TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editorial

> "He who rejects change is the architect of decay. The only human institution which rejects progress is the cemetery". **Harold Wilson** (1916 - 1995), *Speech to the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, Strasbourg, France, January 23, 1967*

Change is in the air and in our dealings and relationships, and we also change with these external changes. At the time of writing this editorial the London Symposium has been a month gone, leaving its traces in the discussions that have taken place on the online GASi Forum and, hopefully, these traces will continue to be explored in these pages in this, and future issues.

There have been significant changes in the GASi Committee this year. We have welcomed Sue Einhorn, Regine Scholz and Helga Felsberger to the Committee. There have also been goodbyes: to Gerda Winther, our chairperson and President who has ably led us for many years and has reliably (and impressively!) managed to write a President's page for each and every issue of Contexts; also to Kevin Power who has contributed valuably and richly to the Committee for many years and who has competently led the Symposium Team in organising the successful London Symposium.

And, as you will know, Robi Friedman is the new President of GAS. He writes his first President's page in this issue of Contexts.

In this issue we continue to develop a topic that has been introduced in the previous couple of issues: the theme of the political context in which our work is placed. It is clear that this context has changed greatly in contemporary times and the pace of change has quickened in recent years. It is important that we have a clear idea of where we have come from and the underlying drivers and philosophies that underlie these change processes.

The ideological ideas that are creating change in health and public services are all based on the ideal of the market economy, competition and efficiency. One view we might take in response to this would be that in order to survive we need to, increasingly, see our therapy as a product that we can advertise, market and sell as a discrete package that offers certain advantages over other therapies in terms of efficiency, cost, and effectiveness. In this view we can no longer cling to the illusion that the world is as it was when we trained and therefore we have no need to change. Steinar Lorentzen presents one way in which we

might undertake this process of standardisation and marketing of our product. It is clear, from this vantage point, that there is also an urgent need for research. We also need to be clear about what it is that we have to sell and, again, Steinar Lorentzen presents us with both a challenge to our current thinking about Group Analysis and a potential way of answering this question. Robi, in his President's Page also highlights the need for research and the clarity that manualization might bring to our enterprise.

Most of the articles in this special issue have a political theme. The Midlands Group article argues that the traditional role of psychotherapy has been to support the status quo and the power of the privileged and powerful and argues for a more radical and socially engaged theory and practice. Nick Totton then argues that psychotherapeutic practice and theory is inextricably bound up with political issues since the goals of therapy are always ultimately frameable as social and political goals, saturated as they are with concerns and issues about values. He also raises the political question of the role of power relationships in psychotherapy. Mark William Johnson and Peter McMylor then go on to provide us with further analyses of managerialism that build on the articles we have published in previous issues. All of these articles present a challenge to the views expressed earlier in this editorial about the need to sell our services in a managed, market economy and they highlight the collusions and compromises that such an accommodation may involve. David Pilgrim's article focuses on the politics of Elvis Costello, which includes thoughts about the influence of commercialisation on popular music – thoughts that seem to relate to the thinking of Theodor Adorno's critical analysis of popular music, a view which highlights the capitalist domination and production of popular culture leading to the formation of a culture industry that supplants and corrupts popular culture. In Adorno's view the culture industry is actively destroying (partly through standardisation and a view of music as a product) art and the relationship between art and humanity. We might productively replace "popular music" with "health services" and see this as a warning against selling out to commercialised forces and the loss of autonomy, identity and the bad faith that may be involved in "consorting with the devil".

The article by Malcolm Pines also touches on politics and the influence of the Frankfurt School and adds to our thinking about how Group Analysis has evolved and the cultural influences on it. We also have a number of pieces from the London Symposium.

We are aware that any discussion about politics is likely to create controversies, agreements and disagreements and we would like to encourage you, the readers, to respond to these articles with your own thoughts and responses in order to further deepen these discussions. Please write!: letters, brief thoughts, or articles.

We would also like to thank the "Editorial Collective" who generously agreed to meet with us at the beginning of the London Symposium and who were enormously helpful in asking delegates and presenters for articles and personal descriptions of the Symposium for publication in Contexts. We are grateful for the help provided by Teresa Sommaruga-Howard, Teresa Bastos Rodrigues, Anca Ditroi, Yannis Nikolis, Michaela Maoz and Sarah Kalai.

If you were approached and asked to write for us please do your best to respond – the presentations and discussions that took place in London are worth preserving and disseminating more widely.

Terry Birchmore and Regine Scholz

I must also say a personal goodbye to Paula Carvalho, my co-editor for the past five years who has wonderfully sought out articles from the Spanish and Portuguese speaking worlds and from EGATIN and has always been a rich source of ideas for developing Contexts. Thank you Paula. I will miss your co-editorship.

And welcome Regine, as our new co-editor. I look forward to our collaboration and the work that we will do together.

Terry Birchmore

_____

President's Page

This is the first time I am writing to you, GAS (International) members, in my role as president of the Society. Before referring to the elections, I want to express my gratitude to Gerda Winther, our last president, and those in the Management Committee who helped her, for their wonderful work. I and the elected management committee members will try hard to be able to fit into these "big shoes" and face the challenges of such very interesting times that we experience in these days.

In the background of these elections were distinctive markers, first of all our London Symposium, which attracted again a large number of participants and produced much interest. It is with great gratitude to Kevin Power, John Schlapobersky, the SPC and many, many others who invested their time, energy and passion for Group Analysis and the Society and made this congress a success. They turned the congress in a Space of Influence for all of us. I especially wish to mention the opening lecture of Judge Albie Sachs from South Africa, successfully portraying the greatest human change possible: from feelings of revenge to cooperation and the move from being a victim to being an empowered, moderate and thoughtful contributor to society.

The growing interest in Group Analysis and our Society on the one hand, and the threats of a lesser reception of group analytic therapy by some organizations in the UK and in Europe is a challenge. Furthermore: processes in the Group Analytic Society have resulted in changing our family name from 'London' to 'International'. I see it as my task, as part of the Management Committee, to stand up to this challenge. What may Internationalization mean and what can be done in the next years? How can we gain from multicultural/multinational co-operation rather than lose? Such a change surely aroused in some of us worries some about our Society and our Identity, and some may feel the loss of a tradition. We should acknowledge possible distress, and we can only promise to work hard, listen to suggestions and difficulties …and bring out "the honey from the lion".

Another challenge is bringing in young group therapists to GAS International. I have in mind the strengthening of a professional home for group analytic thinking professionals. This can only be done together with new and younger colleagues. Those of us who sat in the Large Group in London, which is the FACEBOOK of the Group Analytic Society, experienced the lack of balance in ages. It seems to me crucial

to appeal to the younger generation, as heterogeneous togetherness is a partnership which enriches members of all ages, it gives more than takes from us. We will try to continue to offer our colleagues and organisations our unique therapeutic tool, which often complements individual and family approaches, and we will offer settings which enrich our togetherness. We need to work to increase knowledge of the choice of Group Therapy and Group-work as a fascinating professional career, and of the Society as the place to belong to.

We have many more tasks before us: helping Research to establish us as an evidence based therapy; manualizing our trade in a way that does not limit our freedom and creativity and also deepens our knowledge of Group Analysis and its applications. We not only profess a therapeutic approach; it is a way of thinking and a way of being-in-the-group as an authority and as a resource. Not surprisingly, groups dealing with inter cultural and inter-national conflicts need people with a Group Analytic approach as much as those with disordered relationships. With the personal experience and education in Group Analysis we are called to lend our qualities to conflict-ridden endeavours.

I will try my best to implement Group Analytic ways by "working with the MC as a group, including the president".

Robi Friedman

––––––––––

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)

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

———————

GAS New Members

Mr Alan Turkie	Full Member	Bristol, UK
Mr Tim Stott	Student Member	Oxford, UK
Ms Kjersti S. Lyngstad	Full Member	Oslo, Norway
Mrs Victoria Sophia Gavin	Full Member	York, UK
Mr Naison M. Msebele	Full Member	London, UK
Ms Maggie Carmicham	Student Member	Aberdeen, UK

––––––––––

Politics

Psychotherapy and Politics: Uncomfortable Bedfellows?

The growth of psychotherapy as a form of treatment within the NHS in the UK cannot be divorced from the overall post-war development of the welfare state within Western countries (Barr, 2004). Notwithstanding the argument that the primary function of the welfare state may be limited to ameliorating some of the worst effects of global capitalism for citizens (see Allen, 2007), it at least represents what could be considered a humane response to such social harms. Unfortunately, however, the welfare state has come under increasing attack from the growing dominance of neoliberal political philosophy which is primarily based on minimising the role of the state in social protection (Mishra, 1999), with some libertarians arguing that the welfare state is unethical in impeding the functioning of free markets (Barr, 2004). Using the argument that fundamental change is necessary to address the national debt, the current UK government is implementing a typical neoliberal package (cf Klein, 2007) of de-regulation, privatisation and massive spending cuts which are, in the words of Environment Minister Greg Barker, "on a scale that Margaret Thatcher in the 1980's could only have dreamt of" (Peev, 2011). The situation is perhaps even starker in smaller European economies such as Ireland, Portugal and Greece that are currently being financed by the IMF and EU bailout fund and are thereby being compelled to introduce neoliberal economic reforms. In Ireland, for example, the government is in the process of pushing through a series of austerity budgets that include severe cuts to social protection, health and education and which will, according to bodies such as TASC (an independent equality think tank) "impact disproportionately on low income and other vulnerable groups by reducing their disposable income, driving more people into poverty and exacerbating inequality" (TASC, 2011, p. 2). In the context of such a dismantling of the public services it is important to critically evaluate how psychotherapy, in its disavowal of its political role, may have unwittingly supported the growing dominance of right wing neoliberalist ideology.

The theories and practices of individual and group therapies to date have largely eschewed the social/political factors that give rise to much

of the distress witnessed by therapists (Pilgrim, 1992), and the focus has been on the "individual as the locus of problems" (Hare-Mustin and Marecek, 1997, p. 113). For example, Volosinov (1976) contends that Freud's theoretical focus on individual factors (such as sexuality) in the formation of the psyche represents a denial of how a person's consciousness is shaped by socio-political contexts such as class, nation and historical period. Other authors have also shown how theoretical developments in the field of psychotherapy reflect and support the power dynamics of the historical period in which they become popular (e.g. Cushman, 1995). The typical material situation of therapy as a professionalised relationship occurring in a clinic or consulting room already somewhat divorced from the particulars of everyday life helps support this generalised tendency to treat what arises in the therapeutic encounter as somehow separable from the wider context of its constitution, precisely because it is this wider context that is consistently bracketed off.

The frequent result of all this is that understandable distress arising from the socio-political contexts of peoples' lives has been reduced to individual psychological problems to be fixed in the privacy of the consulting room. At best, therapeutic practices based on such reductionist ideology leads to individual's feeling less distressed in an oppressive world as they are encouraged to conform to societies norms (Moloney & Kelly, 2003). However, more commonly it is likely to lead to individual's blaming themselves for their own distress and their inability to change, while the social and material origins of their distress remain intact and blinded from view (Smail, 2001).

Pilgrim advocates the potential for the development of more radical forms of therapy arising from challenges to the reductionism of mainstream therapies in his statement that he "saw psychotherapy at first promising a role in personal and political liberation" (Pilgrim, 1992, p. 226). Although he admits that his experience of working in this field for a number of years led to a degree of disillusionment with this role, he holds on to some degree of guarded optimism in therapy's potential "as a stepping stone to empowerment and social change" (p. 241). For therapy to act as a stepping-stone to empowerment and social change it is necessary for therapists to base their work on ideals of social justice. This implies developing therapeutic approaches that recognise the links between personal and social distress, rather than obscuring them (Parker, 1999). This linking of the personal with the political, as advocated for example within the feminist movement (Moane, 2011), aims towards an explicit recognition of the well-researched links

between psychological distress and the socio-political contexts that contribute to its constitution (Pilgrim, 1997). These contexts include both oppressive ideologies such as racism and sexism, and structural power inequalities such as the growing gap between rich and poor (Wilkinson, 1996; Wilkinson & Pickett, 2010). This implies that critical therapeutic work will need to engage with the political realities of people's lives involving both ideological and structural power.

In recent years, there has been a 'turn towards discourse' in psychological theorising that is reflected in recognition among certain therapists of the importance of ideological power in human distress. For example, within narrative therapy (Freedman and Combs, 1996; White and Epston, 1990) attention is paid to how dominant discourses within society (e.g. in relation to race, gender, class, sexuality etc.) impact negatively on the well-being of clients and an attempt is made to assist individuals to challenge these discourses. One of the aims of the critical therapist may, therefore, be to assist individuals to recognise that their difficulties are not due to some psychological deficit, but rather an almost inevitable outcome of living in a certain type of society: as Smail (2005) puts it, rather than simply encouraging insight there is a need to foster 'outsight'. This may involve having conversations with clients with the aim of deconstructing culturally held notions that pervade traditional psychotherapy of for example, individuality, freedom, and choice and that lead to individuals internalising their struggles in life. Although the process of deconstructing oppressive discourses may lead to some alleviation of distress through challenging ideas of self-blame, it could be argued that this in itself is unlikely to lead to any lasting positive change for individuals as they are still faced with the social factors that led to their distress. A true recognition of the role of the social context in distress would suggest that lasting change only comes about through actions that lead to changes in the wider context of the individual's life. Such changes might be facilitated by the therapeutic co-construction of new and more advantageous personal narratives but do not flow automatically from them: actual social and material opportunities for change also need to be present. Furthermore, the so called re-authoring of personal narratives may prove to be difficult and at times impossible given that such narratives are usually integral to the power dynamics within society and so deeply embodied within individuals' emotional repertoire that they are relatively impervious to change (Archer, 2000). This may imply that the role of the therapist as it is currently conceived is rather limited and will need to

expand beyond the confines of the consulting room into the social and political arena.

As Pilgrim (1992) recognised, the movement from individual to group therapy presented an (unfulfilled) opportunity for therapists and their clients to connect their individual distress with that of others and ultimately with their shared social and political environments. There have been some attempts among therapists to make this connection in their work. For example, Prilleltensky (1994) outlines how family therapy, theoretically based on general systems theory, offered the potential for therapists to engage with their work at a social and political level. Unfortunately however, earlier schools of family therapy tended to focus their attention on the family as the locus of 'pathology' and failed to see how the family itself is "embedded in systems of power" (Parker, 1999, p. 7). This has helped psychiatry to dismiss explanations of the causal role that family relations can play as 'family blaming', and so helped to bolster intellectually bankrupt organic deficit models of distress. As family therapy has evolved towards what is commonly referred to as systemic therapy, there has been a growing recognition of the importance of working at a social and political level to effect change although this approach remains a relatively small player in the overall therapy industry (see for example Pearce and Cronen, 1980)

Drawing on feminist theories and the field of community psychology (Orford, 1992), Sue Holland developed a model of working with distressed women in a deprived social environment that moved from an understanding of individual experiences to social action (Holland, 1992). The women were encouraged to question internalised and de-contextualised formulations of their distress and instead to situate their experiences within the context of the environment in which they lived. Ultimately, the aim of this was to encourage the women to overcome their distress by finding ways of changing their context for the better through social action and this appears to have had some success. This recognition of the importance of social action has continued to influence the work of psychologists whose work could be described ad falling under the broad umbrella of community psychology (see for example Kagan & Burton et al. 2011; Holmes, 2010).

David Smail, a clinical psychologist, has also argued for the need for therapists to assist their clients in making changes to their environments in order to effect any lasting positive changes in their lives (Smail, 2001). Drawing on his experience of working as a clinical psychologist in the NHS for many years, he has consistently pointed

to the role of harmful socio-political environments in the causation of the types of psychological distress seen in clinical settings. This has led to the development of a clinical tool known as 'power mapping', in which individuals are encouraged by the therapist to recognise potential sources of, albeit often limited, social power in their lives (e.g. education) and to access these resources as a way of reducing their distress (Hagan & Smail, 1997). Smail does, however, recognise that access to such resources are limited by the social and material positions of individuals and that therapy is therefore likely to be of limited benefit to those who need it most. He argues, therefore, that one of the implications for a psychology based on the recognition of the role of power in human functioning is the need to "cultivate a very strong sense of professional modesty and to strive continually to make clear what the limits of its possibilities are" (Smail, 1996, p. 241).

Although all of the above approaches do move some way towards challenging the reductionism inherent in mainstream therapy approaches, it could be argued that their potential to achieve the promise of a genuinely radical approach to therapy is limited by their focus on proximal social factors and they offer less potential for a genuine engagement with the arguably more important distal social and political contexts. One positive example of therapeutic work that attempts such an engagement is to be found in the work of the 'Just Therapy' team in New Zealand (Waldegrave, 1990; Waldegrave, Tamasese, Tuhaka & Campbell, 2003)). Their work combines a therapeutic focus on the discursive / ideological context of distress with attempts to intervene within local communities and to influence political policy-making. For example, they have instituted regular contact with political economists in an attempt to influence the government to recognise the links between poverty and psychological distress.

The importance of addressing distress at multiple levels of context clearly has far reaching implications for the work of therapists in terms of the necessity to broaden their skills and knowledge from working directly with clients to engaging with communities and the political establishment. It may not be necessary or possible for all therapists to become involved in political activism. However, at very least it would be important for therapists to form alliances with those who are involved and skilled in social / political activism, and where appropriate to encourage their clients to form such allegiances for themselves. For example, Brown (1981) discusses the important contribution of the radical challenges to the theories and practices of the psychiatric

establishment by activist anti-psychiatry groups. Parker (1999) also argues for the importance of alliances between critical psychologists and other professionals that are traditionally considered to be 'outside' psychology such as sociologists. He sees this as crucial to challenging the reductionism that pervades mainstream psychology as he states that the "division between psychology and sociology is one good example of an academic division of labour that encourages people to think that what they do as individuals and what they do in society should be in separate compartments" (Parker, 1999, p. 7).

A further implication of the recognition of the role of power in psychological distress is the need for therapists to be aware of their own positions of power in relation to their clients (Proctor, 2002). Therapists are likely to occupy positions of privilege in society and therefore to benefit from current socio-political arrangements. It is important, therefore, that critical therapists maintain a critical self-reflexive stance towards their work in order to prevent unwittingly recreating social oppressions within their work with those in less powerful positions. These considerations are sharpened once we acknowledge that the efficacy of therapy – all forms of therapy - is greatly overstated by most outcome studies (e.g. Westen & Morrison, 2001), because this requires us to ask even more searching questions about the interests to which this power imbalance is being recruited.

In conclusion, if therapy is to take politics seriously it needs to re-envision its purpose, theories and methods to fit with the core vision of critical psychology "in challenging a status quo that benefits the powerful and works against the powerless" (Prilleltensky & Fox, 1997, p. 7). However, sceptics might argue that therapy from its inception is too closely tied up with maintaining such a status quo; this is arguably demonstrated in recent times by the enthusiasm with which government has embraced psychological therapy – in the form of the IAPT (see Website Links below) scheme - in order to compel the unemployed and miserable to seek non-existent jobs on greatly-reduced rates of benefit. In this context it is interesting to speculate about whether the apparent recent increase in interest among therapists in current political realities is motivated less by the desire to challenge the ways in which the theories and practices of psychotherapy may have served to reflect and support certain types of unjust societies and more by the fact that their professional power seems to be under threat from political / economic changes within an increasingly neo-liberal political environment.

References

Allen, K. (2007). The Corporate Takeover of Ireland. Dublin: Irish Academic Press.

Archer, M. (2000). Being Human: The Problem of Agency. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barr, N. (2004). The Economics of the Welfare State (4th edn). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brown, P. (1981). Antipsychiatry and the left. Psychology and Social Theory, 2, 19-28.

Cushman, P.C. (1995). Constructing the Self, Constructing America: A Cultural History of Psychotherapy. Cambridge MA: Perseus.

Freedman, J., & Combs, G. (1996). Narrative Therapy: The Social construction of Preferred Realities. London: Norton.

Hagan, T. & Smail, D. (1997). Power-mapping I. Background and basic methodology. Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 7, 257-267.

Hare-Mustin, R.T. & Maraceck, J. (1997). Abnormal and clinical psychology: the politics of madness. In D. Fox and I. Prilleltensky (eds) Critical Psychology: An Introduction (pp. 104-120). London: Sage.

Holland, S. (1992). From social abuse to social action: a neighbourhood psychotherapy and social action project for women. Changes, 10(2), 146-153.

Holmes, G. (2010). Psychology in the Real World: Community-Based Groupwork. Ross-on-Wye: PCCS Books

Kagan, C., Burton, M., Duckett, P., Lawthom, R., & Siddiquee, A. (2011). Critical Community Psychology. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Klein, N. (2007). The Shock Doctrine. London: Penguin.

Mishra, R. (1999). Globalization and the Welfare State. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Moane, G. (2011). Gender and Colonialism: A Psychological Analysis of Oppression and Liberation. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Moloney, P., & Kelly, P. (2003). Beck never lived in Birmingham: Why cognitive behaviour therapy (CBT) may be a less useful treatment for psychological distress than is often supposed. Journal of Critical Psychology, Counselling and Psychotherapy, 3(4), 214-229.

Orford, J. (1992). Community Psychology: Theory and Practice. Chicester: Wiley.

Parker, I. (1999). Critical psychology: critical links. Annual Review of Critical Psychology, 1, 3-18.

Parker, I. (ed). (1999). Deconstructing Psychotherapy. London: Sage.

Pearce, W. B., & Cronen, V. (1980). Communication, Action, and Meaning: The Creation of Social Realities. New York: Praeger.

Peev, G. (2011). Coalition is inflicting cuts Mrs Thatcher 'could only have dreamt of', says environment minister. Mail Online. Retrieved from http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1373350/Coalition-inflicting-cuts-Margaret-Thatcher-dreamt-says-Greg-Barker.html

Pilgrim, D. (1992). Psychotherapy and political evasions. In W. Dryden and C. Feltham (eds) Psychotherapy and Its Discontents (pp. 225-242). London: Sage.

Pilgrim, D. (1997). Psychotherapy and Society. London: Sage.

Prilleltensky, I. (1994). The Morals and Politics of Psychology: Psychological Discourse and the Status Quo. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Prilleltensky, I. and Fox, D. (1997). Introducing Critical Psychology: Values, Assumptions and the Status Quo. In D. Fox and I. Prilleltensky (eds) Critical Psychology: An Introduction (pp. 3-20). London: Sage.

Proctor, G. (2002). The Dynamics of Power in Counselling and Psychotherapy: Ethics, Politics and Practice. Ross-on-Wye: PCCS Books.

Smail, D. (2001). The Nature of Unhappiness. London: Robinson.

Smail, D. (1996). How to Survive without Psychotherapy. London: Constable

Smail, D. J. (2005). Power, Interest and Psychology: elements of a social materialist understanding of distress. Ross-On-Wye: PCCS Books.

TASC (2011). TASC Response to Budget 2011. http://www.tascnet.ie/upload/file/TASC%20Response%20to%20Budget%202011.pdf

Volosinov, V. N. (1976). Freudianism: A Marxist Critique. Translated by I.R. Titunik and edited in collaboration with N.H. Bruss. New York: Academic Press.

White, M. & Epston, D. (1990). Narrative Means to Therapeutic Ends. London: Norton.

Waldegrave, C. (1990). Just Therapy. Dulwich Centre Newsletter, 1, 6-46.

Waldegrave, C., Tamasese, K, Tuhaka, F., & Campbell, W. (2003). Just Therapy – a Journey: A Collection of Papers from the Just Therapy Team, New Zealand. Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications.

Westen, D., & Morrison, K. (2001). A multi-dimensional meta-analysis of treatments for depression, panic and generalised anxiety disorder: an empirical examination of the status of empirically supported therapies. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 69(6), 875-899.

Wilkinson, R. (1996). Unhealthy Societies: The afflictions of inequality. London: Routledge.

Wilkinson, R. & Pickett, K. (2010). The Spirit Level: Why Equality is Better for Everyone. London: Penguin Books.

Website Links

Improving Access to Psychological Therapies (IAPT) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Improving_Access_to_Psychological_Therapies

Cognitive Behavioural Therapy and Increasing Access to the Psychological Therapies http://ipnosis.postle.net/pages/IAPTCBTdebate.htm

The Midlands Psychology Group
Email: admin@midpsy.org
Website: www.midpsy.org

Psychotherapy and Politics: Is There an Alternative?

I have been writing and speaking for some years now on the general subject of psychotherapy and politics (e.g. Totton, 2000, 2005, 2006, 2008); what follows below is some of my most recent thinking around the issue. Times have changed in the world of psychotherapy from the not very distant days when any political reference was interpreted as a personal one: 'Perhaps the Iraq war reminds you of your family conflicts; perhaps you are sensitive to issues of racism/sexism because you felt that your mother preferred your sister to you...'. Times have changed; but maybe not that much.

Andrew Samuels' ground-breaking book The Political Psyche (Samuels, 1993) demonstrated not only how many practitioners were already quietly working with explicitly political issues, but also just how many therapeutic issues actually have a political dimension. Samuels argued for the importance of addressing both explicit and implicit political dimensions of life. This book inspired and brought together a number of practitioners whose thinking was already heading in similar directions; it also, among other things, helped to inspire the creation of Psychotherapists and Counsellors for Social Responsibility in the UK (http://pcsr-uk.ning.com/), and its sister organisation Psychotherapists for Social Responsibility in the USA. A more recent development was the launching nine years ago of the refereed journal Psychotherapy and Politics International, from the editorship of which I have recently retired.

So why do I say that times may not have changed that much? Although the acceptance of 'psychotherapy and politics' as a meaningful concept is now much more mainstream than it used to be, that concept still tends to split into two halves, with most people who are interested at all being interested in either one or the other. It seems to be general agreed that 'political' signifies 'having to do with one kind or another of power'. With not that many exceptions, I find that people are either interested in micro-politics or in macro-politics: either in power relations in the therapy room and in people's personal lives – politics with a small 'p' - or in what therapy might have to say or to do about large scale power relations in public political issues, especially conflict of various kinds – Politics with a big 'P'.

I want to try to show in this article that it makes no sense to split micro-politics from macro-politics, and that this is particularly true if one's analysis starts out from a psychotherapeutic world-view. In order to do this I will start out afresh from the basic question – still a live one – of whether therapy and politics belong together at all. Times have changed: the question used to be 'Can therapy be political?' but the new question is 'Can therapy be apolitical?' My answer is that it can't, for two core reasons:

1) Even if a person can be an apolitical plumber or an apolitical postal worker, this is not an option for therapists, because we are working with values, and values have an inherent political quality.
2) But actually I don't believe one can be an apolitical plumber or postal worker. Just as psychotherapy exposes the unconscious fantasies and emotions within a situation, it also exposes, or can expose, the unconscious politics.

Let me explore each of these points in more detail.

Therapy is inherently political
I have argued this position several times in several contexts, and it still feels important to do so. The nub of the argument is that therapists are always expressing a political position - because their work always and inevitably flows from a view on how human beings should be, and therefore carries a vision of how we could become how we should be (Totton, 2005, 2008). However these visions and positions are often implicit rather than explicit, or even held out of consciousness; and this can be problematic – politically problematic, with a small 'p', because this inexplicitness is in effect manipulative of the client.

Taking a view on how human beings should be seems to me intrinsic to our interactions with our clients – however much some therapists would like to believe otherwise. Many forms of therapy aim explicitly at cure and adjustment; with the underlying assumption that we should be healthy and well-adjusted – and of course each therapy and each practitioner has their own definitions of what 'healthy' or 'well-adjusted' looks like. Each believes that their clients should adjust to whatever aspects of life they themselves see as acceptable, as natural; while tacitly assuming that other less acceptable aspects should be resisted (Totton, 2000, 66-8, 106-7). The point, though less obvious, is no less true for more 'permissive' styles of therapy, which take it as

their goal to support the client in their authentic, spontaneous growth. Apart from the subtle difficulty of establishing which features of the work represent the client's authenticity, and which their resistance to it, this goal is itself no less a political one than the goal of adjustment: it is founded on a belief that people should be authentic, spontaneous and growthful.

The goals of therapy, then, are always ultimately frameable as social and political goals. The line which many theorists attempt to draw between individual and the social territories is not a real one: what we want for our clients, we necessarily in some sense and to some degree want for society. And as therapists, we are also always needing to navigate within society as it is now constituted: many positions we take within the consulting room are also positions about what goes on outside it.

In therapy as in the rest of life, claiming to be 'apolitical' generally translates as being conservative (or possibly as being an anarchist). Ultimately, there is no neutrality; what generally passes for 'neutrality' is an active or passive acceptance of the status quo (Totton 2005, 2006a, 2008). If therapists do not acknowledge a) that they operate in a social and political context, and b) that they are agents in that context, then they will be misleading themselves and misleading their clients. This in any case follows from my next point.

Life is inherently political
Whatever the specific fit between psychotherapy and politics, therapy is a human activity; and I believe that every human activity has a political aspect. As Foucault taught us, power twines its way through every relationship and situation; and as Freud and others have also taught us, even the most solitary activities take place in a web of remembered and fantasised relationship. To put it in very simple terms, there are always and everywhere people telling us what to do; and we are constantly implicated in some combination of resistance to, appeasement of, adjustment to, negotiation with, evasion of, collusion with or submission to these instructions.

As a practice which investigates conscious and unconscious motive, psychotherapy is deeply interested in these power relations with both real and imagined others. What we discover is that there is a profound and complex correlation between 'big P' Politics and 'small p' politics. In a sense the traditional interpretations I referred to in my opening paragraph were correct: the Iraq war does remind us of our

family conflicts, we are sensitised to issues of racism/sexism by sibling competition. What was mistaken was the crude reductionism which privileged the personal level over all others. The Iraq war reminds us of family conflicts because the two share similar structures (after all, the war was tied up with an oedipal struggle between the two Bushes). Lines of causality and correlation must always be read in both directions simultaneously: our 'small p' personal histories shape our 'big P' Politics, and what happens in the 'big P' register simultaneously shapes our personal experience. It is never a question of choosing between the two.

It is of course true and important that individuals have different degrees of what Andrew Samuels calls 'political energy' (Samuels, 1993, 57-8; 2001, 16-20)). Some people are drawn to issues of power, conflict and social responsibility; others tend to stay in the so-called 'private sphere' and cultivate their gardens. Interestingly, the rise of green politics and the urgency of the ecological crisis means that cultivating ones garden is no longer a very good image of the apolitical life – gardening has become an arena of political struggle! As the old joke slogan has it, 'Gardeners for a Secure Fuschia'...

Revolutions seem to happen when the implicit micro-politics of everyday life suddenly reveals an explicitly political nature. In ordinary times, only those with high political energy will make the connections. But at certain moments – for example in the Argentinian financial collapse in the early years of this century (Hollander, 2010, Ch 7) – it becomes a self-evident fact that the personal is political and the political is personal; and collective political energy shoots off the scale.

I have experienced similar transformative moments, on a smaller scale, in therapy groups: when individual issues suddenly reveal their collective meaning and vice versa, so that the usual convenient partitions of the world momentarily collapse and we are revealed to be all inhabitants of the same space, who must necessarily negotiate relationships of power with each other. However these moments when a brilliant light falls on everything can be obscured and negated by a facilitator who persistently reduces reality to a family at home. Reminding people of this personal, infantile component of political life can offer a crucial grounding – particularly when it recognises that family life is not an alternative to but a special form of political relationship; but I think there is actually something rather mad, or at least dissociated, about its habitual reductionist use.

This interpretative strategy privileges a couple of specific frames on which the therapist happens to be expert: that of the nuclear family, and that of individual agency. It wrong-foots and dis-empowers the client or group member, seemingly implying that political engagement itself is intrinsically mad, a misunderstanding of what, in the therapeutic context, matters. An alternative point of view is that such engagement is, as Andrew Samuels has suggested (1993, 57-8; 2001, 16-20), a normal human capacity, a specifically 'political energy' which expresses itself in different styles and with different degrees of strength in each of us.

The politics-avoidant response implies that therapy has nothing to say about politics or society - that therapy is somehow uniquely and wholly apolitical, or even asocial. If this were true, I think it would be a very sad truth; luckily, though, it isn't. Therapy and therapists have a great deal to offer, through practical and theoretical engagement with 'big P' political issues (Totton, 2006b), and – perhaps even more so, since we are uniquely placed to explore this area - through an analysis of the 'small p' micro-politics of personal life.

References

Hollander, N. C. (2010) Uprooted Minds: Surviving the Politics of Terror in the Americas. Hove: Routledge.

Samuels, A. (1993) The Political Psyche. London: Routledge.

Samuels, A, (2001) Politics on the Couch: Citizenship and the Internal Life. London: Profile Books.

Totton, N. (2000) Psychotherapy and Politics. London: Sage.

Totton, N. (2005) Can psychotherapy help make a better future? Psychotherapy and Politics International, 3, 2: 83-95.

Totton. N. (2006a) Power in the therapeutic relationship. In N. Totton (ed.), The Politics of Psychotherapy. Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2006; 83-93.

Totton, N., ed. (2006b) The Politics of Psychotherapy. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Nick Totton

Politics and the young Elvis Costello

Elvis Costello has been one of the most prolific and often controversial singer-songwriters present at the turn of this century in Anglophone cultures. This short article examines his work in the context of Britain in the 1980s and draws some conclusions about a dialectical exploration of the man and that particular period*. This exploration is informed by work offering a framework to appreciate personal experience and action in its social context, for example Sartre's 'progressive-regressive method' and Bourdieu's notion of 'habitus' and 'field'. The application of these frameworks generates some difficult questions (that is, ones which are not readily answered) about artistic identity and authorial intentionality.

   In the case of Costello it remains difficult to know who he is. Is he from London, Liverpool, Dublin or (latterly) New York? He loved women but got fairly irritated with them as well and a journalistic consensus emerged during the 1980s about his work being incorrigibly misogynistic. He espoused progressive political or humanistic values but could treat some of his colleagues and employees ruthlessly. He was a proven anti-racist and he played in Rock Against Racism gigs and produced 'two tone' bands like The Specials. However, his reputation has been tainted by a single event suggesting the opposite, which has left him in a state of impotent guilt. (This was about a drunken bar incident with some fellow musician, who leaked his use of the word 'nigger', in relation to Ray Charles and James Brown, in his diatribe against American music.) He was both adoring and sneering about the USA in his work. Similarly he venerated some musicians and was publicly hateful about others. Many of his recorded covers of the other songwriters were palpably nostalgic and yet we find this: 'I am the least nostalgic person you will ever meet. And I have no concern for posterity. I believe when you're gone, you're gone' (interview in Rolling Stone September 2004, emphasis added).

   A challenge of decoding the intentions and work of any commercially successful musician is that we only ever really know any of them via their performances, their lyrics, the odd publicised scandal and the interviews they supply to the world, with the occasional contribution from colleagues or ex-lovers with axes to grind. We do not know them in the same way that a supportive friend or a loving relative would know them. This invites us to project onto them our needs and fantasies and so we have to proceed with caution when making interpretations

about their intentions, vices and virtues. We are dealing much of the time with what Goffman called 'impression management' in a highly charged commercial context. At the centre of this challenge is the problem of 'authenticity'. Earnest singer-song writers like Costello place their artistic integrity at the centre of their commercial persona. This is an inherent paradox: good faith is being claimed in a context of bad faith (of personal marketing).

Returning to two aspects of his controversial reputation noted about misogyny and racism, a few points need to be made in his defence. First, so much of the criticism of prose and song writers falls into the trap of confusing the products of their imagination with their personal views. Second, there is no behavioural evidence that Costello treated women badly. His sexual life has been unremarkable for a heterosexual man in the music industry. Had it not, the red top press would have certainly prosecuted a case against him. Some of this will remain mysterious. How much do any of us let our unconscious thoughts and feelings, revealed in our dreams and imagination, become our private or public conduct?

Moreover, Costello's reputation for misogyny needs to be placed in the context of a post-feminist music industry in which female artists were turning pop videos into soft pornography. Who has done a greater disservice to women's rights in popular music, Elvis Costello or the oxymoronic 'girl power' from the likes of the Spice Girls, the Pussycat Dolls, Madonna, Beyonce, Britney Spears, Shakira and Christina Aguilera, with their faux-feminist lyrics, scanty dress and formulaic pelvic gyrations and thrusts? Also, the normative context of second wave feminism was arguing about how gender relationships should be, whereas Costello was saying 'this is how it is, as I see it'. He put forward from his imagination and his coded experience a version of the common chaos of intimacy.

Turning to the contention over his alleged racism, his reputation should remain intact, given his political commitments and his collegial work with black musicians. What is remarkable is that other artists such as David Bowie (who publicly venerated fascism and collected Nazi memorabilia during his bizarre cocaine-fuelled Thin White Duke period in the 1970s) and Eric Clapton (who adored Enoch Powell and boasted publicly that 'I used to be into dope, now I'm into racism') have been left unscathed after the event. Bowie later recanted his views but this was not the case with Clapton who is now a Commander of the British Empire and whose racist ranting on stage was the trigger for the establishment of Rock Against Racism. Costello's progressive aspirations and claimed

ideology made him a bigger target to hit. This reveals a cultural shift in the 1980s when the implications of the feminist slogan 'the personal is political' became a new evaluative context for us all.

If there is any residual matter about racism it is maybe Costello's contempt for the English. As he made clear in the hook of 'Tramp the Dirt Down' in which he fantasised about stamping on Thatcher's grave, 'England was the whore of the world and Margaret was her madam' post-colonial hatred and self-hatred were mixed in his mind. (Costello is from Irish parentage but was born and raised in England.) Indeed, his abiding political attacks were on Thatcher's nationalism and on her special relationship with Ronald Reagan's economic and military policies. Apart from 'Tramp The Dirt Down', we also find 'Shipbuilding' (written with Clive Langer), 'Peace in Our Time' and 'Pills and Soap'. The last of these was banned from the airwaves by the BBC.

Although Costello is thought of, understandably, as a 'political' song writer, most of his output was around his obsession with heterosexual intimacy. They focused on what the arch-conservative T.S. Eliot summarised as the recurring dramas of 'birth and copulation and death'. Also, memories in his life or musings about past generations preoccupied his imagination. For example, his family script from his father and grandfather was of being a troubadour and this source of personal knowledge, confidence and orientation in his habitus runs throughout his commercial life. At times his family history was also the source of lyrics. For example, 'Any King's Shilling' is about the anomalous position of his Irish grandfather in the British Army and the latter is also an important allusion in 'American Without Tears'. The song 'Veronica' (written with Paul McCartney) is about his frail grandmother.

The emotional range of his inner life did not translate fully into his favoured forms of lyrical production. Despite the shallow rhetoric of the oft quoted interview in NME in 1977, when he said that his 'only' (sic) motivations to write his songs were 'revenge and guilt', he also had very tender emotions. In his typically contrary manner he also complained that music critics did not appreciate the latter in his songs. However, he opted most of the time to sing tender songs written by other people. It is as if there was a block from within to do this alone; possibly some sort of 'taboo on tenderness', embodying his own personal version of the modern crisis of masculinity (Suttie, 1935). His songs were dominated by indignant self-pity and masochistic victimhood, with furious accusations flowing from his aggrieved imagination. When and if tenderness was present in his own lyrics (for example in 'Indoor Fireworks') it was drowned out by other, more

stormy, feelings nearby. His critics would consequently stereotype him as 'Mr Angry' but he thought of himself, maybe quite sincerely, as 'Mr Love'.

Turning to the context of the 1980s (the fields of politics and the music industry) Thatcherism provided him with rich material for his political songs. He remained angry and critical and refused to join the throng of carefree jollity and zany abandon. In 1989, just as Thatcher was coming to the end of her time at the political helm (but unbeknown to him at the time) he protested angrily in an interview on BBC2, with Tracey MacLeod and showcasing the album Spike!, 'I'm a man. I'm thirty five years old and I'm fucking sick of it, you know, of what is going on in this country'.

Costello complained that his record company (Columbia) were the source of limited commercial success. For example, in 1991 he protested that, 'The simple fact is that anyone with any talent at Columbia was never given a chance. People would become invisible...almost non-human…if they transgressed certain codes.' (cited in Kent, 2007). However, his limited audiences and disappointing sales were predictable. His particular fans, more than others in the new land of atomised consumerism, were not simply dupes of the record industry. They were self-selecting in their attraction to a particular type of artist and music.

Costello's clever word play, obscure allusions and earnest political view of life, were only going to find a fairly limited market within the commercial marshmallow of the 1980s. Most of the industry and its collusive fans were fiddling while Rome burned and were happy to collapse into a hypo-manic scenario of bread and circuses. Costello was trying to stage Macbeth in the midst of a foam party. Some people could see and get what he was trying to do but most did not. Most of the young record buying public would not be educated enough to understand and appreciate his erudite allusions. Moreover, of the minority that was in tune with his intentions, not all present necessarily shared his political value system.

In summary, Elvis Costello in the 1980s was a successful petit-bourgeois individualist and an impressive autodidact (he had no formal education in music). He was also a highly egotistical auteur. Angry and arrogant in turn he did not suffer fools gladly and he always believed that he could be the sole author of his own destiny. When he had to concede the limits set by his cultural and economic context, this created a narrative of victimhood and the latter joined recurring points of projective identification evident in his lyrics about the oppressed casualties of particular political times. These included the victims of Thatcherism,

who could not be put back together with 'your paper and paste' (from 'Pills and Soap') or from State executions in the wake of miscarriages of justice ('Let Him Dangle') or the watery grave of Falkland combatants (who were 'diving for dear life', when they should have been diving for pearls, the haunting condensed hook of 'Shipbuilding').

Finally, with the emergence of post-modernism in the 1980s Costello might be judged as an avant-garde exponent of musical bricolage and pastiche, given his wide ranging willingness to experiment with the unexpected. However, a detailed look at his episodic and meandering musical eclecticism reveals an old-fashioned modernist. He was largely his 'father's son', only much more successful. Costello was trying to pay his due respects to the traditions of music he had learned to love in his childhood. He was young and creative at a time of monetarism (soon to beget casino capitalism), acquisitive consumerism, cultural pornification and, most depressingly, unremitting military violence in the world. Costello delivered his view of events in his own particular way. He was not alone but he was part of a memorable minority, whose legacy is likely to endure when the cultural resistance to Thatcherism is appraised in the future.

References

Kent, N. (2007) The Dark Stuff: Selected Writings on Rock Music London: Faber and Faber.
Suttie, I.D. (1935) The Origins of Love and Hate London: Kegan Paul, Trench Trubner and Co.
* A longer version of this exploration is to appear in Pilgrim, D. and Ormrod, R. (2012) Elvis Costello and Thatcherism: A Psycho-Social Exploration London: Ashgate

David Pilgrim
Professor of Mental Health Policy
Department of Social Work
Faculty of Health
University of Central Lancashire
Preston
PR1 2HE

Tel +44 (0)1772 893458
Fax +44 (0)1772 892974
Email DPilgrim@uclan.ac.uk

––––––––––

Managerialism, Technology and Conviviality

The opponents of 'managerialism' do not necessarily oppose 'management': only anarchists might object to the idea that some sort of regulation or control of institutions is necessary. Managerialism is distinct from 'management' in the sense that managerialism is a particular ideology of management. It is an ideology which states that the regulatory functions of management are common and similar techniques can be effective whether applied to a telecommunications business, a university or a hospital. However, in its 'strong' form, managerialism asserts its position as the only effective ideology of management. In this way, managerialism presents what Bhaskar (1979) calls a TINA ("There Is No Alternative") formation: in effect we are told, "either accept the tenets of the ideology of managerialism, or face economic and social collapse".

There are two questions here:

- How is the ideology of managerialism distinct from the more general principles of organisation and management?
- How does the TINA formation of managerialism arise to make managerialism unassailable in the management of institutions?

Managerialism isn't new. However, the extent to which it dominates most large-scale social institutions – particularly health and education – is. Orwell would have recognised this managerialism as having the same characteristics as his dystopian world presented in Nineteen Eighty-four (2008). Conversely, many academics and managers in education, or doctors in the health system recognise Orwell's description in the increasing degree of 'newspeak' jargon within their institutions, tied often to increasing specialisation and demarcation within practice and discourse. At the same time, the increasing inability to critique the foundations of academic practice, government policy, and sometimes even research practice testifies to what looks suspiciously like 'doublethink'. An example can be found in Alasdair MacIntyre's (2009) recent critique of the culture of modern research universities, where the concept of 'universe' - fundamental to university - becomes lost in a haze of specialised disciplines: in MacIntyre's view, "The contemporary research university is, therefore, by and large a place in which certain questions go unasked or rather, if they are asked, it is only by individuals and in settings such that as few as possible hear them being asked".

According to Orwell's fictional author of "The Theory and Practice of Oligarchic Collectivism", which explains to Winston Smith the functioning of the Party and the political organisation of the world in Nineteen Eighty-four, the machinations of the state, including newspeak, doublethink and the ever-present war with Eurasia or Eastasia was to ensure that the party member...

"is supposed to live in a continuous frenzy of hatred of foreign enemies and internal traitors, triumph over victories, and self-abasement before the power and wisdom of the Party. The discontents produced by his bare, unsatisfying life are deliberately turned outwards and dissipated by such devices as the Two Minutes Hate..."

Orwell's 'managerialism' is the institutionalised creation of anxiety. This resonates I believe with the sociological analysis of modernity presented by Beck in his 'Risk Society' (1991). Beck considers that modern society manufactures and distributes 'risk', the individual experience of which is anxiety:

"Ages ago in our so-called western civilization, the primal social power was captured in the sentence: "I'm hungry". Today the equivalent would be: "I'm afraid". Instead of common interest through need, modern society represents common interest through anxiety."

In the large institutions of state, the risks have multiplied in ways that suggest that Beck is right. Not just increasing threats of litigation, but new anxieties concerning compliance with ever-emerging standards of practice, fulfilling ever-changing funding formulae, coping with increasingly detailed audit procedures, and so on. Every new such managerial intervention creates disruption in current practices and inevitably anxiety in individuals. Managerialism is the institutionalised creation of risks.

But managerialism is seen to be effective across a range of contexts. This is because it is individuals who become anxious, and managerialism's risks are always ultimately threats to continued employment and career progression: "if I don't comply with this new rule, I will lose my job". Consequently, the individual reacts. But managerialism at its worst manipulates individual insecurities in cruel ways which only through the guile and cunning of clever higher-level risk management avoids the accusation of 'victimisation'.

In order to understand the success of managerialism in its manipulation, it is important to understand the extent to which biology and psychology render the individual susceptible to this sort of manipulation. In essence, managerialism is a very successful manipulation of the outer-worlds of individuals which have deep and predictable consequences on their inner-worlds. Psychology and Sociology have a variety

of different theoretical approaches which can help to unpick the mechanisms involved. Harré's 'Positioning Theory' (1999), for example, would argue that the inner-world 'storyline' of an individual is partly constituted by the outer-world 'positioning' produced by the communications of others and normative social conditions. Looking deeper at the specific aspects of identity, Bowlby (1969) would focus on the attachment relationships between individuals and the systemic balance of control systems between the inner-world of the individual and the outer-world of meaningful attachments which are frequently undermined through the actions of managerialism. In a related way, Winnicott (1971) might focus on the relation between individual identity and practices, objects and play - also subject to continual managerial intervention. In essence, the continual disruption of the relationship between inner and outer worlds is an assault on the identity of individuals.

But focus on attachments, creativity and practice suggest that there might be an alternative to managerialism. Children with strong attachments in families, friends and schools usually thrive where those who have experienced family or social attachment problems struggle. A secure balance between inner and outer-worlds that is brought about through strong attachments to people, objects and practices gives rise to the capability to manage the risks that managerialism (and the modern world in general) presents. But by definition, an environment which at once supports rich capability and strong attachments is not an environment of isolated individuals beset by personal anxieties: where attachments and capabilities are strongest, society is at its most convivial. For Illich (1971), such situations are the epitome of dignified humanity.

But managerialism seeks to disrupt and sometimes sever individual attachments to one another. It has found ways of leveraging technology to help it to do this. It has found in the internet radical ways of rationalising and organising individualised risk, asserting 'realities' which are not ontologically grounded. It has exploited the resulting alienation to further its risk-produced manipulations. As Beck argues, the economy also appears to be organised in this way: as such, individuals seem helpless in the face of these forces. The mechanism of 'risk' is that they are deprived of ways of being together because their attachments are subject to managerialism's interference. Not least the individuals who work or study in modern higher education - particularly in the risk-laden environment of rising fees and economic uncertainty.

But technology has a surprising knack of upsetting the applecart. Enthusiastic technologists have always sought to fly beneath the radar of institutional systems. The teachers who in the 1980s enthused a

generation of children by bringing their newly-acquired personal computers into the classroom saw this: for a moment, everything seemed possible. As Illich explains, every new technical innovation has had this sort of moment. To many teachers in the mid 1990s, the web represented the closest thing to realising Illich's 'learning webs' that he thought would bring about 'deschooling'. Even after managerialism had effectively colonised the web by the early 2000s with restrictions and firewalls, new 'Web Services' enabled the connecting of the functionalities of different systems together in ways which would once again create new possibilities for doing things that were once unimaginable: the resulting blogs, wikis and social networking sites characterise the web as we now know it. Of course, the cycle is that corporate managerialism consumes most of these ideas, using them to find new ways of producing risk for individuals in the form of the big global social network enterprises: the increasing global power of corporations like Google and Facebook only serve to shift the locus of risk-creation. But might there be a special case where this does not happen?

Managerialism relies on the anxiety of the individual. In a convivial environment, the capability of individuals to manage the anxieties that managerialism throws at it is increased. But a convivial environment means the capacity to form attachments, to play and create. The online text-based environments we currently know cannot support this. For all the talk of 'friends' on Facebook and other social media, online social engagement amounts to strategic manipulation of social connections through selective public communications. But the next wave of technology will have different affordances.

The speed of internet connections is increasingly allowing for rich interactive and real-time social engagements. Driven by new technical developments like HTML5 and WebSockets (http://dev.w3.org/html5/websockets/), new capabilities are emerging to create direct communication protocols between web pages without necessarily interfering with any high-level institutional barriers. The affordance of much richer real-time communications enables those communications to be served and managed not by corporate or institutional services, but by ordinary individuals: setting-up a real-time communications server will become as easy as setting up a blog.

The experiments of Konrad Lorenz (1973) in establishing 'relationships' between new-born geese and inanimate 'mother' figures suggests something in the regulatory biological wiring which connects outer-world to inner-world. As our technological sophistication makes it possible for rich real-time interactions online, the ability to 'imprint'

or (as Bowlby would have it) 'attach' to people and objects through technology remains an important question. Given rich attachments and new kinds of online activity, the central question is whether convivial environments for play, creativity and identity-construction can be established online. If the technology can genuinely support environments for rich attachments, then the risk culture of managerialism is undermined: the collective that looks after each other is more immune to individual risk manipulation than the fragmented social landscape we all-too-often see around us. We might ask, in the face of convivial self-organisation, will managerialism cease to coerce behaviour through the creation of risks, or merely find new ways to disrupt attachments and assail identity? Our hope might be that instead of the coercing of behaviour, the coordination of social organisation might instead embrace the inherent value-pluralism of convivial society through the coordination of creative activity rather than the manufacture of risk.

References

Beck, U (1992) The Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity. Sage.

Bhaskar, R (1979) A Possibility of Naturalism. Sage.

Bowlby, J (1969) Attachment. Attachment and Loss, Vol. 1. Basic Books.

Harré, R; Langenhov, L (1999) Positioning Theory: Moral contexts of intentional action. Wiley-Blackwell.

Illich, I (1971) Tools for Conviviality. Marion Boyars.

Lorenz, K (1973) Behind the Mirror: A Search for a Natural History of Human Knowledge. Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich

Orwell, G (2008) Nineteen Eighty-Four. Penguin.

Macintyre, A (2009) God, Philosophy, Universities: A Selective History of the Catholic Philosophical Tradition. Continuum.

Winnicott, D (1971) Playing with Reality. Routledge.

Dr Mark William Johnson
Institute for Educational Cybernetics
University of Bolton
BL3 5AB
Tel. 01204 903567
Mob. 0778 6064505
Blog: http://dailyimprovisation.blogspot.com

Book Review: The Pursuit of the Good

Peter McMylor considers Alasdair MacIntyre's classic After Virtue: a study in moral theory, first published in 1981

After Virtue is a work of moral philosophy written some 30 years ago. However it is much more than a conventional discussion of moral philosophy – it is also a critique of the culture of capitalist modernity. This was widely recognised when the book first appeared for it was read as much by scholars in literature, history and the social sciences as by philosophers. But it was also read outside the university. MacIntyre himself has described getting letters and phone calls from members of communities that felt excluded from elite cultural discussion and felt this book spoke to them and for them.

What, then, does After Virtue attempt to achieve? MacIntyre originally wanted to write two books: one on the state of moral philosophy in the contemporary world and the other on the philosophy of social science. He discovered that each book needed the support of the other to make sense. The reasons are clear when we identify the three main aims of the book.

The first is an attempt to understand why it is so difficult to settle moral arguments in liberal modernity – that is, the experience of cultural relativism. Second, the book contains a critique of the whole edifice of managerialism and its social scientific claims to authority in our lives. And third, MacIntyre attempts to reinstate a practice-based Aristotelian virtue ethics as an alternative to the prescriptive rule-based morality of modernity.

After Virtue begins with a 'disquieting suggestion' that in modern liberal society, the basis for moral agreement has fragmented. It is not that we are confused over particular moral questions but rather we have lost the basis for understanding what a coherent moral argument is. How this has happened is complex but can be broadly understood as due to the cultural and institutional transformation of European society during the long transition from feudalism to capitalism that underpins the rise of modernity.

The key point is that our moral vocabulary was ripped from its social context and we are left only with the fragments of an originally meaningful moral scheme. We use the fragments in everyday life and act as if there still exists an overarching moral framework. In practice we

have a marked tendency to appeal to different bits of the fragments depending on what we want; hence our difficulty.

The cultural and intellectual response to this situation is the emergence of so-called 'emotivist ethics', in which arguments about values are considered just statements of individual preference, so argument tends to become rhetoric. MacIntyre suggests that emotivism is not only a philosophical position but a widespread perspective within liberal culture.

It follows that moral judgements are now generally contrasted with factual judgements. About the latter we have independent criteria for reaching agreement but about moral judgements, if agreement is secured at all, it is by producing non-rational effects on the emotions or attitudes of those we disagree with. In other words this is a culture of manipulation in which facts and values are supposed to be kept separate and that fits perfectly a society in which individual consumer preferences are taken to be sovereign.

It is in this context, MacIntyre suggests, that managerialism appears. Values or 'preferences' are put beyond argument and the focus is on finding the most 'effective' or 'efficient' means to an end. This is why MacIntyre's criticism of the social sciences is important for he suggests positivist social science promised the manager the tools for accurate predictions that would ground his or her decision-making ability. However, the claims of the social sciences to accurately predict human behaviour and hence control the social order have proved hollow. Instead what we have are dramatic or ritualised claims by managers to possess such powers, along with equally ritualised claims to the possession of predictive knowledge by their social scientific accomplices, notably certain kinds of economist.

The alternative to this liberal individualist order is to revive and extend the Aristotelian tradition of social thought. Here there is a strong emphasis on the practice-based pursuit of the good of a particular activity, which in turn is to be set in the context of a wider set of goods we pursue throughout our lives. Central to this claim is not that everyone should go and read Aristotle but rather that when any of us are engaged in some practice, as varied as learning a musical instrument or organising a trade union, we are pursuing the good of that activity.

In so doing we are learning anew the virtues that we need to possess to pursue the good and it is these virtues that the Aristotelian tradition, right up to the present day, reflects and elaborates upon. If and when we become conscious of the wider significance of these activities,

what helps and what hinders the pursuit of the good, we may be led to what is, in effect, a 'revolutionary Aristotelianism'. That is to say a conscious rejection of the dominant institutions and culture of capitalist modernity and a vision of what a way of life might be that had gone beyond the market and the state.

Peter McMylor

- This article is reproduced, with permission, from the Red Pepper website at: http://www.redpepper.org.uk/the-pursuit-of-the-good/

_____

An Historical Approach to Psychoanalysis and Group Analysis

Freud gave birth to the idea of psychoanalysis in the 1890s, at the end of the 19th Century. The idea of group analysis began to form in the 1920s, the 20th Century. Let us see what were the circumstances surrounding these two major events in the psychological history of Europe and later North America. In his recent comprehensive challenging historical survey of psychoanalysis Ellie Zaretsky "Secrets of the Soul: a social and cultural history of psychoanalysis" (Alfred A Knopf New York 2004), begins by stating that we lack the large social, cultural and intellectual frame which is necessary to understand the phenomenon of psychoanalysis, so central to our self-constitution, as W H Auden wrote at the death of Freud that his work belongs now to a climate of opinion, of self understanding. The ubiquitous awareness of unconscious forces both in the psyche and society; childhood as the crucible of psychic formation; the complexity of our psyches, the stresses of both everyday and exceptional circumstances; the forces which evoke mental breakdown, the forces that help recovery. Even though other schools of psychology have made their contributions, they are, of necessity, in orbit around the solar system of psychoanalysis. As Zaretsky puts it, psychoanalysis is the first great theory and practice of "personal life". Emerging as personal life our sense of identity becomes both previous and problematic. Neurosis is part of the price that we pay for our autonomy. Family life was losing its grip

as an economic unit; urbanisation, consumerism, industrialisation; the loosening grip of religion, all these great social forces both release and impel individuals to personhood, to an identity now distinct from that experienced and conditioned solely by place and family, by labour and by social structures. "All that is solid melts into air" was the striking phase in the communist manifesto. Persons could now merge into urban crowds as new social spaces appear; boulevards, restaurants, a process of "de-familiarisation" is occurring as extra-familial life begins.

So, at the end of the 19th Century psychoanalytic practice emerges to meet the need for owning and understanding this new type of person, to chart these new depths. For Freud and the first cohort of psychoanalysts the unconscious of each person was idiosyncratic, singular, though through his interest in psychosis and symbolism psychoanalysis developed as an alternative system of universally shared symbols. As experience accrued the central significance of relationship to authority emerged in the transference in the relationship to the therapist, marked the first quarter century of psychoanalysis. Then women came forward for training after World War One beginning the feminising of psychoanalysis, as a strength and complexity of the first relationship to the mother is now acknowledged, so child analysis begins. Within psychoanalysis the voice of feminism challenged the male presumptiveness of Freud.

Now a little known pioneer in recognising the importance of his primary relationship was the American analyst Trigant Burrow. His early papers in the decade of 1915 to 1925 focuses on the infantile fusion with mother in the primary relationship and on homosexuality where the man retains his identification with the woman. However his interest to us is more because he coined the term group analysis and began to explore the dynamics of groups, setting up "laboratories" for group work. Foulkes had read his papers, which were in his mind when he conceived his own practice of group therapy in 1939.

World War One destroyed the 19th Century European cultures. The authority of emperors and kings crumbled. Families experienced great losses of men, of fathers and brothers and husbands. Women had gained independence as vital workers during the war and the relationship between the genders were not the same as pre-war. Society now featured mass production, Fordism, assembly lines, work where individuals are now treated as production units – we all remember Charlie Chaplin in Modern Times rebelling against the assembly line culture. New psychologists arrived to meet these changed circumstances: industrial psychology, social psychologies; psychoanalysis continued to focus upon the individual's psyche. Burrow had tried without success to interest

Freud in his ideas but Freud replied that he could not thank Burrow for trying to extend the reach of psychoanalysis from the individual to society.

The understanding of society, both sociologically and psychoanalytically, was the subject of study of the Frankfurt school in Germany in the 1920s and 30s. Here Marxist influenced philosophers were keen to use the insights of psychoanalysis to understand such phenomena as the rise of Fascism and the adherence of the authoritarian type of personality to such mass movements as Nazism. This was the setting in which Foulkes and Norbert Elias met and began their fruitful collaboration. Foulkes was impressed by Elias' work on the civilising process, the societal changes that over centuries had led to the emergence of contemporary Western mankind whose ego capacities were reflection, impulse restraint and superego structures which gave a sense of safety through impulse control and this was combined with respect for and fear of society's disciplinary powers of justice and punishment. The psychic structure of modern man and woman could be traced to the internalisation of central forces. Thus, as Foulkes would later emphasise, how can we clearly distinguish what is outside from what is inside as there is a continuity which can be likened to a mobius strip with the same structures at one time facing out and at another in. Together the approach of Elias and Foulkes can be summarised as "sociogenesis and psychogenesis".

To take a contemporary example group analysts have been asked to work in the Baltic States released from control of the Soviets. Here before group analysis as a psychotherapeutic method could be taught the personality structures developed under communism had to be explored and reorganised. Under dictatorship with its command economy, the channelling of intellectual and psychological life into Marxist channels and freedom to think, to associate, to challenge the pervading ideology was suppressed. A Scandinavian group analyst, whose initial training had been by visiting British therapists, took on this task with dedication and determination. In addition to the traditional small groups for personal group analysis they introduced median and large groups. A median group contains 15 to 20 persons and a large group 30 upwards. The dynamics of these larger groups differ from the small groups in that these larger groups became samples of the wider society of which the participants are members as citizens. In the larger groups there are experiences of estrangement, confusion, loss of the confirmation needed to support the cohesion of the sense of self. The emerging anxiety leads to aggression which when recognised, verbalised and worked with strengthen capacity to recognise the hostility and hatred which had been held back by the defences, the fear of the authoritarian state.

These phenomena first recognised and written about by Patrick de Maré were especially strong in the very large groups, which in conference settings can consist of upwards of 200 persons. Here from a seemingly chaotic and frustrating situation, full of contradictions, rapid mood swings, incongruities, competition, gradually a sense of containment can emerge, a sense of the conference as an entity as the very structure can be questioned and analysed for its underlying assumptions. Thus the roots of democracy are strengthened by this process.

I have vivid memories of being asked to organise and conduct a large group during the first psychoanalytic conference in South Africa. No group situation had been built into the conference structure, an omission which reflected an organisational fear of unstructured and spontaneous expression of ideas, of opinions, responses generated by the conference situation. This block can lead to stagnation, a sense of powerlessness or as a revolt, which will turn into an attack on the purposes of the meeting. This can be considered as an instance of the anti-group phenomena so well described by Morris Nitsun, a group analyst whose origins in fact are in South Africa.

I must now return to the unfolding story of psychoanalysis and group analysis. As psychoanalysis grew into institutions for training, with hierarchies of senior trainers and junior trainees, its energies were directed inwards into the development of national and international organisation of psychoanalysts. In North America, far more than in Europe, psychoanalysis became a major institutional force, a part of the medical establishment. However, as psychoanalysis stultified so group analysis emerged. Where psychoanalysis had compartmentalised psyches, each inhabiting its unique territory, group analysis questioned this compartmentalisation and the very structure of the psychoanalytic movement. Trigant Burrow asked a psychoanalyst to examine the organisational structure, which he saw as reproducing the neurologic structure of the patients who came for treatment. Karl Kraus in Austria had said that psychoanalysis was the very illness that it was meant to cure. In America the Psychoanalytic Associate repudiated Burrow's charges and dealt with his views by excluding him from their membership despite his having been a founder member and former President. Foulkes' contribution to the growth of group analysis was to reflect upon the fact that in 1938 when having left London to work in Exeter he encountered day after day in his practice persons who had underlying similarities of psychic conflicts, problems of family and social life. He thought that they could dispense with the service of "experts" in psychotherapy as they themselves were experts in understanding the underlying problems that they shared, seeing aspects of themselves mirrored in the psyches of others. We see into others in a way in which we cannot see into ourselves but, if we accept it, we will

be understood and possibly changed by the way in which we in our turn will be seen into. The group of strangers can become over time a psyche group, doing much of the work of therapy by the patients for themselves, but requiring the service of the group conductor to see how they as a group are evolving and because it is through his own position as a recognised authority he could set up the therapeutic structure of the group itself.

Malcolm Pines

––––––––––

Papers From the London GASi Symposium 2011

Introduction to a work-shop at the London Symposium in Group Analysis August 30th- 2011

One Group Analysis or many?
Does a 'main-stream group analysis' exist?

The title is a paraphrase of Robert Wallerstein's paper, One psychoanalysis or many? (Wallerstein, 1988), where he describes Freud's life-long struggle for maintaining psychoanalysis as a unitary enterprise. Some years after his death, however, psychoanalysis demonstrated an increasing diversity or pluralism of theoretical perspectives with cultural, regional, and linguistic differences, showing that psychoanalysis was not a unitary theory. What is the relevance for Group Analysis?
  In 1975 Foulkes wrote (Foulkes, 1975 p.3):

> *'Group-analytic psychotherapy is a method of group psychotherapy initiated by myself from 1940 onwards in private psychiatric practice and outpatients clinics. It grew out of and is inspired by my experiences as a psychoanalyst, but it is not a psychoanalysis of a group by a psychoanalyst. It is a form of psychotherapy by the group, of the group, including its conductor. Hence the name: group-analytic psychotherapy'.*

These formulations are somewhat vague, but that does not mean that he did not say a whole lot more, that he further developed theory and constructs to fill in the picture. Besides, successors have done a lot to

broaden and differentiate his theories. Nevertheless, GA has an array of different theoretical contributions, like elements of object relations theory, self psychology, and interpersonal theory, just to mention a few. Also, it is not uncommon to combine GA and cognitive behavioural and psycho educative elements, lately also 'mentalization based therapy'. From being a treatment for affective, anxiety- and character disorders for outpatients, it has according to many group analysts become a treatment for diverse conditions like eating disorders, traumatized patients, alcohol dependency, schizophrenia and other psychoses, alike.

Group Analysis is today used in a number of different situations and contexts: in schools, in organizations, in psychotherapy training, in neighbourhood controversies, in clinical practice, in small and not so small groups, in conflicts between ethnic groups, and even nations. To confirm the correctness of this, I think it is enough just to look at the program for this Symposium, and notice the different situations where GA appears.

An interesting question given all this diversity is: What unites us as group analysts? What keep us together in spite of all our different interests and expertise? I think the answer to this is the clinical work we do in our consultation rooms. This is also my main interest, the reason why I took a group analytic training, and also the focus for this workshop.

In my experience, this is a theme we do not talk enough about, i.e. what group analysis is and what we mean when we use it. It is easy to get the notion that the answer to this question is self-evident, that everybody knows why we as group analysts stick together. In that case I am sticking my neck out, exposing my own lack of knowledge in this matter. However, I am not alone.

GAS, International and IGA, London have for a while felt the pressure from health authorities about the role of GA in the National Health Service, and commissioned The Centre for Psychological Services Research, University of Sheffield, in order to review the research base for GA and Analytic/Dynamic group psychotherapy. The conclusion of the report from this centre was (Blackmore et al., 2009):

> *"Studies examined consistently support the use of Group Psychotherapy as an effective approach. However, the number of empirical studies, in particular of high quality RCTs into the effectiveness of GA and A/D group psychotherapy is small. They found 5 RCTs, 2 studies with case-controls, 1 qualitative study, and 34 observational (naturalistic) studies. The methodological quality was identified as variable. The terminology used to define therapeutic interventions was ill-defined. Key words were omitted from titles and abstracts. A point especially relevant for this occasion: There were ..."difficulties in identifying appropriate studies due to the lack of clearly defined terminology to describe analytic/dynamic group psychotherapy" (Blackmore et al., 2009, p.65).*

GAS International and IGA, London have also appointed a task force to discuss if GA should be manualized. I have written manuals (Lorentzen, 2004) for short- and long-term (GA?) dynamic group therapies connected to a research project that started in 2005 (Lorentzen et al., 2008). The manuals also refer to an important workbook in GA, which in several places has been used in training of group analysts (Kennard et al., 1993). One question in connection with the work of IGA/GAS has been if the long-term manual could be used as a point of departure for developing some sort of manual in GA, and it has been translated to English.

In February this year I went to an interesting workshop at the American Group Psychotherapy Association's annual meeting in New York. Molyn Leszcz and John Schlapobersky, representing North America's Interpersonal and Europe's Group-Analytic models of group therapy, respectively, gave brief theoretical presentations of the two approaches. From a theoretical point of view the approaches seemed distinctly different. When Molyn and John later in a fish-bowl demonstrated their techniques on a group of volunteers, I had difficulties in seeing any difference at all between the two approaches. I want to underline that this was my perception, and can accept that others may have seen it differently.

Does a 'main-stream' Group Analysis exist?

There has been a growing demand for documentation of the effectiveness of group analysis, and I think we talk too little about what GA is within our organizations and in our publications. On the same note, clinical conferences demonstrate that our understanding of concepts and theories differ, which may be a serious challenge to meaningful communication. Against this background I will invite the group to reflect on the following themes or questions, or possibly other matters that may come to mind:

What is GA today? What necessary elements have to be present to call a therapy GA? How does Group Analysis differ from other psycho dynamic group approaches? How can they be distinguished? How may Group Analysis be modified working with different patient categories? Are longer therapies better than short-term interventions? What are the typical technical interventions in Group analysis? Do we need or want a manual in group analysis? Would it be possible to develop a smaller 'core manual' of group analysis, and open up for the possibilities of modifying this approach in different directions depending on which patient category one treat?

About the subsequent discussion:

A group of about 20 people participated, and after this introduction, there was an interesting sharing of ideas, circling around these themes. The participation was high, indicating an open, safe atmosphere, and most members of the workshop contributed. David Kennard who was present, talked about the background for their workbook. From the feedback both during and after the discussion, my impression was that the discussion was seen as relevant and important for those attending. Many left their e-mail address, as they wanted a copy of the treatment manual (English translation), and two papers covering some of the issues we discussed (Lorentzen, 2006; Lorentzen, in press).

References

Blackmore, C. et al. (2009). A Systematic Review of the Efficacy and Clinical effectiveness of Group Analysis and Analytic/Dynamic Group Psychotherapy. The full report can be found at: http://www.groupanalysis.org/uploadedfiles/workshops/IGA_GAS_FINAL_REPORT_UPDATED.pdf

Foulkes, S.E. (1975). Group Analytic Psychotherapy. Method and Principles. London, Maresfield Library.

Kennard, D., Roberts, J., and Winter, D.A. (1993) A Work Book of Group-Analytic Interventions. London: Routledge.1993

Leszcz, M. and Schlapobersky, J. (2011). Lost or Found in the transference? The Intersubjective Domain of The Group: A Trans-Atlantic dialogue. American Group Psychotherapy Association's annual meeting in New York, February.

Lorentzen, S. (2004) Short- and Long-Term Psychodynamic Group Psychotherapy. Unpublished manuals (in Norwegian).

Lorentzen, S. (2006). Contemporary challenges for Research in group Analysis. Group Analysis, 39(3):321-340.

Lorentzen, S., Høglend, P., and Ruud, T. (2008). The efficacy of short- and long-term psychodynamic group psychotherapy. A Norwegian multi-center study. Panel presentation at the annual meeting of Society for Psychotherapy Research, Barcelona, Spain.

Lorentzen, S. (2011). Writing Manuals for Psychodynamic group Treatments. Group Analysis. In Press.

Wallerstein, R. (1988). One psychoanalysis or many? International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 69:5-21.

Steinar Lorentzen
Professor,MD,PhD
University of Oslo, Institute of Clinical Medicine and Researcher
Clinic for Mental Health and Addiction.
Oslo University Hospital,
Sognsvannsvn. 21, build. 12,
0372 Oslo, Norway

———————

The Challenge of Chairing a Special Symposium Plenary

Elizabeth Rohr's presentation of her supervisory work in post civil war Guatemala was widely considered to be remarkable. When I read her paper which detailed the organisation and development of her project I began to understand the extent of the challenge she was facing. My personal experience of being born in a Nazi Ghetto, spending my early childhood in Bergen Belsen Concentration Camp and being part of a totally traumatised community gave me a lifelong personal insight. I had just returned from Poland working with now elderly Holocaust survivors who had survived as children. They and I are still seeking the healing of our wounds 66 years after the liberation.

So why was her presentation so special? My 20 years of work with massive trauma victims has taught me some fundamental lessons. These survivors have finely tuned antennae. They will not trust or engage with a worker if they detect attempted deception. They will detect any conceit and consider it with mistrust. Elizabeth Rohr described the work with simple and complete honesty. She spoke about the survivors, the community and the counsellors and not about herself. She spoke with great humility. When she spoke of herself it was with an openness and honesty that contained no hint of self deception or self congratulation.

The difficulties of the work were presented with not one word of defensive self-protection. The community's trauma was portrayed by the art of Oswaldo Gayasamin. It captured the unspeakable anguish. To have the courage to face the challenges is extraordinary. To posses this courage and yet have such humility marks her out as one of our most remarkable group analysts. It was an honour and a privilege to have chaired her presentation.

Alfred Garwood

————————

The Colonisation of the Term "Holocaust"

Abstract:
Using two papers by Elie Wiesel and Bruno Bettelheim as source material, I will be examining the origin and misuse of the term 'holocaust'. The term, as applied to the extermination of the Jews of Europe, was derived from Greek and Latin translations of the Old Testament, and is now in contemporary use as a euphemism for this overwhelming catastrophe. My own analysis will attempt to explain that the perversion of the term 'holocaust', was a means to alleviate the collective guilt feelings of the Allied Powers after World War II.

Martyrdom

The terminology of Martyrdom can be traced back to the root concept of bearing witness to the Resurrection, a concept which was already present in the Synoptic Gospels. A connected idea is that of suffering by way of imitation of Christ's suffering.

The absence of a developed terminology for 'Martyr' or 'Martyrdom' in either Greek or Hebrew, is a striking feature of the Jewish representation.

There is no single term to be found for the person of the Martyr beyond Kedoshim meaning 'Holy Ones', a term first used by the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus in the first century after the Common Era (ACE) (Bellum Judaicum) writing about the Jewish Revolt against the Roman occupation from 66-70 ACE. This was also used in later Hebrew records of the European victims of the First Crusades, their death being described as 'Kiddush Hashem' - for the Sanctification of G-d's name.

An anonymous author of the Fourth Book of Maccabees summarises, in one long Greek sentence, the achievements of the heroes and heroines whose dreadful deaths they have recounted. They are imagined as a visual portrayal of piety in action, an imaginary epitaph, to serve as their memorial among their people.

The essential attributes of the Jewish Martyrs as perceived by the authors of the four Books of Maccabees are as follows:

1) Defence of the Divine Law against a tyrannical oppressor
2) A threat to the Nation, heroic endurance by the ostensibly weak (women, children, and the elderly),

3) Harrowing torture certified by detailed description,
4) Anonymity of the martyrs,
5) Victory which is inherent in the death itself, secured by faith and requiring nothing further to make it complete, even if the gift of immortal life happily follows.

There is no mention of a sequel beyond the moment of the martyr's death. Martyrology is essentially idealized representation, the characterization of martyrs is portraiture, and is stereotyped to a greater or lesser extent.

Martyrdom is description requiring by its very nature, an audience, a response, a record. In Christian tradition, the death of martyrs bear witness to their faith, in front of the assumed audience, immeasurably greater than the immediate one at the scene. The event is then shaped for the future, to serve in the telling, as a model for others. A heroic moment transcends the significance of the individual moment, transmuting its horror.

The phenomenon and the ideology of martyrdom was developed in Greek texts written by Jews before becoming part of Christianity, one example was Philo Judaeus of Alexandria, who flourished ca. 40 ACE. The term 'martyrdom' was apparently not used by Jewish writers to describe the acts of those who died for the Torah (the Jewish Bible).

Nowadays, the term martyrdom is widely used in the context of Judaism. Historians often refer to the 'Ten Martyrs, among them Rabbi Akiva, Tarfon, and others, died under horrific Roman torture during the reign of Emperor Hadrian (117-138 ACE). These ten martyrs are specifically remembered during the Day of Atonement Yom Kippour prayers by a liturgical Hebrew poem called Aleh Ezkereh. The victims of the holocaust are described as 'martyrs', by what the late rabbinic scholar Dr Louis Jacobs has called a kind of autanamic consensus, in other words, without objections.

The 'holocaust'

The term 'holocaust' is derived from the Greek 'holos' - meaning whole or entire, and 'kaustos' - burnt offering, and the Latin 'holocaustum' meaning burnt offering, taken from the Hebrew word 'Olah' meaning a burnt offering in the Pentateuch (the 5 books of Moses). The term was introduced to describe the massacre of large numbers of people killed for their religious faith, hence a form of martyrdom with a particular Christian significance. The Latin word used by several Christian

writers under the Roman Empire from the Emperor Nero to Constantine, 54 to 337 ACE, when Christianity became the State religion.

The word 'holocaust' was adopted as an official description by American historians in the 1950's (see OED) together with a newly invented word 'genocide', to describe the extermination of people on grounds of their racial inferiority. This term was invented by the Polish-Jewish lawyer Lubetzkin in 1946, and it was then used in the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal. The wide acceptance of this term has been shown by the UK government's adoption of January 27th, as the official annual 'Holocaust Memorial Day'.

Several Jewish scholars, such as Bruno Bettelheim, Elie Wiesel and the Nazi war crimes hunter Simon Wiesenthal, amongst others, have protested against the general acceptance of the term 'holocaust', for a number of reasons which I will explore in this paper.

Bruno Bettelheim states that the use of the word holocaust gives an entirely false impression that the Jews were sacrificed as martyrs to their faith, in the form of a 'burnt offering', in this case the literal burning by fire - in the crematoria - after death in the gas chambers.

The genocide which consumed the Jews and the Gypsies from 1941 to 1945, had none of the cleansing and singular purity of an all-consuming flame. That genocide was brutal, bloody, and largely carried out by human hand. Most of the victims were starved, tortured, and worked to death in appalling conditions. The gas used to asphyxiate the victims was Zyklon B, which had been developed to kill rats.

The fact that Jews were deliberately targeted for extermination on grounds of racial inferiority applied to all categories, including religious and secular Jews, atheists and those who had converted to Christianity.

Derek Cohen writes that to describe the murder of 6 million Jewish victims of Hitler as a holocaust, is to endow the event with a quasi-religious, mystical property, that empties it of its political reality, which must be faced and confronted if it is to be properly understood. It then belongs to mythology instead of reality. As such, it loses its place on the rational and the real, and occupies some kind of transcendent space, which romanticises and removes it from the realm of normal compre-hensible discourse. This might then lead to pointless speculation that it is the Will of G-d, rather than a palpable historical and all too human occurrence.

Nazi euphemisms played an important role in the dehumanization process of the holocaust. We know that using technical or specially created terms instead of words from our common vocabulary, is one of the most widely used distancing device, which separates the

intellectual from the emotional experience. Talking about the 'holocaust' permits us to manage it intellectual where the raw facts, given their ordinary names, would overwhelm us emotionally - because it was a catastrophe beyond comprehension, and beyond the limits of our imagination'.

Even the Nazis shied away from facing openly what they were up to, and called this vile mass murder the 'final solution of the Jewish problem'.

On 20th January 1942, a group of 13 men, all of them high ranking Nazi officials, 7 of whom had university doctorates, met at Wannsee, a beautiful lakeside villa outside Berlin. It took them 2 hours to formulate 'The final solution' as they sat and drank brandy, thus sealing the fate of a people whom they regarded as sub-human.

After all, solving a problem can be made to appear like an honourable enterprise, as long as we are not forced to recognize that the solution we are talking about consists of the completely unprovoked, vicious murder of millions of helpless men, women and children. The Nuremberg judges of these Nazi war criminals followed their example of circumlocution, by adopting Lubetzkin's neologism out of Greek and Latin roots, 'genocide'. These artificially created technical terms serve to disconnect from our strongest feelings.

Before WWII, Germany had a monopoly of Nobel Prize Winners in physics, Chemistry and Medicine. The Final Solution combined German scientific expertise with atavistic racial hatred.

Death entered history with the murder of a man killed by his brother (Cain and Abel in Genesis). The horror of murder is archetypal and is part of our most common human heritage. From earliest infancy, it arouses abhorrence in us. Therefore in whatever form it appears, we should give such an act its true designation, and not hide it behind polite, erudite terms created out of classical words.

To call this vile mass murder the 'holocaust' is to deny its uniqueness which would permit over time, the word becoming invested with feelings appropriate to the event it refers to. We have seen that the correct definition of 'holocaust' is burnt offering. As such, it is part of the language of the Bible, full of the richest emotional connotations. By using the term 'holocaust', false associations are established through conscious and unconscious connotations, between the most vicious of mass murders and ancient rituals of a deeply religious nature. Using a word so charged with unconscious religious meaning and the highest of moral connotations, when speaking about the murder of 6 million

Jews, robs the victims of the only thing left to them: their fate and its uniqueness. It is a sacrilege and a profanation of G-d and humanity. By doing so, we connect what happened in the death camps with events that we deeply regret but also greatly admire. This makes it easier for us to cope with our distorted image of what happened, not with the events with the way they happened.

By calling the victims of the Nazis' 'martyrs', we falsify their fate. We have seen that the true meaning of 'martyr', is one who voluntarily undergoes the penalty of death for refusing to renounce his faith (OED). The Nazis made sure that nobody could mistakenly think that their victims were murdered for their religious beliefs. Renouncing their faith would have saved none of them, since we have seen that all categories were targeted, including those who converted to Christianity. They did not die for any religious conviction, and certainly not out of choice.

The millions of Jews and other targeted undesirables, were systematically exterminated because they stood in the way of the Nazis' delusional belief about what was required to protect the purity of their assumed Aryan superiority, and what they thought necessary to guarantee them the living space which they felt they needed. Thus while these millions were murdered for an idea, they did not die for one.

Millions of innocent men, women and children, were processed after they had been utterly brutalized, their humanity destroyed, their clothes torn from their bodies. They were then sorted into those who were destined to be murdered immediately, and those others, who had a short-term usefulness as slave labour or as guinea pigs for medical experiments. Soon they too would be herded into those same gas chambers, piled up and asphyxiated so that, in their last moments, they could not prevent themselves from fighting each other in vain for a last breath of air.

In the words of Bettelheim, to call these most wretched victims of a murderous delusion 'martyrs' or a 'burnt offering' is a distortion invented for our own comfort, small as it may be. It pretends that this most vicious of mass murder had some deeper meaning, that the victims either offered themselves, or at least became sacrifices to a higher cause. This distortion robs them of the last recognition which could be theirs, and denies them the last dignity we could accord them: namely to face what their death signified, and not embellish it for the small psychological relief that it may give us.

Elie Wiesel has compared the holocaust to Anti-Creation. He is caught in a dilemma: between the Duty of Testimony, for an event that cannot

be described, named or imagined, and the duty incumbent on the Survivor, who must be a witness. He/she does not have the right to hide behind a facade of false modesty. The easy way would be to say nothing...He goes on to say: 'the greatest writers are incapable of describing what the holocaust means: how to explain or even describe, the agony, the terror, the prayers, the tears, the tenderness, the sadness of the scientifically prepared death of 6 million human beings, sentenced to death by an evil dictatorship, not because of their faith or their circumstances, but for their very being...'

Many people are troubled by its evocation of a religious act: It is wrong to lend the event any purifying value. No word can express this tragedy, no word can contain the humiliation, the suffering, the loss of human life that it is meant to encompass. We use it because we can do no better. The holocaust is the destruction of 6 millions, one third of the Jewish people.

The Duty of Testimony kept people alive.

Many autobiographical writers have tackled the subject of the holocaust. They have developed literary devices in their use of language, which emphasises the horror. Their prose approaches poetry. Poetry starts where words fail.

Jean-Francois Steiner was in Jerusalem at the time of the Eichmann trial in 1961. He wrote a book entitled 'Treblinka', where his own father perished. The book starts with a description of the first 7 days of setting up the death camp, along the lines of Genesis in the first Book of the Bible. The prose is metered, and as one reads on, the reader is caught in a kind of gasping.

Primo Levi recorded the events day by day with scientific objectivity and precision 'If this be a Man' (1958). His descriptive language is succinct and precise, detached and unemotional, there is a total absence of technical words. His duty to Memory kept him going. When his memory started to fail, he took his own life in 1987.

The poet Paul Celan, refers to 'that which happened (1933-1945)'.

Death Fugue

Black milk of daybreak we drink it at evening
we drink it at midday and morning we drink it at night
we drink and we drink
we shovel a grave in the air where you won't lie too cramped

A man lives in the house he plays with his vipers he writes
he writes when it grows dark to Deutschland your golden hair Margareta

he writes it and steps out of doors and the stars are all sparkling he
whistles his hounds to stay close
he whistles his Jews into rows has them shovel a grave in the ground
he commands us play up for the dance

Black milk of daybreak we drink you at night
we drink and we drink
A man lives in the house he plays with his vipers he writes
he writes when it grows dark to Deutschland your golden hair
margareta

Your ashen hair Shulamith we shovel a grave in the air
where you won't lie too cramped.

He shouts dig this earth deeper you lot where you others sing up and play
he grabs for the rod in his belt he swings it his eyes are so blue
stick your spades deeper you lot there you others play on for the
dancing

Black milk of daybreak we drink you at night
we drink you at midday and morning we drink you at evening
we drink and we drink
a man lives in the house your goldenes Haar Margareta
yours aschenes Haar Shulamith he plays with his vipers.

He shouts play death more sweetly this Death is a master from
Deutschland

he shouts scrape your strings darker you'll rise up as smoke to the sky
you'll then have a grave in the clouds where you won't lie too cramped.

Black milk of daybreak we drink you at night
we drink you at midday Death is a master aus Deutschland
we drink you at evening and morning we drink and we drink
this death is ein Meister aus Deutschland his eye it is blue
he shoots you with shot made of lead shoots you level and true
a man lives in the house your goldenes Margarete

he looses his hounds on us grant us a grave in the air
he plays with his vipers and daydreams der Tod ist ein Meister aus
Deutschland

dein goldenes Haar Margarete
dein aschenes Haar Sulamith

Paul Celan committed suicide in Paris, aged 50.

Conclusion

There have been many genocides in the 20th century.

From 1891 to 1918, the Germans colonialists occupied what they called German East Africa, a land rich in gold and diamonds, which is now the Republic

of Tanzania. In 1904-5, they drafted the Herrero Tribe into forced labour, kept them in concentration camps, starved and tortured them. Their bones and skulls were sent back to Germany for examination. The Germans suspected that these people were not human, as their appearance was so different. The handful of survivors, now elderly, are anxious to erect a memorial to this tragic little known event.

The Armenian genocide in 1915 was perpetrated by the Turks: one and a half million innocent individuals were brutally tortured and murdered, the girls and young women were taken into harems. Many died while escaping across the Syrian desert. A few reached Lebanon, Iran and Syria. The Khmer Rouge under their leader Pol Pot in Cambodia, exterminated 2 millions of their citizens on grounds of purging the bourgeois elements, based on principles of class warfare during the period from 1975-79. Then came the genocide in Rwanda, when one million Tutsis were brutally murdered by the Hutus during 1994.

No other genocide has been described as a 'holocaust'. I do not believe that the sheer scale of the tragedy can solely account for this.

The modern Hebrew equivalent word 'SHOAH' (taken from the Book of Proverbs, Chapter 3, verse 25) - meaning devastation, a catastrophe, or an act of destruction, is the preferred description used by all who are aware of its true significance.

References

Elie Wisel: Notes from a Lecture on Reflections on the Holocaust, 1981, USA.
Bruno Bettelheim: Surviving and Other Essays. Vintage 1979
Derek Cohen: The Politics of Shakespeare. MacMillan 1993

Primo Levi: If this is a Man. Abacus 1958
Paul Celan: Selected Poems and Prose. Norton 2001

Annie Hershkowitz
Annie Hershkowitz is a Registered Art Psychotherapist and Group
Psychotherapist. She has worked in the National Health Service for
28 years, and now works free-lance.
E-mail: annie45hl@yahoo.com

——————

GAS Website

Website Statistics for the 30 Days before 30th September, 2011

Visitor Numbers
2011-08-31 to 2011-09-30

Base Stats

1,718	Visits
4,445	Pageviews
2.59	Pages/Visit
58.51%	Bounce Rate
00:02:42	Avg. Time on Site
59.6%	% New Visits

Top Posts
Group Analytic Society (London): To Promote and Support Group
Analytic Psychotherapy. S H Foulkes. Group Analytic Contexts. Group
Psychotherapy
1163 views

Video | Group Analytic Society (London)
398 views

Video | Group Analytic Society (International)
291 views

Forum | Group Analytic Society (London)
234 views

Forum | Group Analytic Society (International)
215 views

The Society | Group Analytic Society (International)
158 views

Future Events | Group Analytic Society (London)
121 views

News from Norway on Training | Forum | Group Analytic Society
(International)
104 views

The Society | Group Analytic Society (London)
92 views

News from Norway on Training | Forum | Group Analytic Society (London)
79 views

Future Events | Group Analytic Society (International)
75 views

Top Searches

130   group analytic society
99   group
40   group analytic society symposium 2011
27   group analytic society london
26   gas london

Top Referers

745   google
606   (direct)
65   confer.uk.com
42   bing

As you will see from the above statistics, a video page has been added
to the website. This page displays videos of the Keynote Lectures from

this year's London Symposium and also a number of views of the Large Group assembling. This page can be found under the Publications drop-down menu.

Additionally, a 2014 Symposium page has been added under the 2011 Symposium page. This page displays videos about the Lisbon 2014 Symposium.

You will note that, in the middle of the month, the name of the website was changed from "London" to "International" and the statistics on visitor numbers from one page are displayed as if it were two different pages e.g. Video/Group Analytic Society (London) and Video/Group Analytic Society (International) is one page, London referring to the first part of the month, International to the second part after the name change.

Terry Birchmore

—————

Request for Foulkes Letters and Documents for Society Archives

We are appealing for letters, notes, and correspondence from Foulkes that Society 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

IGA/GAS Film Group

Screen Memories exists to engage actively with cinema; an attempt to challenge the fast food ethos of modern consumption, by giving time and thought to a series of films that potentially challenge us, offer a fresh perspective, disturb or confirm our certainties. At best they offer insight into our lives via the initially voyeuristic pleasure of spending time in the lives of others.

Peter Mark and Roberta Green invite you to another year of Screen Memories - 11 monthly film evenings in our tried and tested group analytic format of refreshments, introduction, film viewing, speaker and large group discussion.

All films are shown at The Institute of Group Analysis
1 Daleham Gardens, London, NW3 5BY (0207 431 2693)

Friday evenings, monthly 7:30pm to 10:30 pm

Everyone welcome

Fee:
£15 for individual tickets
£100 for a season ticket (only available in advance of season and not transferrable)

We advise booking in advance at the IGA: 020 7431 2693 or iga@ igalondon.org.uk

Tickets are usually available at the door. Reserved tickets without payment must be collected by 7.20pm to guarantee entry.

Information from:
Peter Mark 07786 088194
Roberta Green 020 7385 3408

Listings

9th December 2011. Songs from the Second Floor. Directed by Roy Andersson (Sweden 2000). A Scandinavian black comedy, formed by a collection of stories with many characters about the trials of life in a city. Discussion led by Yana Stajno, artist, film maker and scriptwriter.

20th January 2012. I am Love. Directed by Luca Guadagnino (Italy 2009). Beautifully filmed, a work of art, set in Italy and focussing on a troubled family across the generations. A Greek tragedy set in an Italian mansion with a magnificent central performance from Tilda Swinton. Discussion led by Virginia Ironside, writer, performer and agony aunt, taking time off from her one woman show The Virginia Monologues.

17th February 2012. The Social Network. Directed by David Fincher (US 2010). A true story about the battle for ownership of the Facebook network. A modern fable of wealth, power and friendship. Discussion led by Bob Harris, group analyst working in the public and private sectors.

16th March 2012. Monsoon Wedding. Directed by Mira Nair (India 2001). Set in India, magnificent to look at with an uplifting sound track, the film explores family relationships and allegiances across the generations, when an arranged wedding is celebrated. Discussion led by Nigel Planer, writer, actor, comedian with an interest in Indian films

20th April 2012. The Kids Are All Right. Directed by Lisa Cholodenko (US 2010). An award winning film about a lesbian couple whose family is rocked by their children bringing the children's biological father onto the scene. It has Oscar and Bafta nominated performances from Annette Bening, Julianne Moore and Mark Ruffalo. Discussion led by Lisa Gornick, film maker ("Tick Tock Lullaby") and artist.

_____

Democracy and Transparency in Society:

Psychoanalysis and Group Analysis
December 9 2011
Israel
Case studies
Discussions
Median Groups
And open discussions with the panel.

Further information: Dr. Pnina Rappoport
6 Israel Galili
Tel-Aviv 69377
Israel
Tel: 972-3-6437007
Cell: 972-54-4211135
E mail: ps_rapp@NETVISION.NET.IL

————————

Information About Conference Accommodation in London and Donations to the Society

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