SFPPG but who later dropped out.

I had prepared a short text for this meeting proposing the premises of the first hypotheses from which a clinical method of research could develop. This was the basis for the first discussions centred on a

principal theme: how would it be possible through the analysis of groups to carry out research on the cultural bases of the psyche and the structuration of the self? So from the beginning of our working in groups together was the idea of clinical research by putting into the situation people of different nationalities and different cultures in our intercultural group.

So now we are in November 1982 and the first seminar which was held in Maastricht in July 1985. During these three years we had several meetings and spent a lot of time together exchanging what it was that was leading us to the interest in this dimension of inter- and trans-culturality, on our personal histories and on how we could develop a common research and work together in these intercultural seminars.

I must say that these three years were very interesting, enriching for us, even though it was at quite a considerable financial cost: there were no subsidies for this work and we had to do much travel in order to be able to meet. It is important to emphasise that there was a strong real motivation and undoubtedly pleasure in our meetings and exchanges in this perspective which was the crucible in some ways of our future work. Shortly before the Maastricht seminar we formed a European Association for Transcultural Analysis of Groups (EATGA) so that we had a common identity for organising these activities. But though we had succeeded in agreeing despite our different perspectives to conceive and organise this first session at Maastricht, conducting the seminar and the analysis of the groups revealed that there were very considerable differences that had to be faced. This we had not fully realised before we actually worked together. Without doubt one of our principal interests and our research was to face up to ways of working analytically in this transcultural team. This indeed is the object of the Association, contrasting with international associations where discussions cover over the differences which are stimulated by the meeting with others and therefore do not form part of the work. Undoubtedly this new association which we had created together was a turning point in our relationships which were at the same time both closer and more different than we had anticipated in the work itself.

One issue that arose was in the different conceptions of carrying out the analytic work. Some of us worked with an emphasis on the transcultural dimension, and others on the intercultural dimension. This led me to distinguish these concepts: transcultural is researching on the origin of differences, on the single person, on the unity which overcomes differences. From my point of view it is formative for the

team of analysts who conduct a seminar. It is a basic function for our European Association: If there are cultural differences the work that we do together is transcultural and aims at overcoming conflicting dimensions of the intercultural.

The intercultural dimension puts emphasis on the conflicts in relationships between people and between groups of cultural differences. In the course of a seminar it will stir up conflicts not only between the participants but also in the team of analysts, and against the setting.

These two viewpoints were developed in the seminars, one focusing more on transcultural exchanges, attempting to bypass the conflictual aspects, while the other worked upon the tensions which were developed by the intercultural relationships and particularly on transference dimensions relating to the analytic team and to the setting. The transcultural orientation was more "British", going along with the Foulkesian conception of the "Matrix" and the intercultural orientation was more "French" which were linked with group transferences. Though these two viewpoints gave rise to a tension in the group of conductors, these two ways of working are necessary and complementary to the extent that in every group situation, inter- and transcultural, they exist conjointly and are in themselves a cause of tension and conflicts intrapsychically for each one of us. Striving towards transcultural research on relationships, exchanges, of uniting with others, is a secondary process and a way of sublimating. To find at the same time being confronted with intercultural differences evokes primary mechanisms of incorporated culture.

We had thought ourselves to be much closer in our ideas of how to do analytic work in groups. It was in the examination of the way in which we worked once we began to conduct or intercultural seminars that we recognised that there were differences more or less irreducible, both in how we saw the relationships between the participants and the analysts, in laying down rules and in conducting the analysis. Certainly these seminars were not easy to conduct with about 80 participants mostly coming from different parts of Europe and the west without simultaneous transaction so these primary phenomena and intercultural violence were present.

We learnt much through working with groups, with confronting our ways of working, situations that once can describe as extremes arising from situations where you have to work both with the groups that are participants and between ourselves. These were indeed important experiences which more than we realised at the time we have learnt from.

We must not forget dear Dennis Brown who is a part of all these years of research and who exercised an important moderating influence. The last time that we met was at Budapest by complete chance as we were going to the same performance.

With Malcolm, together we walked a very important road, sometimes close, sometimes more or less distant, sometimes in opposition, moving together and forming the history of an old friendship with complexities and coherencies woven from the thread of times in our togethernesses both similar and diverse.

Jean-Claude Rouchy

---

## Research Quotation

"The qualitative researcher, like the field of qualitative enquiry, refuses to be frozen into one space, or one fixed identity. At the same time there are efforts to impose so-called "value neutral" but uniform bio-medical ethical standards on qualitative research. There are also increasing efforts to judge qualitative research in terms of experimental or scientifically-based criteria. Increasingly, qualitative scholars are resisting institutional attempts to impose narrow models of evidence on research. Too often, state-sponsored systems of science rely upon narrow definitions of research and scientific reasoning. These regulatory and ethical activities raise fundamental philosophical, epistemological, political, and pedagogical issues concerning scholarship and freedom of speech in the academy". *2008 Manifesto of the International Centre for Qualitative Enquiry.*

Quotation supplied by Terry Birchmore

---

# Can Group Psychotherapy Survive NICE?

## *Examining the Evidence*

## Joint GAS/IGA Conference

## 29th January 2010, London

## Can Group Therapy Survive Nice? Some Conference Afterthoughts

The conference hosted jointly by the Institute of Group Analysis and Group Analytic Society on January 29 2010, on research into the effectiveness of group psychotherapy, has been a long time coming. Possibly 30 years. In the late 1970s the Institute and the Society invited a number of members interested in research to set up a Joint Research Committee. They included, Tom Caine, Barbara Dick, Caroline Garland, Jeff Roberts, Beau Stevenson, David Winter, and me. That committee continued till the early 1990s when the IGA introduced a time limit on how long members could serve on committees. The remaining members – Jeff Roberts, David winter and me – were duly thanked and stood down, though not before we had edited a special section on research in Group Analysis in 1992 and, in 1993, produced the most lasting outcome of the committee's efforts, A Workbook of Group-Analytic Interventions.

That book was a bi-product of the task the committee had set itself at the outset: to describe what characterizes group analysis in practice by asking the simple but elusive question, 'What do group analysts actually say and do in their groups?' The published results of this study were Garland et al (1984) and Kennard et al (1990).

Methodological problems in our approach meant we were unable to produce reliable findings at that time. Now, in 2010, the need for a clear definition of group analysis, and of different types of group intervention, has resurfaced in the recommendations of the systematic review of the effectiveness of group analysis.

### The context in which the review was commissioned

Interest in research in Group Analysis seemed to disappear from our collective radar after 1992. It did not reappear in the pages of Group

Analysis until 2000, when a special section on empirical research was published. Since then a small number of papers have addressed the question of how to reconcile the practice of group analysis – and psychodynamic therapies generally – with the increasing trend in the NHS to restrict services to those approved by NICE (National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence) on the basis of evidence from randomised controlled trials.

The penny has been slow to drop that psychotherapies for which RCT evidence is lacking - which include most therapies based on psychodynamic principles – were under severe threat. Only recently has this threat galvanised our organisations into action.

Resistance to the effort of reconciling apparently opposing perspectives has been great; and understandable. The perspective and values of psychodynamically informed therapies seem to differ fundamentally from the perspective and values of outcome research. I've set out these differences out in the following table.

| *Group-analytic/Psychodynamic perspective* | *Research perspective* |
|---|---|
| The process of therapy is about human relationships, which can't be standardised. | Standard manualised procedures are needed in order for the effectiveness of a particular therapy to be evaluated. |
| The goals of therapy are about resolving the blocks to mature emotional functioning – achieving the capacity 'to love and to work'. | Therapy outcomes are defined by what can be measured: behaviour, symptoms, self-rated well-being. |
| Patients/clients problems are complex and can't be pigeon holed into neat categories. | Diagnostic categories are needed as a basis for comparing the effectiveness of different therapies |
| In group therapy, heterogeneous groups maximise learning opportunities by providing a richer range of relationships and 'mirrors'. | The effectiveness of a therapy can only be evaluated in the context of its application to a specific problem or diagnosis – i.e. homogeneous groups. |
| Therapy is often long term and outcomes must also be evaluated in the long term. | Funding and institutional constraints mean that most research focuses on brief therapies with short follow-ups. |

Notwithstanding this clash of perspectives, some actors within the field of psychodynamically informed therapies in the UK have been quicker off the mark in engaging with the challenge and looking for ways forward.

In the 1990s Peter Fonagy and Anthony Bateman developed a psychoanalytically based approach to borderline personality disorder that could be subjected to a randomised controlled trial, and have subsequently developed a manualised treatment model known as mentalization based therapy (MBT).

In 2000 the Association of Therapeutic Communities launched a joint initiative with the Research Unit of the Royal College of Psychiatrists to create the Community of Communities. This is described as 'a standards-based quality improvement programme bringing together Therapeutic Communities (TCs) in the UK and internationally, engaging them in service evaluation and quality improvement using methods and values that reflect their philosophy.' This has enabled therapeutic communities to keep control of the process by which they are evaluated by commissioners.

These have been the exceptions. For a long time group analysts, along with other psychodynamic therapists, kept their distance from research and the politics of NHS commissioning, arguing that the kinds of evidence used by NICE were not appropriate. A very small number of group analysts with a research background sought to communicate their interest within the Institute. In 2004 Chris Evans began a regular column on research in Dialogue, the IGA Newsletter, and a year or so later Jenny Potter, a member of the Institute Board, took on responsibility for thinking about research and audit.

With the waters of NHS commissioning lapping round our feet action was finally taken. In 2007 the Institute of Group Analysis and Group Analytic Society decided jointly to commission a systematic review of the effectiveness of Group Analysis and analytic/psychodynamic group psychotherapy. An expert panel of IGA and GAS members, chaired by Jenny Potter, was set up to oversee the review, which was carried out independently by the Centre for Psychological Services Research in the School of Health and Related Research at the University of Sheffield. It was completed in December 2009 and the conference held the following month.

## The unsurprising findings and the more important qualifiers

The positive but rather bland overall conclusion of the enormous effort that went into the systematic review was that 'studies consistently support the use of group psychotherapy as an effective approach across diverse conditions, participant groups and settings', but that there was too little evidence to support any particular therapeutic approach.

The more interesting parts of the conclusion were the findings on outcome predictors, and the recommendations. Group analysts will not be surprised by the findings that the outcome of group therapy is related to a number of variables, including psychological mindedness and the quality of object relations, and that group attendance is related to attachment style and the level of interpersonal distress. As with all research, asking the right questions is half the battle. In the case of Group Analysis, the right question is not 'does it work?' but 'with which types of patient is it most effective?' – what the researches call the aptitude-treatment interaction. While this is true for any model of psychotherapy, a particular challenge for group analysis arises from its emphasis on the value of groups with patients who have different problems and personal styles. A group only for depressed patients might suit NICE with its 'silo' approach to evidence, but it flies in the face of much clinical experience that such a group will be less productive than a group that contains patients with different psychological problems or symptoms.

The authors of the systematic review concluded that 'the homogeneity of group membership may be an important part of the group's success'. This was based on interviews with the members of one group, who said they valued being in a group with people who had had similar problems and family experiences. This, of course, is exactly what group analysis aims at, where the apparent differences that patients enter the group with give way to the realisation that they have much in common. We may need to conceptualise our groups as heterogeneous for specific symptoms but homogeneous for underlying life experience.

## What do we do next? A strategic choice

The review recommended that further research should be undertaken into what types of patients benefit from Group Analysis, the different

indications for group versus individual therapy, the effectiveness of homogeneous versus heterogeneous groups, and the equivalence or 'non-inferiority' of group analysis compared with CBT group therapies. The review also proposed a study of group members' experience - service users' personal testimony. In carrying out any research, it recommended the use of clear definitions of the types of group interventions (something noticeably absent in many of the papers reviewed) and the use of a consistent set of outcome measures.

In considering the review's recommendations, a broad strategic choice was presented at the conference

*Strategy one:*
Professor Glenys Parry, who oversaw the work of the systematic review, put this at its most stark and uncomfortable: you have to play the evidence game, or risk disappearing as an NHS funded treatment. This means accepting that, for this purpose, Group Analysis is a commodity, to be branded, packaged and delivered. Bite the bullet.

*Strategy two:*
Championed by Rex Haigh (who masterminded the collaboration between the Association of Therapeutic Communities and the Royal College of Psychiatrists): don't be cowed by the tyranny of evidence; even the Chair of NICE has criticised 'over simplistic, pseudo-quantitative, assessment of the available evidence' and argued for decision makers to 'incorporate judgment as part of their appraisal of the evidence in reaching their conclusions.' Rex argued that group analysts should take the lead in setting their own standards for meaningful research – e.g. looking at the long-term impacts on quality of life, and measuring what matters to service users. He also encouraged us to recognise and use the growing power of the service user movement.

How different are these two strategies? One argues for us to slot into an established process for approving NHS therapies, with the goal of Group Analysis becoming an approved therapy for particular conditions, alongside CBT and MBT. The other argues for us to set up our own approval process and convince those with purchasing power that our criteria of success are genuine, and that the 'product' is worth buying. The strategies are not so far apart in terms of accepting the need to 'sell' Group Analysis. The difference is in how we go about it and who our target audience is.

One factor to take into account is, who has the money? In private practice the target audience is the patient him or herself. If the NHS were to go down the route being taken in the provision of social care, of personal budgets for people with long-term conditions, as suggested in Putting People First (DoH 2007), the same could apply for some potential users of group psychotherapy. But that is in the future.

In the mean time what should our strategy be? My suggestion would be for a combination.

1. Engage, individually and as an organization, with NHS service managers and commissioners. What are their priorities in terms of services required and unmet needs? What are the client groups whose psychological needs are least well provided for? What can Group Analysis contribute to the Trust's service provision? Treat any new venture as a piece of research, recording and evaluating its progress.
2. Develop a body of service user testimonies – direct quotes are especially effective in conveying the value of Group Analysis, It was striking that in the systematic review 4 pages were devoted to the one qualitative study that met the inclusion criteria – more than to any other single study. In a world awash with numbers, personal accounts have particular power.
3. Develop simple, robust criteria for defining Group Analysis that can be applied in practice, to differentiate it from other kinds of group therapy. This might lead the way towards some kind of group-analytic practice manual, though I'm not sure how far down that path we would want to go. The existence of working criteria for defining Group Analysis will in itself be helpful in communications with other professionals and institutions.
4. Agree a set of measures to be used in outcome studies, and where possible by all practising group analysts. These should include three key strands: economic (e.g. group attendance, use of resources like GP appointments); symptom improvement; group members' testimony.
5. Mobilise efforts to set up one or more collaborative research trials comparing Group Analysis with treatment as usual, randomised if possible, where patients with different mental health problems can be allocated to heterogeneous groups but evaluated separately.

## Conclusion

We have spent a long time overcoming our resistance to accepting frameworks other than our own, for evaluating the effectiveness of Group Analysis. But there is nothing like to the threat of extinction, or at least of being severely marginalized, to mobilize energies directed at adaptation and survival. We do not, however, need to lose our identity or integrity in the process – the fear that may have underlain our resistance.

We value groups because we believe that individuals are stronger when they are willing to give up some of their isolation and sovereignty in return for being part of the group. If we consider our position as group analytic therapists, our 'group' – those with whom we need to relate in order to survive and grow - includes psychotherapy researchers, service managers and commissioners, and service user organizations. We will be stronger (and so, hopefully, will they) if we can engage and communicate openly with these other members of our group.

## References

Garland, C., Kennard, D., Roberts, J.P., Winter, D.A., Caine, T.M., Dick, B. and Stevenson, F.B. (1984) What is a group analyst? A preliminary investigation of conductors' interventions. *Group Analysis* 17(2): 137–145.

Kennard, D., Roberts, J. and Winter, D. (1990) What do group analysts say in their groups? *Group Analysis* 23(2): 173–184

Kennard, D., Roberts, J. and Winter, D. (1993) *A Work Book of Group-Analytic Interventions*. London: Routledge. [Republished in 2000 by Jessica Kingsley]

Ministers, local government, NHS, social care, professional and regulatory organisations (2007) *Putting people first: A shared vision and commitment to the transformation of adult social care*. Department of Health.

David Kennard

# Group Analysis Holding in Mind as it Does, the Individual, the Group, and Society as a Whole, is better Placed Than Any Other Discipline I can think of to throw light on the psychological dimensions of Climate Change

## Where are all the large group events on Climate Change?

I was the Convenor of an event due to take place at the IGA London on the 31st January 2010 on Group Analysis and Climate Change. The event had to be cancelled because only nine people signed up for it. This contrasted with an oversubscribed event the previous day about NICE guidelines. What to conclude from this? Cynically I might think that my colleagues are more concerned about their short term job prospects than the future survival of humanity and the planet. To be kinder perhaps, the NICE guidelines are, at least marginally, an issue about which something can be done. Environmental change perhaps seems so vast that it isn't worth directing energy towards it. This is, I believe, to underestimate the power of groups.

## Group analysts need to think about climate change

The foundation matrix, the background to our cultural and emotional lives is it seems undergoing an unprecedented and urgent change. The most reliable aspect of our experience, the continued dependability of the natural world threatens to be no longer reliable or dependable. The sun will continue to rise and set, but according to some highly respectable predictions unless we make dramatic changes to our lifestyle almost everything else in the natural world is likely to be altered by the end of the century.

This is a totally new problem in the history of civilization. Humanity has produced throughout its history diverse and varied forms of destruction. As people interested in thinking about the behaviour of human groups we are familiar with the destruction caused by human violence and the misuse of power.

When it comes to the destruction we face now however, the potential catastrophe is probably worse than anything we have yet

experienced and perhaps worse than we are capable of imagining; and each of us is culpable. Also now as the problem and it's potential solutions are so well publicized, we are no longer innocently culpable.

Change in the Foundation Matrix, is a new disturbing element in the ecology of the group, society and in each of us. The importance of the natural world to each of us as individuals is so sensitive. How much poetry and religious experience relates to nature? The bond can feel so fragile and close to what we experience as divine or sacred. Perceptions about the Earth and nature so often involve idealisation or also denigration. This makes it hard when thinking about climate change to tread a path through the potential pitfalls of despair, panic, denial and apathy; a path which doesn't render us unable to act effectively or to take appropriate responsibility for what we can do and what we can contribute. What we certainly can contribute as group analysts are forums for thoughtful, transformational discussion.

## So why aren't we doing it?

Group Analysis holding in mind as it does, the individual, the group, and society as a whole, is better placed than any other discipline I can think of to throw light on the psychological dimensions of this massive challenge. We know, as group analysts how to create the conditions in which evolution and developments in awareness both personal and social can take place. Why aren't we doing this to facilitate discussion about climate change?

There have been remarkable grass root changes. The Transition Movement started in Kinsale in Ireland and has now spread rapidly across the world. Communities are beginning to work together to make initially small changes, by starting with what can be done locally to reduce oil use and carbon emissions. As part of the Transition movement small gatherings called 'Heart and Mind' groups get together to discuss their emotional responses to problems associated with climate change and Peak Oil. This sounds very like group analysis to me, but perhaps would be even more effective with the contribution of some group analytic expertise.

Alongside the development of the Transition Movement though, the snowball of environmental concern that developed in the lead up to the COP15 meeting in Copenhagen last December seems to have been superseded by a rise in skepticism. Environmentalists who urge action are identified as politically motivated. Opinions seem to be polarizing.

The analytic group is a place in which one becomes aware of how one's behaviour has an impact on upon others. This is a crucial consideration in countering the current tendency towards denial and apathy. It's much easier of course to see the consequence of one's behaviour if the other, is sitting in the same circle of chairs in the same room. It's much more difficult if the victim is far away in Tuvalu or Bangladesh and one is dependent upon information provided by third parties, i.e. scientists and the media, for information on what behaviour maybe causing the problem.

Unfortunately both scientists and the media are not seen as reliable currently and it becomes easier to dismiss the warnings. Perhaps cutting out the third party and setting up forums for discussion between those already affected by climate change and those yet to be so could enable us to truly grasp the challenge ahead. Group analysis could make a vital contribution by helping to make connections between the global challenges of climate change and the very personal repercussions resulting from those changes.

How useful it would be to get all of us: sceptics, idealists, carbon addicts, low carbon living enthusiasts, etc, into a large group together. My perception of so many discussions about climate change is that they either preach to the converted or are largely sceptical. It is hard to have an open discussion in which a full range of views is represented. We need forums in which we can own up to our carbon addictions and be honest about what we are really prepared to change in our own lives and face how difficult change can really be. If we are to rise to the challenge of this problem it will involve being able to hold in mind the scientific evidence, the external reality, alongside an understanding of the psychological impact of this evidence. This needs to be done with as much psychological skill and sensitivity as we can muster and group analysts have I believe a crucial part to play.

A series of large group discussions at the next UN meeting, COP16 in Mexico, perhaps?

Sarah Deco

If you are interested in exploring group analytic approaches to climate change please contact: Sarah Deco: sarah.deco@care4free.net

# GAS/IGA Library Report

## King's Fund Library Database Guidance
## Elizabeth Nokes, IGA/GAS King's Fund Librarian.

---

# Obituary

## David Clark: A Personal Memoir

In 1952 I was a new trainee at the Maudsley. One day a large, handsome, friendly older man entered the junior common room, straddled his back to the gas fire and started to talk to myself and Neil Kessel who had just joined the Maudsley. This was David Clark, a senior registrar who was soon to move to a run down mental hospital at Fulbourn, Cambridgeshire. His transformation of it to become a leading centre for social and administrative psychiatry vividly portrayed in his book "Administrative Therapy" and in personal detail in "The Story of a Mental Hospital Fulbourn 1858 to 1983.

At this first meeting I knew nothing of his current war service as a medical parachutist, later given the responsibility of care for 6000 Dutch civilians who had been imprisoned by the Japanese in Sumatra. Realising that these people would soon be in danger from their uprising against the hated Dutch colonial powers, he led them over the mountains to the coast for evacuation.

David was always a strong supporter of SH Foulkes to whom he had been senior registrar, a post which I myself filled a few years later. He involved himself in a personal psychoanalysis.

David's family were successful Quakers of the famous Clark Shoe enterprise. His father, a very distinguished medical pharmacologist whose text book on pharmacology helped me through my medical degree, was said to have been a stern pater familias. That he was also facilitating was shown by the fact that he sent David, the eldest son, to visit Canada, South Africa and Germany before the 1939 war. David's German experience convinced him that the Nazi regime had infected all young German contemporaries with the military zeal that would soon lead to war. Therefore he chose medicine, eager to involve himself in the forthcoming battle. He volunteered to train as

a medical parachutist in 1943; he was engaged in fearsome active war experience during the German last desperate attempt to break through the allied lines in the Ardennes, the Battle of the Bulge. At that time he was with ground troops but soon after was parachuted with his regiment who were to attempt to cross the River Elbe. Eventually his regiment reached as far as the Baltic! As well as all the horrors of active combat David saw the unbearable horrors of the German prison camps for Russian soldiers, the bloated indifference of German civilians for what they knew was happening nearby. Then later the films of the horrors of Belsen.

Soon after his return to Britain David was sent to the Far East, to India, Ceylon and finally parachuted into Sumatra where the Indonesians were now actively rebelling against the hated Dutch colonial power. David vividly describes the dangers he lived through, once subduing a dangerous insurrection by the force of his personality. A good introduction to social psychiatry! Later he served for six months in a psychiatric hospital in Palestine and it was that experience which turned him towards a career in psychiatry. As an Edinburgh graduate he now began his psychiatric career serving for Professor D K Henderson, the co-author of the famous text book Henderson & Gillespie.

This was the beginning of a brilliant career in social psychiatry. He vividly chronicled his work at Fulbourn, wrote his influential Administrative Psychiatry when on a year's sabbatical at Palo Alto, was invited to Japan to help modernise their psychiatric system and has left a lasting influence there.

When I was at the Cassel in the 1960s I joined with David, Richard Crockett, Stuart Whiteley, Maxwell Jones and others to form the Association of Therapeutic Communities, the ATC. This has had a lasting powerful force in "humanising", as Patrick de Maré would say, our mental hospitals.

Characteristically active David formed the Cambridge Groupwork Training where he worked with Jane Abercrombie and other IGA members who like Bill Lintott were living in or near Cambridge.

Age scarcely diminished his intellectual and physical vigour. My wife and I greatly enjoyed our conversations when we called on them on our way to our Norfolk cottage. His wife Margaret joined us on these pleasant occasions. Another great friend who visited him years is James Anthony, a contemporary from the Maudsley who left to take up a chair in child psychiatry in St Louis and who has remained in the States since then.

Sadly in his final years he suffered from motor neurone disease which gradually took its physical toll though not his mental activity. His passing aged 89 fortunately was peaceful. He died in his sleep having with his GP agreed not to treat a bladder infection with antibiotics. His second wife Margaret and his daughter Pamela from his first marriage were with him at his last.

Ave adque vale. We will not see the like of him again.

Malcolm Pines, London, UK

---

## David Clark Memorial Meeting

On Friday 21st May I sat in a group of more than 100 persons who were gathered to speak out their contributions to the memorial meeting for Dr David Clark, formerly the Lead Consultant at Fulbourn Mental Hospital near Cambridge: from the nursing staff who had been there for many years and witnessed the changes that David wrought; someone remembered walking through and round the hospital and noticed that David greeted every person and knew their name; all remembered the groups that he had introduced and the huge effect it had upon the atmosphere of the hospital and the morale of both patients and staff. Others spoke about the University of the Third Age that he seems to have started and of which he was a most enthusiastic supporter and contributor. His younger brother Ralph (who has a strong resemblance to David) spoke of being a member of the distinguished Quaker family and whose strong memory was of always being told by the school teachers when he came into their classes that his elder brother David had been such a brilliant student. In fact the meeting was at the Friends Meeting House in Jesus Lane. The atmosphere was respectful, pauses were quickly filled, many spoke of the very great changes in their lives that David had helped to bring about either through the work in the hospital, work outside the hospital where he created a community for discharged immigrations, to the inspiration that the University of the Third Age had given them. As someone put it and all agreed, that we had lost a Great Man. Even Margaret, David's second wife, said at the end that she had heard people speak about David in ways that

had been unknown to her so we see again what a multi-faceted person he was.

Many had read his writings and knew about his great courage as a medical parachutist in the 1939–45 war. His GP spoke about the way in which he and David were able to work together and how well each other understood their role. What he did not say was that in his final illness David, suffering severely from motor neurone disease, asked not to be treated with antibiotics for the bladder infection that finally took him into hospital and from which he died very peacefully with his wife and daughter Pamela at his bedside.

David Kennard spoke of David's important role both in setting up and maintaining activities of the Association of Therapeutic Communities and quoted a writer who wrote that just at the point where the hospital really was becoming a therapeutic institution that the move to close down the hospital was gathering speed and could not be undone.

I spoke from the short paper that he had published in Group Analysis about his connection with and work with Michael Foulkes whom he considered to be the wisest and greatest teacher he had ever had. He had found that when having talked to Foulkes who had answered him in his characteristically somewhat diffuse way he came away realising that he now understood himself all the better and that this was the lesson that Foulkes was teaching him, how to listen and to learn from himself. These are words which many of us will I am sure echo.

Malcolm Pines

---

## The Group-Analytic Society (London)

### The Jane Abercrombie Prize 2011

This award was established in 1984 following Jane Abercrombie's death. At that time donations were made to establish a fund to award a monetary prize every three years at the Triennial European Symposium of the Group Analytic Society to an individual or a number of individuals who had undertaken noteworthy work in applying

group-analysis in education, which was Jane Abercrombie's special interest. For the purposes of the award the term "education" is broadly applied.

All Society members and others who work in group-analysis are encouraged to submit details of work which they consider suitable for the award of the prize. It may be presented on paper, video, DVD, art form or a combination of these media. Interested persons should apply directly to the President at the Society address. Entries for consideration should be with the President by 16th May 2011. The Prize will be a cheque to the value of £1,000 Sterling. It will be announced and awarded at the London Symposium, August 2011.

Please contact **Gerda Winther,** President of GAS, if you wish to discuss a potential entry, or to recommend that the work of another person should be considered.

---

## Letter to the Editors

### Request for Foulkes Letters and Documents for Society Archives

We are appealing for letters, notes, and correspondence from Foulkes thatSociety members may possess. This will add to our already valuable society archive that contains much interesting material, papers and minutes and that is a significant source of information on our history and development.

Please contact Julia in the GAS office if you would like to donate any original or copied documents:

Group Analytic Society
102 Belsize Road
London NW3 5BB
Tel: +44 (0)20 7435 6611
Fax: +44 (0)20 7443 9576
e-mail: admin@groupanalyticsociety.co.uk

---

# Events

Announcing

## THE FIFTEENTH G.A.S. TRIENNIAL EUROPEAN

### GROUP-ANALYTIC SYMPOSIUM

***CULTURES, CONFLICT AND CREATIVITY…***

*which will take place at*

***ST MARY'S COLLEGE in***
***RICHMOND-UPON-THAMES, LONDON, UK,***
***AUGUST 29TH – 2ND SEPTEMBER 2011***

*The event is being organised by*
*THE GROUP-ANALYTIC SOCIETY (LONDON).*
*Symposium Sub-Committee Chairman: Kevin Power*

*Group-analysis seeks to understand the many facets of culture. An analytic group has a culture, and so does a family, an organisation, a community and a society. We live in a time when cultures are increasingly interconnected while also striving for separateness to preserve identity. Most cultures are anxious about the global economy, climate change, and how to live together in the context of continuing wars, genocide and terrorism. Not only must we work with our personal conflicts but also with those that arise in interpersonal relationships, in organisations, and within and between societies and nations. How can the creativity of group-analysis respond to and work with this complex matrix of cultures and conflict?*

# 16th Triennial European Symposium in Group Analysis 2014

## *Invitation to Tender for this prestigious event in Group Analysis and central event in the Calendar of the Group Analytic Society (London)*

*This is an invitation for Group Analytic Societies/ Institutes from all over Europe to tender for the 16th European Symposium in Group Analysis which will take place in 2014.*

*The 15th European Group Analytic Symposium will be held in London, from August 29th - September 2nd, 2011. It is the central event in the Group Analytic Society (London) timetable. The Dublin event in 2008 drew over 550 participants and London is hoping to attract at least this many participants. It will provide an opportunity to meet and share theory, practice and experience, and surely be a meeting place in which much socialisation with old friends and colleagues will occur, new acquaintances will be encountered, and one may even be inspired anew in one´s work with groups.*

*The European Symposium has been held every third year since 1970, when the first event took place in Estoril, Portugal. The tradition is to hold it in a different part of Europe each time. Oxford (UK), Heidelberg (Germany), Copenhagen (Denmark), Budapest (Hungary), Bologna (Italy), Molde (Norway) and lately Dublin (Ireland) have all hosted this Symposium in the past. It is a joint venture between the local Society/Institute and the Group Analytic Society, London.*

*The application should give information about:*

*A responsible chairperson*
*A responsible local organisation*
*A venue description*
*Accommodation information*
*Travel information and access*
*A preliminary working title*
*A preliminary realistic budget*

*For further information and guidelines about the organisation, economics and responsibilities:*
*Please contact the Society's e-mail address: groupanalytic.society@virgin.net*
*Applications should be addressed to the President of GAS (London) either by post or e-mail and be at the Society Office by Thursday 17th March 2011*
*Gerda Winther, President*

---

## Information about Conference Accommodation in London and Donations to the Society

Please see the GAS Website at:
http://www.groupanalyticsociety.co.uk/

---