

Group-Analytic Contexts

September 2013

ISSUE NO 61

Newsletter of

THE GROUP-ANALYTIC SOCIETY
(International)

Editor: Terry Birchmore

GAS INTERNATIONAL MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE 2013

Robi Friedman, Israel President	robif@netvision.net.il
Francis Griffiths, UK Honorary Treasurer	francesjgriffiths@hotmail.co.uk
Helga Felsberger, Austria Honorary Secretary	helga.felsberger@gmx.at
Terry Birchmore, UK Contexts Editor. Website Development and Management	birchmore@yahoo.com
Regine Scholz, Germany International Development Committee	regine.scholz@regine-scholz.de
Isaura Neto, Portugal Chair: International Development Committee	dinisenetopsi@clix.pt immeto@netcabo.pt (weekends)
Dieter Nitzgen, Germany Scientific Committee	dieter@nitzgen.info
Tom Ormay, Hungary Ex Officio Editor of Group Analysis	ormaytom@t-online.hu
Don Montgomery, UK UK Chapter Chair	don@montgomery.gb.com
David Glyn, UK Forum Manager	davidglyn@talktalk.net
Carmen O'Leary, UK Membership Secretary	carmenoleary@hotmail.co.uk
Sue Einhorn, UK Chair Scientific Committee	sue.einhorn@talk21.com

Members are invited to present their ideas; CONTEXTS is a newsletter, therefore the copyright stays with the authors, and the GAS Committee does not necessarily agree with their views. The editors preserve the right to correct language and grammar.

GROUP ANALYTIC SOCIETY, International

102 Belsize Lane, London NW3 5BB

Telephone: +44 (0) 207 435 6611. Fax: +44 (0) 207 443 9576

E-mail: groupanalytic.society@virgin.net Website: www.groupanalyticsociety.co.uk

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Call For Expressions of Interest.....

PRESIDENT'S PAGE.....

Views of the Foulkes Weekend

- ┘ by Anne Harrow.....
- ┘ by Di King.....
- ┘ by Jacqueline Fogden.....
- ┘ by John Hook.....

Remembering Lithuania : Fathers, Groups and the 'Patric' by Chris MacGregor.....

Re-Mean the Healthcare Communications: Balint Groups and Foulkes Groups by Giovanni Giordano.....

A Personal Tribute to Lionel Kreeger by Earl Hopper.....

Book and Review Corner

Review: From Psychoanalysis to Group Analysis: The Pioneering Work of Trigrant Burrow by Kevin Power.....

Introduction to a new book dedicated to Anneliese Heigl-Evers by Malcolm Pines.....

Film Review: Etre et Avoir by Chris MacGregor,,,,,,,,,,,,,

Citations and Abstracts of Articles from Other Journals by Terry Birchmore.....

Events.....

Call for Expressions of Interest: Editor of Contexts

After a number of years, the current Editor of Contexts will complete his term of office during the next calendar year. The Management Committee of The Group Analytic Society International are seeking to appoint his successor as soon as possible to enable the current Editor and the incoming Editor to have a period of handover. The current Editor looks forward to working with the incoming Editor for the next year to facilitate a smooth handover of the newsletter.

It would be helpful for an editor to be familiar with using computer technology, and to have some knowledge of Group Analytic literature, and a commitment to the Society. A good command of English is essential. Attendance at some Management Committee Meetings in London is expected but you will not necessarily need to attend more than two meetings a year.

Please contact the Group Analytic Society International office if you would like to volunteer for this post. The contact details are given on the front inside cover of this issue.

President's Foreword

About exciting new projects and the challenge of going after them....

At the International Summer School of the Group Analytic Society International we will have a unique opportunity to host a long desired meeting between young Group Analysts and students from all over Europe. This special event, the first of its kind, will take place in Belgrade from the 6th to 9th August 2013. This innovative workshop will make it possible to build a network of young Group Analysts who will be able to profit from international relationships; getting in contact with other

colleagues and learning about other Institutes, different approaches to Group Analysis and establishing lifelong European acquaintances. All these will, I believe, promote our professional identity, facilitate the practice of Group Analysis and improve our understanding of its practice. Personally I also think that organizing this event in Belgrade also means an empowerment of those regional local Group Analysts who traditionally are liberal and democratic. We will support them running groups in a place where there still are difficulties. It will meet the needs of those who crave to establish relations with the sane part of the Europeans. Is it not an exciting project?

We need you in order to fulfill it. You may come yourself to Belgrade or suggest it warmly to your students and colleagues. It could be a first event which would give us Group Analytic Joy....

Another such Joy is the next Winter Workshop in Vienna, from the 21st and the 24th October. It will be organized as a co-operation between the Group Analytic Society and the Austrian IGA. In Vienna, this great city, local colleagues will host us. We will be able to meet in this special European Space, which is awash with European tradition in which East touches West. The fascination of organizing a Group Analytic conference (and the AGM) in such a space is great. In this Winter Workshop we will discuss the connections between intersubjectivity and modern Group Analytic thinking. We welcome you, Society members, to enjoy with us some days in Vienna and to enrich yourself with understanding, desire and knowledge.

I am writing these lines flying home from Lisbon, where the Scientific Committee of the next Symposium was meeting for 2 days. We are trying to put up the best possible program for our next great event, happening between the 28th July and the 1st August in Portugal. Happily, I found it easy to bring up interesting and innovative issues. But it will be a challenge for all of us – organizers as well as participants - in these times to set up and to have an event that will also be a success as an organization. A few things can be said about the preparation meetings in Lisbon: it was a pleasure to see the lovely venue, it was a joy to meet the local organizing committee and it is a full joy to work in such a great city. It was pleasantly warm, its hilly streets, old architecture, lovely neighbourhoods, good food and wines and welcoming people promise to allow for a successful Symposium. We should not forget the long and rich Portuguese Group Analytic tradition and lastly the good

prices, which will still further strengthen the attraction of the 16th Group Analytic Symposium in Lisbon.

It seems to me worthwhile to mention here the offer of a Special Membership rate for new members. This would allow many of our colleagues from countries that experience difficulties to be members of the Society and participate in our Symposium as well as in other activities.

Last but not least: together with the London IGA, we have established a new Library committee in order to promote its use by our members. I bring this up because our Library, co-owned with the IGA London, is one of our biggest assets, but is almost never used by our members. As you know, we have the biggest collection of Group Analytic books in the world, and all this you can easily use! I have tried myself more than once to ask for an article or a book chapter, in order to be sure of facts: in a matter of 3-4 working days from having asked for it from the Librarian Ms. Elizabeth Nokes, elizabeth@igalondon.org.uk, being a member of the GA Society, I received the material. The only thing you have to do then is sign a statement that you got the article, then you scan it and send it back to her....

Lastly, another thought: some weeks ago, while participating in the yearly convention of the D3G, the new large German Group Analytic Society, I witnessed an interesting encounter between two Group Analytic Cultures – the British one, represented by Morris Nitsun, who had a Key Note Speech and the German audience. It was interesting to see that the London one was considered to be 'pessimistic', while the local 'optimistic' ones were full of energy and trust in the future of Group Analytic work. Was this a societal clash?

Robi Friedman

Be a Contexts Writer!

“Substitute “damn” every time you’re inclined to write “very”; your editor will delete it and the writing will be just as it should be”. **Mark Twain**

Contexts welcomes contributions from GAS members and non-members on a variety of topics: Have you run or attended a group-analytic or group psychotherapy workshop? Are you involved in a group-analytic or group psychotherapy 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 10,000 words long, or between one and eight A4 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, a reply to an earlier article published here, or stray thoughts that you have managed to capture on paper. Give it a go!

Articles are welcome from all those who work with groups in any discipline: whether practitioners, trainers, researchers, users, or consultants. Accounts of innovations, research findings on existing practice, policy issues affecting group therapy, and discussions of conceptual developments are all relevant. Group therapy with clients, users, professional teams, or community groups fall within our range.

Length: Full length articles; of up to 10, 000 words, should show the context of practice and relate this to existing knowledge. We also accept brief contributions which need focus only on the issue at hand: brief descriptions, reviews, personal takes of workshops or events attended, humorous asides, letters and correspondence..

Presentation: articles, letters, etc. should ideally be in Word format and forwarded as an email attachment to the Editors.

Please don’t worry about language, grammar and the organisation of your piece. We, as editors, receive many pieces from non-English speaking countries and it is our job to work with you to create a piece of writing that is grammatical and reads well in English. This help also extends to English speakers who may need help and advice about the coherence and organisation of a piece of work.

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!

For publication in March: December 25th

For publication in June: March 25th

For publication in September: June 25th

For publication in December: September 25th

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 International New Members

Mr Joseph Acosta Full Member Austin, USA

Mrs Rachel Abramowicz Chejanovsky Full Member Israel

Ms Lucy Draper Student Member London, UK

Ms Janine Lees	Full Member	Nottingham, UK
Mrs Cristina Maria Silva Madeira de Brito	Associate	Portugal
Dr Lawrence Martean	Student Member	Nottingham, UK
Dr Fiona M. Parker	Student Member	North Yorkshire, UK
Dr Irini Segredou	Full Member	Athens, Greece
Dr Laura Sennen	Student Member	Cornwall, UK
Mr Vivian de Villiers	Full Member	London, UK
Mr Dimitrios Zachos	Full Member	Larisa, Greece

Foulkes Weekend, May 2013: The Social Nature of Persons. One person is no person

Travelling from York to London I mused on my past experiences in GAS. I was a member of GAS long before I became a member of the IGA. It was a special place for me, somewhere I could belong.

The Foulkes lecture was at SOAS . My son had started his university career there. More memories. I met people I had known in the foyer but still felt unsure and a bit alone.

I read Tom Ormay's book last year and although I didn't agree with all of it, was very taken with it. Then I was asked to give the Barbara Dick memorial lecture in Manchester in March I called it 'Paying Attention' and I referred to his concept of 'nos' , applying this retrospectively to a group I had been thinking about for some time. Whether you agree with Tom's extension of the Freudian psychic structure of Id Ego Superego to add Nos, or not, it seems to me that he has drawn our attention to something that we should to pay attention to - our need for one another. I envied his phrase 'one person is no person' and wished it was

mine. Foulkes' 'there is no such thing as an individual' and Winnicott's 'there is no such thing as a baby' (only a nursing couple) preceded this thinking. That there is a social self I don't think is disputed. Tom has placed this need for others – nos – as an inherent instinct, and that is changing the classical psychic structure of Freud. There does seem some unease about nos seeming to be entirely benign, and I too am uneasy about this.

I didn't know Tom was to give the Foulkes lecture when I wrote mine, and so when I did know, attending was unquestionable.

Terry Birchmore asked me to write about my experience at the weekend for Contexts, which I used to edit. I was taken back to how I would get it printed in the north and sent to Daleham gardens for distribution. Now I, as contributor, have to just press a button - I hope the right one.

The lecture and study day were complex and intriguing. The lecture followed the form of the book. Erudite and making the case for an instinct - nos – latin for we - to become part of the Id Ego Superego psychic structure suggested by Freud. I had to keep reminding myself that these are only theories, enabling us to think and talk about the unconscious.

Ormay says in his book 'The content of every book may be summed up in a few sentences but the meaning of those sentences become clear only at the end of the book and perhaps not completely clear then.' I think this was true for the whole weekend.

Nos is a difficult concept, and yet seeming deceptively easy. Nos, Ormay says provides us with the natural foundation for relating to one another. Id Ego and superego does not let us understand the social nature of man. That we relate for self-centred reasons only, doesn't work. With a recognition of the social function of the personality we can resolve the problem. Nos is a life instinct not a death instinct.

Tom Ormay's writing is littered with references to philosophers and philosophy. I have joined the University of the 3rd Age and am studying philosophy. I think I have been helped by this to understand more.

One image stayed with me from the lecture, of carnivores not killing and eating all the herbivores. Always leaving enough to maintain a life balance.

Although I didn't hear this used as an analogy, in the study day I thought that something of the sort was happening. Not total destruction but a balance maintained between opposing forces. My small group carried the thought or statement that Freud's psychic theory had been left behind long ago. Certainly not by me. I wondered what, of similar quality, was offered in its place.

Neurology perhaps. Introduced in the paper on music. But where do you go from there? Putting an understanding of feelings into a neurological framework only, doesn't make sense to me. Whenever I read about neurological findings, and impressive as they are, I still think that the science is just catching up. I was reading a newspaper report that neurological research shows the vital importance for babies of receiving close individual attention from a warm sensitive and consistent adult. This importance has been documented by Freud, Klein Winnicott, Bowlby et al. from the beginning of the 20th century. Now apparently we can relax and believe it because science says so. I am not knocking scientific research but I am dismayed at the preferencing of science over intuition.

There seems to be a confusion with the brain and mind. Brain activities can be mapped but thought is a language and can never be registered as brain activity. Neurology can't arrive at thoughts. Feelings and thoughts are complex and as Raymond Tallis points out neuroscience cannot explain the whole of human consciousness, behaviour culture and society. It is a reductionist path and we are far more interesting and complex than we appear in the mirror of biologism. (Tallis Aping Mankind) 'We are our brains' misses out a whole range of mind body problems. Neurological thinking takes us down ever narrowing paths of problem solving and in doing so losing sight of wonder. Wonder Tallis says is the proper state of human kind.

Back to the lecture: Tom says he feels we have lost our way and I think his suggestion was that we have to regain our capacity to love. This of course sounds like idealism and indeed there was little said about hate or the aggressive nature of man.

The papers presented on the study day were interesting and critical.

The paper on music –already mentioned- was enthusiastically received, although the way that music can affect crowds to become mindless masses was not addressed. In fact Dick Blackwell was the only one to introduce doubt, which I appreciated.

A very full morning with – for me- connections being made with people and the environment. Not much time to think and wonder.

It will, I thought, come together in the large group. Unfortunately not. My heart sank at the beginning at hearing the cliché of an attempt to infantilise the group and turn the conductors into policemen or teachers, needing to keep us in order. I didn't want to be infantilised. It moved on as groups do, but the idea of what should be happening, instead of being interested in what was happening raised its head again. Sometimes I wondered if free association had been abandoned.

The idea of Greek theatre was put into the group. I was excited by this as a metaphor, and suggested this was appropriate to the large group with protagonists and chorus. My thought was killed at birth, a rather blatant spoiling (for a fight maybe?) So I was left to wonder, but did not say, that if people from different cultures with different languages, the chorus, said something in their own language we would really hear the real music of the group without the predominance of English. I am still wondering if this would work. I would certainly like to hear that music. Perhaps it may happen in some other group. Perhaps it has happened. International large groups are so potentially rich, I don't think we always access that richness. Language and translation might be a topic for a symposium maybe.

Hate did come into this large group, voiced by one person who hated the phrase 'one person is no person.' It also came in with some of the imagery, reminding me of the carnivores eating the herbivores. I am not vegetarian. The sumptuous repast offered for our lunch, was, though.

I found the large group fragmented and wished the conductors had enabled understanding more. Is it really just a question of getting through it? I like large groups and yet and yet.....

I was returning to what is now GASl after a long absence. What I rediscovered with some emotion, was that I did have somewhere to

belong with people I had known a long time ago welcoming me. I realised in the tranquillity of reflection, that I had been depriving myself of something by not maintaining my connection with GASl. I thought I could manage without it and of course I have, but on a deeper level I had been depriving myself of the nurture of the nos of the group.

There was a lot to include- pack into- one day and I am having lots of 'pensee d'escalier' moments. Not all of them benign!

The small groups were tantalising leaving a hunger for more time. There is never enough time to think as there is so much activity and so many interesting people to speak to. The meal of a lecture and study day takes some digesting. Tom was a quiet but very present, presence. I felt he was expert in paying attention. I would have liked to hear his voice more.

Of course there are many unanswered questions, but continuing to learn to bear not knowing in an absolute way, is where I want to be. There is always an 'and yet.....'

So I want to thank Tom for writing the book, and coming to speak to us. I want to thank the organisers of the lecture and study day and particularly Sue Einhorn who facilitated the study day with wit and emotional intelligence. I want to thank GASl which I will now rejoin and perhaps feel once again at home. I will go on trying to pay attention.

'The content of every book may be summed up in a few sentences but the meaning of those sentences become clear only at the end of the book and perhaps not completely clear then. (Ormay The Social Nature of persons Karnac 2012.)

Anne Harrow

One Person is no Person. Foulkes lecture 2013 - Speaker Tom Ormay.

Nos, The Nos, Nosness

You decide to have friends round for supper. One says 'I'll bring some chicken' 'I'll bring wine' 'Me – a curry.' All lovely ideas. How to get it coordinated? 'Come to my house' 'No - come to mine' 'Wednesday' 'Can't make that... the weekend?' Suddenly a good idea becomes unmanageable. The workshop felt a bit like that. A fascinating idea but so many threads. So many concepts. So many different strands. At moments I lose concentration as I feel more and more overwhelmed. I understand one bit but then another idea is offered. Never mind. Study day tomorrow. That will make sense of it. Tomorrow will bring clarity.

Study day. The original idea is re - presented. Then there is another speaker. A delight of sound. The musicality of communication. I am captivated but how does it relate to the original idea – to the idea of Nos? Then another explanation. Apologies for a talk in wonderful English but even more thoughts on the original idea. More possible tracks to follow. More food for the party. We pause. Lunch. Talk to each other. Other attempts to explain. Thoughts and explanations are abandoned to the relief of light talk. Then the afternoon and more offerings.

This is what it is about – is offered. Another tempting dish but by now I am satiated. I cannot take in any more. In between times there is respite. The small group. Here I ground myself. Stop thinking and just digest. Knowing nobody, I am free to make up my mind about my fellow group members. Is this the Nos? The familiarity of sitting in a circle knowing that whatever it is, something will come out of this experience and even if I don't know it now, my belief that it will be growth. We grapple, we spar – a little, we flirt. We discuss. Gender is referred to. Raises the heat but this is an area we are familiar with. At moments there is clarity. Then another contribution and once again we are on the road to muddle. Perhaps overfull and frustrated with the task, a small spat erupts. We know it is not about Nos but are too full to work with it. It fizzles out in some hurt and retreat.

Finally the large group. Here behaviour is more predictable. It is a difficult forum but perhaps somebody will be able to give us the

explanation. They do not. There is difficulty in hearing each other. Requests for clarity – of language and content. Who dares speak? Will the idea's originator be scarred, damaged by the lack of understanding turned to hostility? His bravery is in no doubt but will he be wounded? Reference to previous similar happenings. There is loss too. This is the end of this day. Long, muddled, delightful, frustrating but engaging. Time to say good-bye. What has been the task? To understand. We have not. To think – to grapple. Certainly that. To move – to change? Perhaps. To unite – belong? I think so. Not comfortable at times but worthwhile. Later in the week, I am facilitating a group. A peace descends. A warmth. We are working. I look around. Is this the Nos?

Tom talked about a genetic possibility - a vacancy for Nos? Is it a sort of calm, a peace, necessary for Nos to develop. What of discord? Can it only happen when things are positive? Apparently not but could an anxious, aggressive state get in the way of Nos? For Nos to happen, is it necessary to be available to it – to be receptive? Is this what propels us to spend time with each other. To bear the difficult times in a belief that with enough work the difficulties can be understood to arrive at – Nos? Is any of this Nos or is all of it Nos? I doubt I've understood but I have shared the process and in trying to understand it has made a sort of sense.

Di King

A view of the Foulkes Weekend: One Person is no Person (3-4 May, 2013)

I heard a heterogeneous mix of comments from GASi members after Tom Ormay's lecture, delivered on Friday evening, on his concept of nos (see Group Analysis, 44 (3) 2011). An (unattributed) selection is: "I cannot get my head around this"; "I am not sure if we need this theory: a social instinct to belong is understood"; "I am not sure if I understand his theory"; "Surely nos is all about Kohut's self-objects"; "Why his idealisation of the animals? Male lions eat the cubs fathered by another

male”: “I think the aggressive instinct is all part of the nos social instinct”...

By contrast, a sense of unity and harmony was experienced on Saturday morning as members watched an extract from Mozart’s opera *Così fan tutte* at the start of Linde Wotton’s response to the lecture. We could see that the warm, intimate relationship between the two sisters, Fiordiligi and Dorabella, expressing their love for their lovers, in the presence of the cynical Alfonso, was beautifully expressed in the musicality of the singing between the trio. Linde went on to develop her thesis that belonging is both musically and culturally derived and therefore the theory of nos in terms of a structural part of the brain is extraneous. While reiterating Tom’s belief that the individual is social to the core, she stated her belief that musicality is fundamental to all human communications and starts in the womb as the developing baby hears the universal rhythmic beat of language. She said there are biologically processed rhythms in our brains and there is a rhythm in intersubjective exchange, which is originally co-created between mother and infant. There is a dynamic adaptive process at work, in which improvisation and variation in the musical narrative and rhythmic exchanges lead to a sense of belonging, as well as an increased sense of self.

In my small group, I had a glimpse of an affiliation between the two concepts. I experienced, as never before, a sense of acute awareness of the musicality and cadences of the voices as members spoke into the silence in the group as they grappled intellectually with their understanding of Tom’s concept of nos and what belonging meant. As each member spoke, it also became evident that there was a considerable cultural and linguistic diversity in the group: Austrian, Italian, Japanese, Jewish, Danish, Lithuanian, Dutch, Irish, English, Iranian and Portuguese. At one point in our struggle, it was suggested that we should each articulate the word for “we” in our home language. The different words were sounded around the group evoking the sound of a finger going around the circumference of a wet glass. A sense of belonging evolved in the music of the matrix.

Significantly, this sense of belonging, encompassing our diversity, was echoed in the plenary large group when there were voices questioning why the small i in GASi?

It seemed that we moved to a greater sense of belonging through our improvisation and exchanges, despite not having full understanding or agreement about Tom's concept of nos. I apologise for not mentioning the work and contributions by Angela Sordano, Dieter Nitzgen and Dick Blackwell; I leave that to others.

Jacqueline Fogden

Foulkes Weekend, May 2013 (post to the GAS Forum after the weekend)

Firstly I want to add my thanks to the organisers of the Foulkes weekend. I know it can be an arduous task. It was a stimulating event. I fear though that we do not make as much of it as we might because of the way it is structured.

So secondly I want to add my voice to those who have already spoken about this. I have long thought that the response to the Foulkes lecture on the Friday evening is an unnecessary distraction. It is a difficult enough task for the audience on a Friday evening to take in a lecture that it is densely packed with material and ideas, often spoken in a language or with an accent that many will find difficult to decipher. It is then followed immediately by yet more of the same. It doesn't really matter how inspirational either or both may be. It is simply not possible to digest it. I therefore have two suggestions. One is that a power point presentation of the main points of the talk is an essential

accompaniment. This itself requires skill and the presenter may well need help to organise their material to best effect. Perhaps also making this or the text available beforehand? Second is that we do away with the response, at least on that evening. Time for questions might then be longer or more time to meet.

I was more than dismayed on the Saturday to have to listen to four more talks, the first two without any time to reflect on the lecture. Again they may be good and interesting but it is not an educational style that lends itself to learning together. In fact I'm sure educationalists will tell us it an outmoded form of education. I suggest we have the response Saturday morning, fairly brief, followed by an open forum with lecturer and responder so we can begin to get into the ideas. I haven't been to the study day for quite a while but I recall this being the format and it being useful. Then no more talks!

The rest of the day seems to me to suffer from task confusion. This was beautifully if unintentionally summed up by Sue, chairing the first session, introducing the small groups as "a chance to study but being experiential groups..." It is called a study day and therefore that has to be the main aim. There are obviously different ways to study the theme – academically, experientially. The problem though is that the small groups invariably in my experience tend towards the experiential with little or no attempt to understand the process and content with reference to the theme. This to my mind is the responsibility of the group and in particular the role of the group conductor. The result is that little learning in the form of understanding, developing and refining the

concepts that we use takes place. It was surprising, at least to me, how often in our small group we could not agree on what had actually been said in the presentations. Something of a block to discussion!

In our small group there was a strong response to being lectured at, if I can put it like that. Several people, me included, felt that the process rendered them feeling stupid as if (we) should have been able to take in and digest all this material. I wonder if this points to an unconscious dynamic that I know will have many roots, that there is a defence against learning which is manifest in the structure as it is this which has the effect of shutting down the space in which learning can occur. There is much more that might be said about the weekend but I want to keep the focus on the weekend structure.

I hope others will add their voice to this because I know for sure that the few that have spoken are not a small minority and may not be a minority at all! I hope the committee can give this some thought. It is of course relevant to many if not all our events.

John Hook

Editor: I would welcome further correspondence and debate about John's post – please send to me at my email address or to the Group Analytic Society International office.

Remembering Lithuania : Fathers, Groups and the 'Patric'

Last summer, I was privileged to attend a conference hosted by the Lithuanian Group-Analytic Society, held in the beautiful countryside near Vilnius, and entitled 'Different Homes for Group Analysis.' I learned a great deal: the presentations were rich and varied. The group work consolidated a sense of shared purpose, in our playing with ideas and thinking about each others' culture and work.

I presented some reflections on group work with patients in the north of Scotland. My focus was on making a link between paternal, historical and cultural factors in the local foundation matrix – or as I termed it, the 'patrix' – and current findings of low self esteem and confidence in people from the Highland region of Scotland.

I provide a brief account here.

In Scotland, the government recently commissioned a review of national levels of confidence, or self-esteem, amongst school-aged children. Levels were found to be comparatively low, and declined at puberty. Although Scots generally feel some pride in their nationality, research found a 'poverty of expectation' in young Scots – 'a palpable sense of resignation'.

The reported pessimism of the nation can be linked to significant health problems including depression, suicide and lowered life expectancy due to cardiovascular disease and cancer.

Working as a psychiatrist in the Scottish Highlands, I often treat men and women who embody the defeated outlook described above – and who seek to assuage their pain with alcohol and drugs, finding no means to talk about its origins.

As a group therapist, I became interested in thinking about factors in the foundation matrix which could contribute to this clinical picture. The Highland population has significant levels of poverty, unemployment and mental illness. Even allowing for demographic factors, the suicide rate has generally been higher than expected compared with other parts of Britain. Many people live in scattered communities, miles from the more densely populated towns. Social isolation can intensify experiences of stigma in vulnerable people, although local initiatives attempt to address this.

Apart from contemporary factors, I wondered about historical contributors to the social psyche in Highland.

The past is ever present in Highland culture: in its folk songs, stories, tartans and heritage sites. Traditionally, there was for many centuries, a patriarchal culture, with tribes or clans occupying territory held under the leadership of the clan chiefs. Three key events have served to undermine the people's confidence - literally 'trust' - in the male leader:

- 1) The Glen Coe Massacre: 1692



The clans were required to swear an oath of allegiance to the king (William of Orange). The MacDonald clan chief was late in doing so, and it was decided to make an example of his clan. The Campbell clan, under orders, visited the MacDonalds, and enjoyed their hospitality for days, before slaughtering them. The mountains of Glen Coe, the MacDonald homeland, are said to mourn the betrayal and massacre to this day.

2) The Battle of Culloden : 1746



The Jacobite Highlanders fought for 'Bonnie' Prince Charlie, the pretender to the throne of England, Scotland and Ireland. Loyal but ill-prepared, they were soon killed in large numbers by the efficient Government troops, led by the Duke of Cumberland – who took savage revenge on the survivors of battle.

Complex divisions arose when some clan chiefs made their sons fight on both sides, against each other.

Highland dress and the Gaelic language were suppressed.

3) The Highland Clearances- 18th and 19th century



With government support, aristocratic landowners began to prioritise sheep rearing over allowing their tenants to work the land. With no legal protection, many families were forcibly evicted from their homes, displaced or exiled.

These examples of patriarchal oppression are very much alive in the culture of the north Highlands, imbuing the history of the local people with complex and ambiguous feelings about their identity, sense of belonging and capacity to trust.

I believe these problematic foundation matrix elements – the troubled, and failing ‘patrix’ – emerge when working with groups in Highland. Patients are very fearful of knowing anyone when they join a group. Whilst this is common in group work, and understandable, for reasons of confidentiality, there is here the additional contribution of high levels of shame and mistrust. Much work is required to get past this concern and bring patients into groups.

However, once they have been supported and enabled to join a group, patients often benefit significantly – it is also part of their heritage to be group-oriented, to understand the value of sharing and discourse.

The role of group leader or conductor requires careful navigation, as always, but particularly with awareness of the potential in Highland groups for the emergence of a strong desire for, and fear of the primal leader.

The group patrix

I conceptualise the group patrix as the partner concept to the matrix, illustrated in this simple sketch. In a configuration reminiscent of Winnicott's family group, the good enough father (group patrix) embraces the good enough mother (group matrix) who in turn enables the baby (group) to thrive:



As groups mature, reference to cultural themes can be held and talked about. In Highland, surnames can be significant, and churn up old rivalries and legends. (I have been reminded by patients that my own surname was outlawed in the eighteenth century!) Language can be a means to alienate or unite, and Gaelic speakers are revered as holders of the old tradition – even when they learn it at evening class.

Above all, new ways of thinking about and defining self and community can emerge through groups – men who can express themselves without alcohol, women who feel secure in new roles.

But the shadow of the ‘old fathers’ remains in the mind of the group.

At the Lithuanian meeting, I was delighted to hear how these ideas were taken up by others, and thought about in relation to different contexts, including:

The painful histories of the nations represented at the meeting – across centuries to the present day

The held-in stories and sense-making around this, often unspoken

The malignant nature of betrayal and its impact on the social unconscious

The complex nature of ‘fatherlands’ and ‘motherlands’ - their identities, shaped through language and folklore

*The complex legacy of forefathers who made many mistakes, and leave
a challenge to all who would aspire to be certain of 'identity' and role
The challenge of both remembering the past but not getting caught up
and imprisoned in it*

References

Scottish Government Discussion Paper: 'Confidence in Scotland' 2006

Art:

'Glen Coe Massacre' 1883 James Hamilton

'Battle of Culloden' 1746 David Morier

'The Last of the Clan' 1865 Thomas Faed

Dr Chris MacGregor, Consultant Psychiatrist and Psychotherapist

NHS Highland Mental Health Services, Inverness

**Re-Mean the Healthcare Communications: Balint Groups and
Foulkes Groups**

In 1993, the seminar entitled “Antipigmalion: Group analysis and the educational revolution” was held in Bari. On this occasion we were able to compare the contributions of Leonardo Ancona, Maria Giordano, Giovanni Guerra, Alberto Patella and Alice von Platen and this began the collaboration between the Interuniversity Research Centre, the “Laboratory of Group Analysis and Epistemology” (C.I.R.La.G.E. University of Bari, Perugia and Verona) and the Group-Analytic Society (G.A.S.) in London. This laid the basis for promoting the establishment of the Group-Analytic Italian Institute (I.G.I.) in Bari, an international outpost of education according to the group-analytic method.

At that time, Maria Giordano (G.A.S. full member and professor of Epistemology in Education Sciences – University of Bari) and Alberto Patella (G.A.S. full member and professor of Clinical Psychology in Medicine – University of Bari) acquired the research conducted by Jane Abercrombie on university teaching and developed these ideas, applying them in their teaching courses, in basic and applied research, and in vocational training for professional helpers.

In this climate of collaboration, the G.A.S., in the person of President Gerda Winther, delivered to the two group-analysts of Bari international the award of the Jane Abercrombie Prize in 2006. The collaboration between G.A.S., C.I.R.La.G.E. and the I.G.I. is further increased in subsequent years by the presence of Malcolm Pines in Bari.

On October 26th 2012, Malcom Pines was in Bari. His presence provided an opportunity for the three educational institutions above mentioned

to propose an educational experience and professional courses for doctors, psychologists and other professional figures in the health sector.

The focus came to be on “Re-mean the Communication between Professional Help and the Patient, along with the Parental and Institutional Entourages: Balint Groups and Foulkes Groups”. We also intend to recover the therapeutic, educational and cognitive value of communicative processes. The event was organized by C.I.R.La.G.E. in collaboration with the I.G.I. and was contained within the circuit of the Ministerial ECM (Continuing Medical Education).

The tension of dealing with the complex issue of communication in health care comes from the many and varied questions that the Apulian (a region of Italy in Southern Italy bordering the Adriatic Sea in the east, the Ionian Sea to the southeast) community poses, at different levels and in different ways, to the two analytical national educational institutions that have managed the event. A common undertone of these applications, is the cry of complaint that professionals launch when they recognize the inadequacy of basic and specialized courses (degree courses, pre-training and post-graduate courses, refresher courses and masters) in the training of communicative relations that are necessary when employed in a health care profession.

The legislative measure that encouraged us in this direction was passed in 1999, and establishes the obligation for healthcare professionals to adhere to professional regulation by entering the “National System of Continuing Medical Education” in Italy. Doctors, psychologists and professionals in healthcare are obliged to participate in a number of

events organized by Provider Institutions. A number of credits are assigned to each event until the quota set by the Ministry of Health (150 Training Credits in three years) is reached, the latter based on the hours of study and formulae through which learning takes place. But, as is often the case, motivation in actively partaking in this process is not always on par with the obligation incurred.

The C.I.R.La.G.E., National Entity Provider since 2011, is aware of this problem. Since 2005, it has assessed professionals on their reasons for partaking in these events prior to participation, in order to exclude those who may wish to accumulate sterile credits. This choice is in line with the group analytic methodology that the centre adopts, and at the same time, it recognizes the clinical value of the motivational drive behind the demand for training. Analysis of motivation takes place through analytical interviews conducted by individuals trained in the methodology of group analysis.

Thirty-six figures of professional help, doctors and psychologists attended the event on 26th October, 2008.

In March 2008, the British analysts gave a valuable contribution to the interactive international Symposium entitled “Learning of Mirroring”. Malcolm Pines explored the psychological process of “Mirroring” and its incidence in professional communication and relational dynamics. He explored the components as a therapist, researcher and editor.

From the discussion of the important innovations of “Balint Groups” and “Foulkes Groups”, Malcolm Pines is a reminder of the need for a

professional re-signification of communication between doctors, psychologists, patients and parental and institutional entourages. In fact, the extreme complexity that currently characterizes therapeutic interactions places a decisive role on communication in the development of therapeutic relationships. It is within the communicative relationship that professional intervention develops and is articulated. What is more, in health care, communication is often seen as an externalized means of conveying information. It also fails to consider that the timing and manner in which communication takes place and that constitutes the very core of the relationship. These are not marginal characteristics .

In this sense, the presence of Malcolm Pines warrants the initiation of a reflection that draws directly from his experience as a therapist and teacher/trainer alongside the greatest exponents of group analysis. Among these are Michael Balint and Sigmund Foulkes, both of whom were crucial authors in his formative and professional career. Balint and Foulkes are analysts who have presented and revealed to the scientific world the extraordinary resource of the dynamics of the analytic group, albeit for different reasons.

“Balint groups” and “Foulkes groups ” though supported by several methodological plants and initiated with a different purpose in mind, largely exemplify that the communicative dynamics that have developed within them play a dual therapeutic and educational role. This shows that professional relationships arise from, and in, communicative dynamics .

The event of October 26th was divided into three seventy-five minute sessions. This division was based on the need of the organizers to facilitate the assimilation of the focus of each particular session. The first session focused on the pioneer discovery of “Balint groups”, while the second focused on innovations from “Foulkes groups”. The third session led to a discussion on the need to “redefine the complexity of communications concerning the request for aid”.

The division of the sessions traces the historical evolution of the development of group analytic science. It aimed to instigate the “re-enactment”, in which one reads contributions proposed by Balint groups and Foulkes groups on different levels, remaining aware of the close connection of the cultural moment in which they were born.

Malcolm Pines outlined the contribution of Michael Balint, remembering the many moments of confrontation that occurred between them. The Hungarian analyst, disciple of Sandor Ferenczi, moved to England to escape the oppression of the authoritarian regime established in Hungary. In the early nineteen thirties he began to hold seminars on psychoanalysis, but this initiative was met with suspicion by the pre-Nazi regime of Horthy, clearly intent on ostracising all forms of cultural innovation that may have awoken minds entranced by the control policy imposed upon them by the dictatorship.

This control was expressed through the presence of a police officer systematically forced upon them, Malcolm Pines recounted, remembering the time when he learned this from Balint. He met Balint at the Tavistock Clinic in London in 1948 on his arrival. He does not hesitate to call him “brilliant, charismatic and provocative”. He was

witness to the training program that Balint offered to general practitioners in the hospital setting. General doctors lacked the specific psychological training required for communicative interaction with patients. The practice that was then in use at the Tavistock, offered medical seminars and conferences, filling their minds with abstract knowledge without leading to any improvement of their skills in interpersonal interaction. Balint focused on a methodology to allow all participating physicians to look at the psychological aspects of communication within the therapeutic relationship, and to dissolve the problematic points of their relationship with the patient, starting with the discussion of a clinical case presented by one of the doctors of the training group. The Balint groups focus primarily on developing interpersonal communication skills between doctors and their patients.

In 1942, Foulkes began his experience with groups in the military hospital of Northfield. The large number of patients, united by the traumatic experience of World War Two, induced him to explore the possibility of group therapy. Malcolm Pines attributed the origins of group analytic methodology to this experience. On the field, Foulkes discovered that the mental status of every patient was an expression of his matrix of belonging and of his plexus. Being able to work in a hospital allowed him to observe that all health care figures working in the structure entered into the therapeutic relationship. On the basis of these discoveries, Foulkes warmly supported the necessity of converting Northfield hospital into a therapeutic centre. In realizing this, the new group analytic methodology showed its ulterior power in being an instrument of education and training for professional figures, and a therapeutic measure for the patients.

The extension of the two-person relationship between doctors and their patients, to all of the figures within the hospital, broadens the field of communication on which the therapeutic relationship in the hospital sector is founded, and in every strongly institutionalized health care structure.

The third and final session of the event, “Redefining the Communication of Professional Help with the Patient and Parental and Institutional Entourages. Balint group and Foulkes group”. Malcolm Pines participated with Maria Giordano, Epistemologist of Psychological and Clinical Sciences, lecturer in the Department of Educational Sciences, Psychology and Communication of the University “Aldo Moro”, Stefano Favale, Head of the Department of Cardiology of the University Hospital of Bari and of the School of Specialization in Cardiology, Maria Teresa Montagna, Professor of Hygiene and President of the Degree Course in Communication Science at the branch office of the University of Bari in Taranto, and Alberto Patella, a clinical psychologist at the Medical Faculty of the University “Aldo Moro” in Bari.

In the third session Malcolm Pines was faced with more stringent difficulties present in both educational and clinical contexts. Recalling various personal and other experiences, the four Italian speakers voiced the urgent need to provide professional help with communication skills. Stefano Favale initiated a discussion on the emotional issues that affect both health professionals and patients in the course of medical practice in cardiology. He spoke of the harshness of working in a conscious way, not just as an implement identified with being alive, but also of the

complexity of dealing with the difficulties of patients in accepting interventions retained as highly intrusive. You will understand the difficulties of accepting the presence of an artificial heart and the need for a transplant. How can these emotions be dealt with so that they do not have repercussions in medical practice? Which communication skills do cardiologists and their staff possess in order to work well in this situation of ambivalence? In what way can a transplant be talked about with patients and their families?

In this regard, Malcolm Pines spoke of his clinical experience in the hospital, and stressed how important it is that the diagnosis be communicated by the voices of different figures within the hospital. This multi-level communication helps the patient and his entourage in visualising the disease and its outcomes.

The focus on clinical practice in the hospital raises further communication problems before a specific intervention. Maria Teresa Montagna asked how it is possible to overcome the limitations imposed on Italy by the Privacy Act which prevents communication of a diagnosis, thus impeding involvement by other professionals involved in the treatment process. Maria Giordano proceeded with her confrontation, continually raising epistemological questions. She stated that the communication of the diagnosis and in the organization of professional intervention, medical and health sciences should go hand in hand with other disciplines. In the absence of this knowledge, diversity of disciplines appears to strongly impede communication both between professionals themselves and with their patients.

Stress diagnosed by a doctor defines a different phenomenon to the psychological distress gauged by a clinical psychologist. The process of providing therapeutic interventions are clearly different.

Alberto Patella enriched the seminar by volunteering his official teaching experience in General Psychology and Clinical Psychology in the Faculty of Medicine at the University of Bari. For twenty years he has applied the methodology of interactive network proposed by Jane Abercrombie in British universities in the seventies. Following her example, Patella highlights the necessity to educate young medicine students to interactional competency standards, from the very beginning of their university studies. He agrees with Jane Abercrombie as she proposes explicitly in *The Anatomy of Judgement*, where she writes “in group discussion on the other hand, the emphasis is on the students talking to each other and the lines of communications form a network”.

Teaching the methodology of interactive networks, being based upon the principles of group analysis, allows students to think, elaborate and process the information with which they are presented. It provides them with the prerequisites to make them aware of the risk of falling victim to scholasticism. It draws attention to specialized scientific language and the implications of the language used during diagnosis and therapeutic practice. Diagnosing a patient, speaking of stress to indicate psychological distress, is equivalent to reducing the psychological complexity of suffering to an organic level. It creates the erroneous perception that it is of an exclusively pharmacological nature.

Giovanni Giordano. Clinical Psychologist; Doctoral candidate in Hygiene and Public Health – Faculty of Medicine – University of Bari
Group-Analytic Italian Institute (I.G.I.) – Bari – Italy
e-mail: giordano_gio@hotmail.com

**A Personal Tribute to Lionel Kreeger, MD, MRCP (Ed),
MRCPsych, DPM**

Born 27 April 1926; Died 18 April 2013

I feel honoured to give this personal Tribute to Lionel Kreeger towards whom I have felt great affection, gratitude and respect. Born and bred in London, Lionel qualified at Guy's Hospital in 1949. He was appointed a Consultant Psychiatrist and Psychotherapist at the Halliwick Hospital in 1965, where he worked closely with Pat de Maré in establishing a therapeutic community culture employing small and large groups. He moved to the Paddington Centre for Psychotherapy in 1973, and to the Tavistock Clinic in 1978. Lionel qualified as a Freudian Psychoanalyst of the Independent school in 1969. He joined the Group Analytic Practice in 1967, and became a member of the Management Committee of it in 1972. An active member of the Group Analytic Society, he was a staff participant in several workshops and scientific events both in the UK and abroad. He was a member of the Executive Committee of the Group Analytic Society and an important contributor to GAIPAC, writing several

articles about therapeutic communities. A Founder Member of the Institute of Group Analysis, he was a training group analyst, a member of the Training Committee, and a member of the Council. Twice the Chairman of the 'General Course', Lionel introduced many of our current members to group analysis. He also functioned as a bridge from the world of psychoanalysis to the world of group analysis. He never really retired formally, continuing to consult to several patients and colleagues, and maintaining his memberships of several professional organisations.

I would like to share a few personal associations about Lionel as a mentor, colleague and friend. However, I have so many memories and anecdotes about him that it is very hard to know what to leave out, a challenge which always fascinated him in his critical appreciation of many forms of creative work, often alluding to the preoccupations of Bion and Beckett with the meaning of lacks and boundaries. As my mentor, Lionel supervised one of my first psychoanalytical cases. He also helped me recover from a difficult experience with my previous supervisor. Although very often we did little more than smoke, drink coffee and sit in silence, after supervision with Lionel, I felt self-confident, and willing to show the detail of my work.

Lionel helped me with my chapter for his very successful book *The Large Group*. Yet, from time to time he went out of his way to thank me for my contribution. We spent hours discussing cases and ideas. He had many ideas for articles and books, which found expression in the work of his students and younger colleagues.

He took enormous trouble in helping me find a training psychoanalyst, eventually referring me to Adam Limentani, his own training analyst. I soon realised that we had begun to speak the same language of British 'Subject' Relations. We often had the same thoughts when participating in a seminar or 'experiential' group, sometimes supporting each other with a quick 'snap'.

As a colleague, Lionel was difficult to categorise. Although he was an Independent psychoanalyst, he referred to himself as a group analyst. Actually, in my opinion, he was a neo-Kleinian Group Analyst, albeit one who offered interpretations as hypotheses rather than as identity confirming prayers. He remained open to ideas from various traditions, acknowledging the influence of Jung, Freud, various analysts within the British Independent tradition, Bion, Yalom and even Foulkes. However, Lionel came more and more to focus on the unconscious dynamics of the group and how the members of it related to one another, and less and less on the unconscious dynamics of personal transferences to himself, or in other words on the 'horizontal' rather than the 'vertical'. He appreciated the value of dynamic administration, allowing the group to look after itself.

He was very keen to follow projective and introjective identifications, accepting whatever a patient might bring, but insisting that the truth of an interpretation of such processes was open to 'negotiation'. He was truly 'relational' in his experience of clinical processes. When I once suggested that perhaps it might be better if he were more active, and

took more risks with his interventions, he replied that it was always better for a patient to make his own discoveries.

He was a great listener, responsive to the full range and variety of communications. He loved the Foulkesian metaphor of listening to the music of a group. This was entirely consistent with his love and knowledge of classical music. He took enormous pleasure in attending concerts and operas, often with colleagues who appreciated the connections between conducting a performance and conducting a therapeutic group.

Lionel also appreciated various forms of the visual arts, and often frequented galleries and exhibitions with his beloved wife Marianne, whose paintings, drawings and prints adorned the walls of his consulting room. He was a keen collector of antiques, taking a special interest in ceramics, candlesticks and containers of various sorts, including 'grotesques'. Music, arts and crafts were a source of imagery for his style of clinical communication.

It is confusing that Lionel's two great intellectual interests, 'the large group' and 'envy pre-emption', are so different from each other, until one realises that for Lionel, as for Bion, the large group is a manifestation of the internal worlds of regressed persons, and that envy pre-emption is a way to focus on the most primitive aspects of the human condition. Protecting ourselves from the destructive envy of the object of our own envy involves a shift from the usual focus on protecting the object from our primary envy of it. Lionel explained these

ideas with eloquence and simplicity in his 16th Foulkes Lecture 'Envy Pre-Emption in Small and Large Groups', in 1992.

As a friend it is hard to think of Lionel outside the context of his family. Lionel and Marianne were married in 1950 and were inseparable for 59 years until she died in 2009. He was a loving father to Joanna, Lulu and Sarah, each of whom followed Lionel into the medical/helping professions, and an admiring grandfather and supportive father in-law. These relationships were at the very core of Lionel's personal identity. Lionel and his family were extremely supportive of me and my family. He took great pleasure in holding my new grandson. Certainly they supported us through our personal and domestic trials and tribulations. I am sure that Lionel was in cahoots with my analyst, helping me have a therapeutic regression while at the same time stopping me from too much acting out. In the process we got through a very great deal of Single Malt Whisky while suffering the slings and arrows of our bets on the market. I seem to remember that we did very well trading the shares of a company which manufactured helicopters, until Lionel made the mistake of interpreting our behaviour, after which we never got it quite right again.

Lionel had a great sense of humour. He used his vast store of Jewish jokes to make an interpretation or to illustrate an important point in debate. For example, he thought that I was too preoccupied with anti-Semitism in England, and advised me to stop commenting on it. I answered that I would, provided that he stopped telling Jewish jokes. He replied 'Fine. I will try. But have you heard the one about humility?'

The only time I ever experienced Lionel as taking delight in the misfortune of another person was when he heard that a colleague in Detroit, who had written a contemptuous review of his and Pat's Introduction to Group Treatment in Psychiatry, had been shot by a patient. I asked Marianne why Lionel was so bothered by one bad review. She replied that I did not realise how easily Lionel's feelings could be hurt. Incidentally, this book is still worth reading.

When I apologised to Lionel that in recent months I had not come to visit him as often as I had wanted, he said that he understood that I needed space. He accepted my anger towards him for opting out of the political struggles of our profession, and for the consequences of this. He also forgave me for not accepting repeated invitations to become a Partner in the Group Analytic Practice. During one of my last visits, Lionel said that he wanted me to sit with him as he approached death, as much, if not more, for my sake as for his, and that I would understand better after he died. However, he realised that I did understand that during the last few decades he had relinquished parts of himself several times: when he became ill in 1978; when the Group Analytic Practice lost its mojo and subsequently becoming a traumatised aggregate (perhaps in connection with the death of SH Foulkes and the circumstances in which this occurred); and when Marianne became increasingly unwell and finally died in 2009.

Lionel would have called it 'synchronicity' that a few hours after his own funeral, the same room was used for the funeral of Ms Betty Joseph, who was his first psychoanalyst, and with whom he had what he himself

called a 'failed' analysis'. Their difficulties influenced the somewhat forced differentiation of group analysis from psychoanalysis, which Lionel came to regret, thinking that too much splitting and projection was involved. During the last couple of years he felt a strong desire to make peace with Ms Joseph, having heard that she had similar feelings and was amenable to consultation. Lionel had begun to ruminate about having such an experience so late in their lives. However, while sitting with him in almost total silence, I decided I should tell him that Ms Joseph had died a few days previously. I am not sure whether he was relieved or disappointed that he would not have to think any more about the possibilities of reconciliation. I hope that he trusted us with our own collective enactments of this.

I am sure that as a Tribute to him Lionel would really have liked a 'small large group' in which we reminisced about him and group analysis. He would have called it a 'small large group' in order to avoid controversy about whether there really is such a thing as a 'median group'. He would not have wanted us to dwell on the positive aspects of the story, but to discuss how 'it had all gone wrong', which is what he had come to feel. In particular he was concerned that the Group Analytic Society International and the Institute of Group Analysis had expanded too quickly. He believed that block training should have remained a kind of post-graduate specialisation, and an activity to be used only in certain circumstances for certain purposes, such as bringing Group Analysis into a new country or region. He also believed that as a general rule group analysts should be trained in psychoanalysis and psychoanalysts in group

analysis. Even if we did not train formally, we should have these experiences both clinically and in supervision.

Perhaps we will be able to give such a gift to him, including our understanding of how it has all gone 'well enough'. The fact that such a memorial event is already being organised is testimony to how much he will be missed by all of us. I personally will remember Lionel as a man who remained a container for the sorrows and sufferings of others, virtually until the very end of his life, taking great pleasure and satisfaction, what in Yiddish is called 'Naches' in the successes and well being of his friends.

Earl Hopper, Ph.D.

Book and Review Corner

Pertegrato, E.G. & G.O. From Psychoanalysis to Group Analysis: The Pioneering Work of Trigant Burrow. New International Library of Group Analysis, Karnac Books, London 2013.

This latest volume from NILGA raises from psychoanalytic depths a stricken vessel that is still in pristine shape. The Editors have spent long

years bringing together this reappraisal of the work of one of the USA's very first psychoanalysts who was also the pioneer of group-analysis, if by this term we mean a number of people sitting together and exploring their interactions as peers in an open, determined and honest way. The volume is divided into two sections. The latter and longer is the presentation of seventeen of Burrow's papers from 1913 to 1930 that, in chronological order, illustrate his early commitment to psychoanalysis, then his describing and championing of group-analytic perspectives ending distinctly with six papers on group-analysis *per se*.

To many readers here this may come as a shock or else a resolve to tell me to get my facts right - "Foulkes invented group-analysis!" they may cry. Only this book on group-analysis shows that not only does it have a history that stretches to the Great War (when Foulkes, Elias and Boon were barely in their Twenties and serving as soldiers) but that it originated in the USA following a confrontation between psychoanalyst Trigant Burrow and one of his patients, Clarence Shields. Analysand Shields challenged analyst Burrow to change places with him because he judged that the situation in the consulting room favoured Burrow as analyst and disfavoured him as client, and he thought that Burrow would have the same difficulties he experienced as a patient if they would swap places. Burrow agreed and the patient acted as analyst; they found that Burrow did possess neuroses, as the patient did, but it also revealed that the patient when acting as analyst also sheltered behind his authority role just as Burrow had when in that role.

Gradually Burrow expanded this situation of peers to include another two persons, or students, and then more until there were up to twenty in a group. He published on this work from 1926, read papers to analytic gatherings and corresponded with Freud about this extension of psychoanalysis though all the time he was moving increasingly further away from psychoanalytic theory. He sought to bring that theory with him and he cannot be faulted for not being able to. He was treated with great caution by Freud and his colleagues in the USA. He created the Lifwynn Foundation for group-analysis activity at a place in the New England hills where he had a property. Here he invited students and patients and like-minded colleagues to take part in group-analysis. The large questions asked by the two editors of the book are, why was he treated thus by the psychoanalytic world? and why has he been ignored by later group-analysts except for minor and mainly dismissive mentions in a few books?

The editors explain his ostracism by psychoanalysis as due to his "suspect" history. Despite having been the first American psychiatrist analysed in Europe (1909-1910) by an analyst, that analyst happened to be Carl Jung. After the split with Freud all Jung's works and connections past and future were treated by the Viennese school with deep suspicion. Once Burrow's experience with his patient Clarence Shields became known, something Burrow made no secret of but included in one of the papers in the volume under review, he would inevitably have been suspected even more of deviance from mainstream analysis. His later advocacy of using groups to understand human nature will have ratcheted up the distrust evinced towards him. In 1931 he was virtually

expelled by the APA despite having been a founder member and dismissed from his university post. His papers were rejected for publication by psychoanalytic journals. He withdrew to the Lifwynn Foundation and continued to espouse what he had by now renamed phyloanalysis. His earlier essays are written in complex socio-analytic language; D H Lawrence wrote to him, "But sometimes your sentences are like Laocoon snakes, one never knows where the head is nor the tail" . (Huxley, A. "The Letters of D.H. Lawrence", Heinemann, 1956, London . p.676). But as you read the papers this style eases into more readily understandable language though slipping back into the earlier manner once in a while. His relationship with DH Lawrence and other artists and writers is also another interesting aspect to his life.

In their Introductory Essay the editors examine in detail how this ostracism came about; it makes uncomfortable reading because it uncovers the extent to which the analytic community of the day - and later - was prepared to go to excommunicate and ignore someone about whom it had been signalled that he was hereafter *persona non grata*. This is alarming reading for those who believe in the inclusiveness of the analytic world, for this was prejudice against the practice of academic and scientific freedom. Not that Burrow was ever an *infant terrible*. Not one bit. He always corresponded with Freud with respect and politeness and seemed never to let frustrations and anger get the better of him in public or in correspondence.

Instead his work went unacknowledged, yet like a [wrecked - omit] ship awaiting salvage it was prey to analytic plunderers. His work with group-

analysis is presented by the editors is in a similar fashion. I have followed this up and while there is evidence of his being passed over or patronised, I disagree on some of their conclusions with regard to Foulkes, though they do quote A J Anthony's dismissive judgement on Burrow having little influence: "... (Burrow) did not strongly affect the field of current group psychotherapy. Essentially, he does not belong to the history of group psychotherapy" (p. lxxxi, reviewed book).

This is complex, twisted territory. While the editors point out that Foulkes did make mention of him it was generally, they judge, to dismiss him. However at least one of Burrow's books is listed in the bibliography of each of Foulkes' books, and he does say that he had read some of his papers. The truth on this requires someone to examine Foulkes' library and see if the books were there and whether there are notes attached. There is one mention of him by Foulkes that is more fulsome than others and it is not mentioned by the editors. This may be explained by their not realising that the first edition of the Anthony-Foulkes volume ("Group psychotherapy: The Psychoanalytic Approach", Penguin, London 1957) is considerably different in its text from the second edition (1965) which is the much more often read and quoted-from volume, (though oddly neither edition is in the bibliography of their book). The difference in these two editions is just not realised by most group-analysts nor students nor by the training tutors; this needs mending urgently.

In the 1957 edition Foulkes states that T.Burrow is "one of the most important pioneers of group-analysis" and was "one of the first to recognise the group's role in the individual's neurosis ...T Burrow has

provided us with many deep insights into the understanding of groups". This encomium is 16 lines long. Added to others that may not have been so fulsome, and he does make some acknowledgement of Burrow's work, though without going into detail of how exactly this influenced him as he does with, for instance, Goldstein's work (The 1965 edition of Anthony/ Foulkes volume merely has his name in a list of earlier group therapists). Elsewhere (1964) he states clearly that while group-analysis was a term first used by Burrow and then dropped by him in favour of phyloanalysis, he, Foulkes, felt free to take it up for his own approach.

As to Burrow's influence? He is the first to use the term "matrix"(p.149 in the reviewed volume), the first to use the term "group-analysis" (1926), to use the term "social unconscious" (1924, 1926). He is the first to bring people together in small to median sized groups (4 to 20 members) in order that members interact in a free and open manner towards one another; he is one of the first to describe the idea of the "here and now": of therapeutic action he states: "...the chief modification has been in the direction of greater emphasis upon the observation *immediate material* with a proportionate disregard for reminiscent episodes" (p. 177), a very early mention of the likely usefulness of such groups in 'conflicts expressed in mental disorder and insanity, in industrial disorders and crime' (p. 187). He pioneered the interpersonal approach to psychodynamic therapy. He describes many times and in detail the generic individual's battles with and compromises over the attitudes foisted upon him by larger society and that it is this that brings about neurosis. He has been ostracised, censored, plundered and ignored. He has now been raised from the seabed of foundered

psychoanalytic vessels, and re-launched, by the enormous efforts of these two editors who have worked to ensure that Burrow's contributions are acknowledged and he restored to his due place as the pioneer of group-analysis and in many aspects of psychoanalysis. The volume is required reading for group-analysts, and Burrow's work needs large re-assessment.

Kevin Power

Introduction to a new book dedicated to Anneliese Heigl-Evers

Brief Biography: Annelise Heigl-Evers, who died in January 2002, was a German physician and psychoanalyst who largely influenced the implementation and development of group psychotherapy in Germany. For many years she was at the Lower Saxony State Hospital Tiefbrunn then at the University of Göttingen in specialist psychotherapy and she managed, from 1974 to 1977, a research centre for group dynamics at the University of Göttingen. Together with her husband Franz Heigl, to whom she had been married since 1959, she developed the Göttingen model of analytic group psychotherapy. In addition, she initiated and led numerous training sessions and organized various associations and organizations. In 1981 she founded, in Dusseldorf, the "Training Institute for Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy". She is the author of numerous books and textbooks on psychotherapy and was co-editor of the journal "Group Psychotherapy and Group Dynamics". Together with her husband

she founded in 1992 the Heigl Foundation and donated the Heigl price for empirical or conceptual work in the field of psychotherapy research.

It is a great honour to have been asked to write the introduction to this book. The original invitation came from Grete Leutz and this was followed up by Georg Gfäller. It was in 1971 that Anneliese and Franz first came to a group-analytic meeting. This was the first European Symposium of Group Analysis held in Lisbon. In the 1970s, Group Analysis, then still under the leadership of Michael Foulkes, began to attract many continental European colleagues and Group Analysis (London) was a nodal point in the growing group-analytic European network. The meeting in Portugal was a significant event. Amongst our several Portuguese friends and colleagues, there were two who had spent significant amounts of time in London: Eduardo Cortesão, who later became Professor of Psychiatry in Lisbon, and Rita Leal, who became Professor of Education at the University. The atmosphere of the Lisbon meeting was friendly and rewarding, both professionally and socially and thus began the series of three yearly meetings, one of which was held in Germany in Heidelberg. I had the pleasure of meeting Anneliese and Franz in Lisbon and again in Heidelberg. Though our meetings were infrequent, I knew that their work in Göttingen was very influential in establishing analytic group psychotherapy in German academic circles. Group analytic psychotherapy needs to meet the challenge and stimulus of universities and Anneliese and Franz were pioneers in this.

Two articles by Anneliese and Franz Heigl-Evers have appeared in the journal of the Group-Analytic Society: Group Analysis. Both were in 1970, one on Indications for Group Treatment, and the other on Indications for Combined Individual and Group Psychotherapy. It is a course for regret, that in the 30 years that have elapsed since those articles appeared, there have not been more publications and translations of their valuable work. However, the translation of books by Karl König have conveyed much of their teaching. Regretfully, the language barrier still stands, interfering with free communication between the significant work that takes place in group analytic psychotherapy in Germany and the English-speaking and reading audience. Fortunately however, the introduction of Foulkesian group analysis into Germany took place through the work of several group analysts who spoke German, either by reason of birth, or by education.

Through invitation to Germany, they opened many doors, a language barrier did not exist, though cultural and political issues still had to be confronted. Michael Lukas Moeller came to a group-analytic workshop in London and was determined to introduce group analysis into Germany. His work led to the important GRAS seminars, which my German-speaking colleagues tell me enabled German colleagues to work through issues that would not have been possible without the presence of these visiting colleagues. Then through the establishment of Institutes of Group Analysis in Heidelberg and Münster, there was the new possibility of visits and exchanges between London and these institutes.

The British group analysts who conducted the GRAS training were all graduates of the Institute of Group Analysis, also founded in the early 1970s. However, we must remember the important activities of Ilse Seglow and of Walter Schindler who were both members of the Group-Analytic Society, but were not graduates of the Institute of Group Analysis. This was because a policy was set up when the Institute was founded, that only persons who had been through a full training would become members of the Institute, that is apart from the founder members. Undoubtedly, this did lead to some hurt feelings from those who felt that they had been loyal supporters of Foulkes and group analysis for many years and who felt that this should have been acknowledged by granting them membership of the new Institute. But this does not diminish our recognition of the importance of the work that Ilse Seglow and Walter Schindler did in the post-war years.

I knew them both. Walter Schindler frequently came to meetings of the Group Analytic Society and would vigorously debate many issues with Foulkes. Their principal differences were about different models of group therapy. Walter Schindler's model was that of the group as a family: Foulkes's view was that, though the family is a group, the therapeutic group is not necessarily a family and its development is restricted by holding too closely to the model of the family. Ilse Seglow regarded her way of working as being very close to Foulkes's model.

Though I have made many visits to Germany, to lecture, to take part in conferences, my involvement has been limited through my only having a

schoolboy knowledge of German. Thus, not only has my participation in activities in Germany been limited, but my knowledge of the profound depths of German literature comes through translation. I am aware that we need to continue exploring the links between German culture and the roots of group analysis, a task which I hope will be carried out by group analysts in both countries.

I vividly recall one of the first occasions when German colleagues came to a group analytic meeting in London. This was on the occasion of the Survivor Syndrome workshop in September 1979. They were indeed courageous to come and take part in small and large group meetings, where many refugees from Germany and survivors of concentration camps were present. They were very powerful and moving encounters which have been described in the Special Supplement in Group Analysis, November 1980, and which are described in Earl Hopper's forthcoming book of Collected Papers, "The Social Unconscious" (Jessica Kingsley Publications, 2002).

Over the years, I have had the opportunity and pleasure of working with several colleagues in the committees of the International Association of Group Psychotherapy. I succeeded Grete Leutz as President of that Association and look forward to the time when there will again be a German president of this important association. The Group Analytic Society (London) has had a German President, Werner Knauss, a situation that would not have seemed possible until comparatively recently. Thus, the barriers between the different language groups and national groups are becoming boundaries, no longer barriers. I see from

the outline of this book that there are many important historical and contemporary issues written about and I hope that the translation of some of this work will appear in English language journals

Finally, I wish to salute the memories and achievements of these two enterprising pioneers whose work made a truly significant contribution to analytic group psychotherapy.

Malcolm Pines

2nd July 2002

**Film Review : Etre et Avoir – an example of embodying
the good enough mother and good enough father in a
group setting**

The French documentary film, *Etre et Avoir* (2002), directed by Nicolas Philibert, offers a charming and thought-provoking observation of the work and life of schoolteacher Georges Lopez and his pupils in a single class school in rural France. Scenes of classroom activity are punctuated with shifting tableaux of labour and landscapes in an agricultural community. We see Monsieur Lopez holding together his young group, of mixed age and gender, with a quiet, warm and authoritative blend of teaching and pastoral care. The camera captures his ability to work at different levels with

his charges, according to age and ability, encouraging self-expression within a safely boundaried space and daily timetable. Life's familiar childhood dramas are portrayed : the boy with a sick father, the 'different' adolescent girl who cannot integrate, the buoyant Jojo, who needs firm but encouraging containment in order to show (and know) what he can do.

Monsieur Lopez directs the younger pupils to reconcile after a simple playground fracas but sits the older ones down to consider the underlying, more complex reasons for their falling out. Questions are offered much more frequently than answers; room is left for the child to make connections. In the scenes where children seek family help with homework, we experience the child's life as part of an extended cultural foundation matrix. Over the year's record, we see the development of each child's sense of identity and community .There is a tense moment when , on the school outing, Alize seems lost but teacher and pupils calmly call through the long grass till she is found, and our trust in the group leader's carefully judged risk-taking is rewarded.

We see the little infants visiting the class in preparation for joining, and also the visit made to the big school where the older pupils will go next. Always, there is a rhythm, etched by the seasons and an understanding of life's natural order – of the need "to be and to have' in order to feel part of humanity. The 'being' is in the full and rich experience of

existing in the world, and the 'having' is in the acquisition of personal autonomy and interpersonal awareness.

Monsieur Lopez is a skilled group conductor, comfortable with both his male authority and his female nurturing self. Such is the understated equilibrium within which he balances these aspects of his role, that they are seamlessly fused into one, and the tears that he sheds as his children leave for the summerbreak, are those of a master craftsman. Following the film's release, and the many awards it received, he brought a lawsuit against the film makers, claiming that the film had been used for purposes other than those he had been given to expect (principally educational).

Some of the children were reported to have experienced stress-related problems as a result of the publicity surrounding the film. Monsieur Lopez's claim was overruled but leaves an interesting question about the potential risks of third-party observation, and the effect of documentary film making on those involved – a debate familiar to group analysts - which focuses on the nature of relationships between subjects and objects, and of participation in this social world of ours.

Dr Chris MacGregor, Consultant Psychiatrist and Psychotherapist
NHS Highland Mental Health Services, Inverness

Citations and Abstracts of Articles from Other Journals

Behr, H. (2001). *The importance of being father: a tribute to Robin Skynner.* *Journal Of Family Therapy*, 23 (3).

The notion that the theory and practice of psychotherapy can be learned through the experience of personal therapy comes in the main from psychoanalysis. For the early psychoanalysts the passing on of therapeutic skills had faintly biblical overtones. It was important to know who begat whom, descending from Freud, and schools of practice became lodged in categories which hallowed the memory of a particular founding figure. Psychologist Robin Skynner was startlingly open about his likes and dislikes of certain behaviours and attitudes. It seemed as if Skynner's therapeutic philosophy embodied a kind of simple behaviourism, which rewarded emotional openness with analytic attention and offered incentives to the 'closed' members of the group to join the fray. Some of Skynner's techniques belonged more to family therapy than to stranger group therapy. Families seem better able to sustain the therapist's subjective responses towards individuals, which may even be needed if strongly held defences are to be shaken.

Burman, E. (2001). *Engendering authority in the group.* *Psychodynamic Counselling*, 7 (3), 347-369.

In this paper I analyse ways of thinking about authority relations in groups. As a specific example of more general processes I discuss the gendering of power and authority within group processes. Using vignettes from an experiential women's group, I attempt to identify and evaluate available ways of conceiving power relationships between women in groups (sister-sister; mother-daughter; the masquerade, the androgyne, honorary man, the father of whatever sex, and the lesbian). From this the paper calls, first, for a move away from treating gender as the primary organizer of difference in order to address the diverse and intersecting forms of power relations operating within groups and, second, to broaden consideration of women's positions within dyadic and group processes beyond the current (conventionally de-sexualized) maternal metaphor. It is argued that attending in these ways to sexed/gendered relations within groups offers vital resources towards

theorizing and exploring the group body, whereby the group is conceived of as composed of embodied minds structured not only around gender but also by relations of class, 'race' and sexuality. This approach therefore envisages group psychotherapies as providing psychic surfaces between familial and broader cultural relations in which transformative group relations can be prefigured.

Parker, S., & Leggett, A. (2012). *Teaching the clinical encounter in psychiatry: a trial of Balint groups for medical students.* Australasian Psychiatry: Bulletin Of Royal Australian And New Zealand College Of Psychiatrists, 20(4), 343-347.

Balint groups are being trialled as a method to facilitate understanding of the relational aspects of student encounters with psychiatric patients. This paper reports on the establishment, processes and trends in the student evaluations of these groups.

Method: The groups have been introduced as part of the medical student curriculum at a tertiary referral hospital. In six of the eight weeks of the clinical rotation in psychiatry, students meet in a group led by the authors, to discuss relational aspects of their interactions with patients. Ten third-year postgraduate medical students participate in the group each rotation. The educational value of each meeting and the group overall is assessed using questionnaires.

Results: The groups tended to be rated positively by the participants. However, students were less certain of the relevance to their clinical practice. Vignettes demonstrating aspects of group process are presented in the context of the leaders' experiential account.

Conclusions: Short-term clinical reflection groups can be effectively implemented for medical students in a hospital environment. These groups have the potential to support students in the process of learning to work in doctor-patient relationships, but may encounter significant challenges necessitating adaptation of method and process to context.

Parker, V. (2010). *A counsellor's personal reflection on facilitating a 'Balint Group' for GPs.* Psychodynamic Practice, 16(1), 79-88.

A personal narrative is presented which explores the author's experience of working with general practitioners to investigate the relationships between patients and their doctors.

Sandner, D. (1998). *[The founding of group analysis by Trigant Burrow - a peculiar amnesia within the tradition of group analysis]*. *Luzifer-Amor: Zeitschrift Zur Geschichte Der Psychoanalyse*, 11(21), 7-29.

The concept of group analysis as formulated by Trigant Burrow (1875-1950), the founder of group analysis, will be explicated on the basis of three of his most important essays. Emphasis will be placed 1. on Burrow's dialogue with psychoanalysis--he regarded group analysis as a methodological development of psychoanalysis--as well as 2. on the particular meaning of certain contents which are defended against on the social level and which can be made conscious and worked through in group analysis. Burrow's work has been largely forgotten by group analysts. This amnesia is understood as a social defense elicited by Burrow's thoughts and analyses of pathological social relationships, which exist throughout society and to which psychoanalysts and group analysts are also subject.

Lerner, M., McLeod, B., & Mikami, A. (2013). *Preliminary evaluation of an observational measure of group cohesion for group psychotherapy*. *Journal Of Clinical Psychology*, 69(3), 191-208.

Group psychotherapy research would benefit from an observational measure of group cohesion to complement existing self-report measures. This study introduces the Therapy Process Observational Coding System-Group Cohesion scale (TPOCS-GC), which observationally assesses cohesion between each member and the group.

Method: In total 27 parents participated in a group parent-training social competency intervention for children with attention deficit-hyperactivity disorder. Independent coders double-coded group cohesion and the alliance in 144 client-sessions. Parents, teachers, and children completed cognitive, behavioral, and therapy participation measures.

Results: The TPOCS-GC demonstrated modest to strong item-level inter-rater reliability and acceptable internal consistency. Group cohesion evidenced moderate stability over the course of treatment. Relations

between TPOCS-GC and theoretically linked and unrelated variables provided some evidence for construct and predictive validity.

Conclusions: This preliminary study suggests that the TPOCS-GC is a reliable instrument that may help fill an instrumentation gap in the field.

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

**GAS International Management Committee announces the
creation of a
Quarterly Members Group**

for all members

The dates for the first year's sessions, to be convened in London, are:
February 2nd, April 20th, July 13th and October 12th, 2013

Each Saturday, there will be three 90-minute sessions with a 90-minute break for lunch; the day will run from 9.30am - 4.30pm with the first group starting at 10.00

The conductor for the group will be Ian Simpson.

The venue will be the Guild of Psychotherapists, 47 Nelson Square, London SE1, three minutes walk from Southwark Underground station. In addition to the large group room, we will have the use of a kitchen; morning refreshments will be provided. For lunch, the Guild is in an area where there are many good, inexpensive places to eat.

The fee for the group will £25 per day or £80 for the year.

You can pay on the day by cash or cheque
or in advance to the GASI office
at 102 Belsize Lane, London, NW3 5BB,
+44 20 7435 6611

**Information About Conference Accommodation in London and
Donations to the Society**

Please see the GAS Website at:

<http://www.groupanalyticsociety.co.uk/>