

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITORIAL	3
PRESIDENT'S PAGE	4
Welcome to New Members	5
Deceased Members	6
32nd Foulkes Study Day: Introduction	7
Foreword to Introduction to Group-Analytic Psychotherapy	8
Preface to Introduction to Group-Analytic Psychotherapy	9
Foulkes Study Day Talk 1 by Az Hakeem	10
Foulkes Study Day Talk 2 by Liam Breen	17
Foulkes Study Day Talk 3 by Ana Luísa Santos	24
Foulkes Study Day Talk 4 by Lionel Kreeger	29
Reflections on The Foulkes Study Day by Di King	32
A Holocaust Survivor's Return by Alfred Garwood	34
In My Father's Office by Ingalill Johnsen Borley	35
Connecting Sounds and Dividing Seas by Michael Münchow	42
XXXV IAGP-SEPTG Symposium: A Bridge called Mediterranean by Concha Oneca	45

EGATIN Report by Angelika Gözl	47
The GAS Forum	51
GAS/IGA Film Group Listings	52
RESEARCH: IGA and GAS Systematic Review: History and Interim Feedback at the GAS Symposium in Dublin in August by Jenny Potter	54
Research Papers IGA/GAS Library Update by Elizabeth Nokes	56

Editorial

In a past editorial we wrote:

“Trainees are essential for the future of our discipline: they will have the responsibility, in the future, of carrying Group Analytic practice and theory forward. We would like to extend a warm welcome to these new entrants and invite them to become student members of GAS and thereby to become part of an International organisation of some creativity that provides a wider perspective than that obtained in the natural insularity of national organisations”.

This issue provides evidence that the future is in good hands. This year, three students from Training Courses in the UK, Portugal and Ireland were asked to give their responses to Foulke’s 1948 book *Introduction to Group Analytic Psychotherapy* at the GAS Study Day in May. We publish all three talks below. They collectively provided an extremely thoughtful and impressive start to the further discussions that occurred in small and large groups throughout the day.

Additionally, Ingalill Johnsen Borley speaks about the experience of being a trainee in Norway from a very personal perspective, adding a significant contribution to what has turned out to be a special student edition. We hope to be able to encourage further contributions from within our training communities in future issues.

The rest is as usual: information and reports from the Group Analytic community across the world. We hope, as usual, that you will be moved to provide all of us with interesting snippets, reports of work being undertaken, courses and events attended, your thoughts and ideas.

Terry Birchmore and Paula Carvalho

President's Page

This year 2008 is Foulke's year, the 60th anniversary of his first book "Introduction to Group-Analytic Psychotherapy (1948)". The content of the present issue of *Contexts* and the Annual Foulkes Lecture, which is in this month's issue of the *Journal of Group Analysis* are living examples of the respect and gratitude his work inspires as well as a testimony of his being very human.

At the Foulkes Weekend Dieter Nitzgen gave a most interesting and elucidating lecture focused on the personal and professional background of Foulkes, and this was supplemented by Liesel Hearst's response discussing her own and other's memories of him. This gave the whole event a very intimate and personal touch. Both Dieter Nitzgen and Liesel Hearst succeeded in giving us an impression of the man and his work almost as if we had been there ourselves.

The next day, the GAS Study Day, Liam Breen, from Ireland, Az Hakeem, UK and Ana Sofia Santos, Portugal (all Group Analytic trainees) gave their understanding of Foulke's first book and Lionel Kreeger, UK, a founder member of the IGA, followed this up by talking about his encounters with Foulkes. The mixing of generations; senior member's personal experiences and students' reading and thoughts about how they perceive Foulkes' book seemed to be a lucky combination that stimulated many interesting discussions and a very inspiring atmosphere. The event had clearly attracted more from the younger generation than is usually the case and that was felt in the atmosphere, which was more optimistic and playful.

In the former issue of *Contexts* I mentioned the people who had passed away Pat de Mare, Alice Riccardi, Angela Molnos, Marisa Dillon Weston and lately Colin James, which leaves, as I said, the Group Analytic torch to us. Having seen more of the young and younger generation during this year's Foulkes weekend and also elsewhere (I have travelled to take part in Group Analytic Events in Portugal, in the Czech Republic, in Italy, and in the North of England), I see the next generation coming forth. What adds to this impression is the description in several issues of *Contexts* of Group Analytic training in different places like Poland, Prague, St. Petersburg, Moscow and Novi Sad & Vojvodina. Some of these training programmes are new; some are established over many years. This all gives the impression

that Group Analysis is alive and well in many places and that there is another very capable generation to take over.

By now the Dublin Symposium has taken place, and seen from where I am writing some months before the event, I can only wish it to be an unforgettable and inspiring event for those of you who are able to attend. The Symposium Chairperson, Liz O'Connor, and the Scientific Sub-Committee Chairperson, Jacinta Kennedy, certainly have done everything in their power to make it so.

I will end by drawing your attention to the 2008 Autumn Workshop in Krakow, Poland, which will take place Friday 14th to Sunday 16th November. The title is: Trauma: Individual and Group Experience. You can read more about it in this issue of Contexts.

I will also draw your attention to the Pat de Mare Memorial, a commemoration of his life and work, on Saturday 22nd November 2008 at The Institute of Group Analysis, 1 Daleham Gardens, London NW3. It is a joint event of the Group-Analytic Society and the Institute of Group Analysis.

Gerda Winther
President, GAS

Welcome to New Members

We are pleased to welcome the following new members to the Society. We hope that you will actively contribute to the Society and that we will hear more from you in this publication and on our Internet Forum, and also actively participate in our events and workshops. Our Society depends on your participation and the sharing of expertise and experience.

Dr Claire Bacha Full Member Manchester, UK
Mrs Pamela Blakelock Student Member Manchester, UK
Dr Mario David Full Member Lisbon, Portugal
Ms Angela Douglas Full Member Durham, UK
Ms Camilla Faith Hall Student Member Coventry, UK
Ms Hara Haritaki Full Member Athens, Greece
Mrs Katarina Härnring Full Member Limhamn, Sweden

6 *Group Analytic Society – Contexts*

Ms Jessica Lindström Full Member Limhamn, Sweden
Dr Fabrizio Valabrega Associate Member Torino, Italy

Deceased Members

We would welcome writings in memory of the any deceased members and in recognition of their contribution to Group Analysis.

Be a Contexts Writer!

Contexts welcomes contributions from members on a variety of topics:

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

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

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

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

Editor's Email addresses:

Terry Birchmore: birchmore@yahoo.com

Tel: 0191 3826810 (UK)
Paula Carvalho: paulateresacarvalho@sapo.pt

GAS Postal Address:

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

**Group Analytic Society 32nd Foulkes Study Day,
May 2008
London, UK**

**Continuing The Dialogue:
The Group Analytic Moment Revisited
Rereading Introduction to Group Analytic
Psychotherapy by S. H. Foulkes**

**Discussants: Lionel Kreeger, Liam Breen,
Az Hakeem and Ana Luisa Santos**

This Study Day continued the discussions begun and evoked by the Foulkes Lecture the previous evening. Sixty year after its publication and more than thirty after the author's death, the 32nd Foulkes Lecture sought to reconsider the book *Introduction to Group Analytic Psychotherapy* (1948). Most of Foulkes' ideas on group analysis are contained in this book. Written in only three weeks, it covers his early experiments of group psychotherapy in Exeter, and most notably his experience of wartime psychiatry in the so called Northfield experiment of 1943–1945. Appearing at a time when Britain had finally won the war and was about to create a National Health Service, the first in any western country to provide free health care to the entire population, the book captures not only the advent of Group Analysis as a coherent theory and valid clinical practice, but also its *Zeitgeist*, the spirit of its time. Foulkes' claim that 'Group Analysis

deserves a central place in Psychotherapy’ transcends the limits of psychotherapeutic professionalism and marks a crucial moment in its post-war history. This moment has passed but is not yet finished: we are still debating the place and the prospect of Group Analysis in a withering welfare state. Beyond the textual level, *Introduction to Group Analytic Psychotherapy* reveals both a meeting and a clashing of minds. In this book, Foulkes established himself as an author, a unique voice in the field of group psychotherapy, and yet as a figure within a much larger, much more complex figuration.

As an introduction to the talks given by Lionel Kreeger, Liam Breen, Az Hakeem and Ana Luisa Santos we publish the original foreword and preface to Foulkes’ 1948 book.

Foreword to Introduction to Group-Analytic Psychotherapy: Studies in the Social Integration of Individuals and Groups by S. H. Foulkes

I feel it a responsibility, and a considerable honour, to have been asked to write a short Foreword to this book. Personally, I find myself in the position of one of those psychotherapists for whom the book is particularly written – which is largely why I welcome this record of Dr Foulkes’ experience and ideas.

During the recent war I was a very frequent visitor to the Northfield Military Hospital, and I saw quite enough of the new developments in psychotherapeutic work there to convince me that they were profitable and capable of much development in the post-war period. Dr Foulkes’ work impressed me and interested me. It was particularly satisfactory to find that work which had been begun on civilian groups and mixed groups of men and women before the war could be adapted to the needs of men in the British Army so satisfactorily.

In some ways, the concept of the group is a very old one. Where two or three are gathered together for a common purpose, something happens; and there are many records of the effects of groups, whether the Methodist class-meeting or more recent group

movements; but none of these have provided any study of group dynamics.

Necessity has forced us towards the idea of experimenting with group treatment, and in so doing we have fortunately been able to discover a number of men who by their training and interest are capable of this kind of research into the dynamics of group relations and the ways in which these can be applied for therapeutic ends. We have far to go before we find any solution of the almost overwhelming problem of providing treatment for all those who are emotionally sick and in need of psychological help.

This book, however, written as it is in an easy and readable style, well documented and thoroughly practical, will quite certainly provide stimulation and be a source book for many others who after the necessary training want to direct their efforts into this particular field.

At a time like the present, when we are facing the need for the provision of a comprehensive medical service for the whole country, it is particularly opportune that this careful primer of Group Analysis should be made available.

J. R. REES, M.D., F.R.C.P.

Preface to Introduction to Group-Analytic Psychotherapy: Studies in the Social Integration of Individuals and Groups by S. H. Foulkes

Group-Analysis is a form of Psychotherapy in small Groups and also a Method of studying Groups and the behaviour of Human Individuals in their social aspects. Apart from a number of practical advantages, it has features of specific value. It is the Method of Choice for the investigation of many problems and for the treatment of many disturbances.

Group-Analysis demands considerable experience and special qualifications from its practitioners, but its principles and knowledge gained from its experiences, can be applied in wider fields, such as Education, Industry, the Armed Forces, in fact in social life in all its manifestations.

Like myself, as a Psycho-Analyst, so this treatment has grown from the psychoanalytic approach. Psycho-Analysis, however, is and remains strictly an individual treatment, taking place between one Therapist and one single patient. Group-Analysis, therefore, is not a Psycho-Analysis in groups or en masse. Nor is it a substitute for, or a mere application of, Psycho-Analysis. The mutual relationships of these two Disciplines, their common ground as well as their fundamental differences, have been made as clear as possible.

This volume puts the Method into the centre, emphasises the special features of the “Group-Analytic Situation” and the role of the Conductor, or Leader, in creating this situation. It tries to show what the Conductor has to do in order to make all the members of his group active participants in the solution of their problems. In so doing, it is not only the Group itself which benefits, but every single Individual can best develop his own individual personality. Although the Group is the field of operation, it is the optimal degree of liberation and integration of the Individual, which is the ultimate aim of this Therapy.

S. H. Foulkes

**1.) Talk Given by Az Hakeem at the Foulkes
Study Day 2008. Thoughts on Foulkes’
‘Introduction to Group Analytic Psychotherapy’ :
60 Years on from a Group Analyst in Training
(London)**

To be honest, I didn’t really know much about Foulkes until I started on the Qualifying Course last year at the IGA. Having worked as a psychotherapist within the NHS for 9 years, with most of my patients being treated within groups, I was no stranger to psychotherapy or working in groups. Prior to arriving at the IGA I had been working, as I still do, next door at the Tavistock & Portman Clinics with their long tradition of group work, heavily influenced by its strong Kleinian and Bion roots along with the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations with its Leicester-style Group Relations conferences. To me this was what analytic group therapy was. During my training next door I was

encouraged to concentrate mainly on interpreting ‘to the group’, and to maintain the classical dyadic or two-person analytic situation, between therapist and group. I was blissfully unaware that there was any other way of running a group. Being trained at the Portman Clinic with its strong alliances with the British Psychoanalytic Society, I was strongly encouraged to further my training at the Institute of Psychoanalysis as all my predecessors had done before me, and I was warned not to get too interested in Groups as they were ‘not analytic’, and were too ‘humanistic’, and definitely not to consider training at the IGA. Having always been somewhat of a free-thinker and perhaps bordering on delinquent I wondered why there was such a split between the psychoanalytic and the more social, especially as I recognised the importance of both these areas, and was intrigued by the work next door at the IGA which seemed to be so discouraged from our side of the fence; I knew I’d have to go there to find out.

On getting over the fence to the Qualifying Course I experienced the other side of the contrast or split. Whereas the place I was coming from was all Klein this and Freud that, now all I was hearing was Foulkes, Foulkes, Foulkes. I felt rather peeved that Bion didn’t seem to be getting any mention or any space in the teaching and as a result felt rather suspicious as to why this Foulkes guy was stealing all the limelight. Whilst I had previously thought of the tripartite split within the British Psychoanalytic Society between the Freudians, Kleinians and Independent Group to be nothing but destructive envy in the form of petty in house rivalry, I now viewed it as the basis for debate and discussion between differing strands within a school of thought that seemed missing over here where Foulkes appeared to have a monopoly with sparse mention being given to others who were instrumental in the development of group therapy. It was only later that I came to hear of an Orthodox Foulkes and Radical Foulkes split which we as students are currently in the process of grappling with coming to some understanding of...

In preparing what I could say today that could be representative of the London IGA student impression of Foulke’s first book, in true Group Analytic style I emailed all the students currently on the Qualifying Course to canvas their impressions on the book. Such an exercise proved quite illuminating in itself. In true student style, the majority of students did not reply. The ones who did respond informed me that they had not read the book. Of the ones who said they had read it (and we are talking single figures here) the comments I received were disparaging. I was told that the book did not

reflect the patients they were treating in their groups. One student commented on how they themselves as students appeared to be from a far more diverse demographic profile personally and professionally than the white male doctors in his book. I was told that Foulkes sounded too idealistic about groups. Students didn't like his style of writing. And there was a lot about the war (neither a criticism or favourable comment, just an observation). It sounded as if students currently felt that this book was not wholly as relevant to them as works of more contemporary group analytic writers.

So what do we make of these reactions?

One of the tasks of those of us currently studying Group Analysis and approaching Foulkes at this point in time is to put it in its historical context. Whilst many of my generation of psychotherapists especially working within UK's NHS take working in therapy groups for granted, it may be easy to forget that there was a time not so long ago that working in groups was not usual or familiar practice and much of what we take for granted now was once ground-breakingly new, even considered controversial at times as conventionally psychotherapy had only involved 2 actual bodies in a room at a time. The appreciation of the extent of this novelty at the time of its writing was the first thing I realised upon reading this work. Foulkes describes the group setting and Group Analytic Situation in great detail. He elucidates the numbers needed for a group, boundary settings and describes dynamic administration. My initial reaction to this was, 'gosh isn't all that stuff obvious?', but this is shortly followed by the realisation that this was written at a time when these concepts were not in practice, not generally known and certainly not obvious. In his first book on the subject of Group Analysis he shares with us his still evolving ideas of how analytic psychotherapy may be able to take place with groups of people. One example of the still evolving nature is when Foulkes describes how long group sessions should be. He writes, 'I...do not terminate the session before 75 minutes and not much after one and a half hours. Somewhere in between the two I tend to let it find a natural halt'. Even when he introduces concepts such as the 'location of disturbance', in being able to consider a problem from the entirety of the contextual system it is within, such ideas seem straightforward to us now and it is hard to consider that there was a time when this was not the case. It can be said that the mark of a genius is someone who is able to point out to us the blindingly straightforward which has yet been unnoticed, which once pointed

out makes complete sense and we are astonished that we never saw the wood for all the trees getting in the way.

One feature of Foulkes' writing which has been noticed by myself and my peers is that of his writing style. Foulkes is clearly passionate about his new venture of Group Analysis, but his enthusiasm is not always matched by clarity in its delivery. I have no doubt that Foulkes himself was an excellent doctor, analyst and trainer, but many of us did find his writing to be somewhat confusing at times. To be fair this was more so in his later writings whilst this first book I think is his most clear. We may hypothesise that it was when his ideas had evolved further and his struggles to maintain the bridging link with Freudian Psychoanalysis became increasingly difficult that the clarity in the writing lessened. It is at these times when I read Foulkes that I wished him to have a similar style to that of Freud, whose writing is not only beautiful in construction even after translation but who never fails to communicate the most complicated of ideas in an understandable manner. However I realise that this is somewhat of a rarity within psychoanalytic writing and Dr Freud may have been unique in this respect (I am someone who has always believed Hannah Segal's accounts of Melanie Klein's writings to be far easier to digest). It is with some relief that over recent years there have been further generations of Group Analytic writers to develop, clarify and distil Foulkes' ideas for us.

For me, the most fascinating and endearing characteristic of Foulkes' first book was the context in which it was written: war-time Britain.

I am of the generation who did not live through the war and know of it only through history or tales from those who did. We are introduced to the reasons why Group Analytic Psychotherapy came into fruition in terms of the War Hospital at Northfield. We are told of the men who could not (or perhaps would not) fight and the task of Foulkes being to get them back into the fighting spirit (so to speak). I find this interesting in itself. It is clear that the nation's government needed its men to fight its war, but if these men were not doing so did this mean that they were unwell? As a forensic psychotherapist myself, much of my work to date has been with offenders or at least men who enact violently, our task being to replace our patients' actions with thought. It seemed to me that it was Foulkes' task to encourage the opposite. I suspect there were reluctant soldiers who would never had entered the forces were it not for compulsory conscription, who inevitably would have been exposed to terrible traumas and who had

good reason to not want to return to battle and probably what we would consider a healthy lack of interest to re-entering the bloody scenes of the front-line, but it was the task of the therapists and psychiatrists then to get them ‘well enough’ to do just that.

The setting of the book does seem to be a million miles away from our outpatient psychotherapy settings where our groups take place today. There are unsurprisingly numerous references to military life and the rank and file of those receiving the therapy and assisting in its delivery. Descriptions of the military hospital with its ‘games of ping pong’, ‘hospital bands’, and ‘hospital clubs’ conjure up fantasies of a combination of ‘Dad’s Army’ and the old Mental Asylums. There are times when the very language of the book is so antiquated now that I actually had no idea what some of the terms of reference being used refer to. An example of such a sentence is as follows: (Foulkes writes)

‘I became aware very interested in the problem of ‘Dodgers’. They were at that time supposed to be around 200 of them. They played a similar role as at the present moment the ‘spivs’ and ‘drones’ in this country. They were difficult to trace....’ (I’m afraid I have no idea what a dodger, spiv or drone is or was).

The first group he describes being conducted at Northfield military hospital consisted of the following patients:

- Private A: Age 25: Suffering from giddiness and exertional symptoms.
- Trooper B: Age 20: Suffering tremulousness and loss of confidence.
- Trooper D: Age 30: Suffering lack of confidence, depression, disturbed sleep.
- L/CPL H: Age 21: Morbid feelings and attacks of weeping.
- Private H: Age 20: Headache, tight chest, general debility.
- Bombardier M: Age 23: Depression and inadequacy.
- Private O: Age 27: Depression & backache.
- Trooper S: Age 24: Headache giddiness, weakness.
- Private T: Age 19: Contraction of little fingers both hands (hysterical).

The rather straightforward descriptions of the patients’ presenting problems appeals to my common sense nature, but what is striking is the type of pathology which does indeed seem far removed from the psychopathology of the current NHS outpatient psychotherapy

groups in the UK from which we conduct our training groups. Foulkes describes his first group session from his group at Barts Hospital which comprised mainly of a group of women he described as suffering from hysterical conversion symptoms. These patients apart from being much younger than most of my patients also seem to have pathologies different from the patients with borderline personality disorder who we increasingly find on our waiting lists for psychotherapy today. Could it be that pathologies have changed or could it be that these were the Borderlines of the day but whose actual manifest pathology was shaped by the social conditions of the time to be different from our patients today who have had differing social conditions and differing sets of adversities and moulding conditions?

Another observation which goes along with the rather idyllic and rosy portrayal of the military hospital far removed from the less rosy traumas of war, is the very hopeful, and optimistic depiction of the content of group sessions. Most transferences and counter transferences can be deduced to be positive ones and the treating psychiatrists are held in high regard and respect. All reported correspondence with authorities relating to the groups mentioned offers reassurance as to the success of the work. It is here where I once again become a sceptic. Could it really be that the groups were that rosy and comfortable for all concerned? My experiences of groups as both therapist and patient are that groups get difficult, destructive, deadening and deadly at times. I am left wondering whether this huge difference is due to the differing composition of the patient pathology within the groups, the evolution of how groups are conducted, or sceptically how they are reported (to oneself and to others). This is in stark contrast to the destructive envy and psychotic anxieties at the root of Bion's basic assumptions. Perhaps it was important for Foulkes not to focus on the negative and destructive forces within groups which he may have considered potentially to be an obstacle in the pioneering of this work.

This brings me on to my next observation from the book where Foulkes discusses what he believes to be the important components of a Group Analyst's training. Foulkes explains the importance for the Group Analyst to have an individual psychoanalysis of his own. Until I came to the IGA all Group Analysts I knew had also been psychoanalytically trained as either psychoanalytic psychotherapists or psychoanalysts, and such a route seemed to make sense to me. However much is changed now and most trainees do not have an individual analysis prior to their training and it certainly is not a requirement

in the way that this original of Foulkes' books suggested that it may have been. I am not sure why this view changed and whether this was due to clinical, technical or political differences and developments. It would be interesting to consider whether there is a difference between Group Analysts in terms of the types of analyses they have and whether there is a qualitative correlation with their own style of group analysis they deliver especially in terms of use of transference and counter transference and use of analytic interpretations. On a personal level the gap between psychoanalysis and group analysis for me is bridged by the few senior group analysts remaining who trained as analysts in both schools such as Dr Lionel Kreeger, Dr Malcolm Pines and Dr Earl Hopper. These individuals manage to integrate the two traditions and whose continued work and writing is an invaluable resource to both fields and serves to challenge the splits, rivalries and envious attacks and promote further understanding for both sides.

Whilst I recognise that 'Introduction to Group Analytic Psychotherapy' is a pioneering work whose importance requires acknowledgement of the time at which it was written, by the end of the book I am left with questions still unanswered. I am still unclear as to why there is so little mention of Bion's work in this book: Bion is only referred to very fleetingly by name in 2 sentences. I was surprised by how the account of the group sessions conducted by Foulkes contained within this book bear little semblance to any of the groups I have ever been in (Foulkes is very active and chatty and talks at length to each of the individuals within the group and behaves very much like a doctor). And importantly I still don't know what a dodger, a drone or a spiv is.

Dr Az Hakeem

Consultant Psychiatrist in Psychotherapy & Forensic Psychotherapy
Dartmouth Park Unit & The Portman Clinic
Clinical Tutor: Highgate Mental Health Centre & St Lukes Hospital
Consultant to the Media having worked on a number of programmes for television.

2.) Talk Given by Liam Breen at the Foulkes Study Day 2008. Thoughts on Foulkes’ ‘Introduction to Group Analytic Psychotherapy’: 60 Years on from a Group Analyst in Training (London)

Here is an abridged version of the paper written for presentation at the Foulke’s lecture in London, 2008. The question from which the paper was written asked what relevance Foulke’s original book has for students today.

Introduction

While writing a response to this invitation, I thought about the personal journey that first brought me to group analysis. Towards the end of my social work training, I saw a specific need to understand more about groups because I had been involved in groups for violent men, and community groups where there was extensive inter-agency conflict.

Men’s Groups

I found that the men’s groups in particular involved a lot of trauma and loss for them and their families.

I was concerned that the traumas they had experienced, if unaddressed in a way that could effect a sufficient working through, were likely to be reproduced and continued in themselves, and for another generation.

I also thought that the group model used with the men was too behaviourally based, and might not give them enough strength to be non-violent when they finished attending the group.

Community Groups

In the community groups, trauma and loss were less obvious but the interpersonal and inter-agency dynamics were more markedly difficult.

For example particular positions towards others were taken up which only served to sustain the more hidden conflicts. There was a strong element involving projection of failure onto the “others”, who were characterised as uncooperative, stubborn, dictatorial, etc. The

“other” could never be seen as workable with, entire agencies, and/or particular people in them, were always the bad guys.

It was then I applied to do group analysis because I was impressed by how highly it was recommended by those with group experience.

Foulkes’ Matrix

Foulkes’ work was a revelation. In the concept of the network, which developed into the matrix, there was a way of looking at things that did not try to blame the “others”. The aim of the work was to foster understanding through communications.

When drawn on paper, the matrix shows a structure that symbolizes location, links, associations and communications. This was a broader concept than that offered by systems theory, which has been such a powerful influence in social work, and was meant to be similarly useful in its psychosocial perspective.

Systems Theory

In practice it seemed the original formulation of systems theory still veered towards a harshly individualistic focus, more often than not locating problems in the person, while nodding at the situation.

There again, even when the problem is located in the situation, there are wider contextual and cultural factors which social work on its own could not take hold of in its practice. This tends to make systems theory quite conservative, and one that lends itself to corrective measures being applied at the front only, instead of also at the root. It was a disappointment for the more radically minded in social work to find that what looked like a genuine paradigm for change sometimes served to achieve homeostasis by leaving everything more or less the same.

Foulke’s foundation matrix places more emphasis on the cultural factors and power differences we are not usually so aware of.

There is no criticism of social work intended here. Social workers often focus on immediate relief for people in distress using any means they can. As well as this there have been further developments in systems theory, in an effort to include the complexity of the influences in people’s lives.

The Matrix

The fluidity implied in the dynamic matrix diluted the tendency towards individualisation.

The matrix incorporated a more evenly distributed inclusivity and equality to the elements in the system, and drew more attention to an awareness of power, and how it must be constantly observed to avoid projections and scapegoating, especially of those who are vulnerable to negative projections at any particular time. It also highlighted the conductor's role in translating communications in the matrix. Finally, the idea that the mind is a composite, with a personal and a derived and fluid nature, again reduced the tendency to personalize, while at the same time making change more possible because people could believe that situations were not all of their own making.

Therapeutic Elements

What were also very helpful from Foulkes' work were the therapeutic elements of group analysis, especially the injunction to the group members to "just talk". With the dynamic matrix in mind, talking could more easily be seen as part of an unravelling process.

The words from the speakers, and especially their associations, when delivered into the group matrix, could be altered through the responses of the other group members, and taken back in a new way. A new understanding could take place. Things would have changed, merely in the exchange of these words, and the speaker would often not really know why something had changed because it is a largely unconscious process.

The idea of the matrix permitted an acceptance that all events in a group will become part of an unconscious and dynamic network that is intra-psychic, interpersonal and trans-personal.

Free Floating Discussion

The scope of the matrix could also be extended beyond the group itself. Through free-floating discussion, personal matters that cannot be spoken about outside can be voiced in the group. The group analytic method often causes personal experiences that have been repressed to emerge by processes of mirroring and resonance.

There is a permission for the darker side of life to be spoken of here, where it has not been possible to speak before, without fear of the others refusal or incapacity to accept what is being said.

Suicide and Death

For instance, suicide and death are subjects that are difficult to speak about. A group analyst must be able to hear these issues, stay with them and deepen understanding if the loss and grief that go with them are to be experienced therapeutically. There is a need to trust the matrix and the supportive elements within it to facilitate the expression of traumatising events that may not have been heard well enough elsewhere.

Violence

Similarly violence towards others is a taboo subject. Many feel that even talking about it as part of therapy, as opposed to straightforward condemnation and punishment, is a form of complicity with it.

This places an extra burden on group analysts who go to these depths with others. But it cannot be avoided. The trauma and pain of those who have been assaulted must also be seen by the conductor, and only then can it be accurately seen by the perpetrator, and the isolation, depletion and emptiness reversed.

Man to Man

There may be another inhibition built into the already difficult possibility of looking at how issues of suicide and assault apply to men, while therapy is largely practised by women. There is a risk in saying this, but the issues may become caught up in the equality or gender issue. It is not very easy nor possible in certain contexts to say that sometimes men need to speak with other men, and that there may be an advantage in this which will ultimately benefit everyone. This is something that struck me in re-reading Foulkes' whose work in Northfield was composed largely of men's groups.

Therapeutic Work

For therapeutic work, the depth at which conversation is consciously and unconsciously allowed is important. What could be spoken about in the analytic group would not be allowed by other groups, in fact even helping certain groups of people can be seen as subversive. In the Foulkes group you can say anything, go anywhere. His injunction to "let's talk" seems so obvious now. But back then it was a very unusual departure from practice. In fact it seems it is still a radical departure.

Loss

Foulkes wrote this work during wartime, when entire societies were suffering from loss and trauma due to assault and bereavement. In society today, the loss from suicide seems especially complex and difficult for the culture to engage with. In Ireland the suicide of young men is a major cause for concern, and is an increasing concern regarding young women. Parents worry incessantly if a suicide occurs in the local school. They fear the copy-cat dynamic that sometimes follows. They can even be afraid to interact normally and supportively with their children in case they upset them and have to suffer the guilt if the child self-harms.

Trans-personal Matrix

The subject of suicide resonated powerfully in one group. As in the wider culture, it is so painful that it could only be spoken about with genuine feeling as something that had happened outside, to someone else.

It is in respect of taking seriously what happens outside the analytic group that we recall Foulkes' insistence about how events in the world affect us profoundly, even if we are not aware of it.

This gives practitioners an acceptance to extend the concept of the matrix to events beyond the group.

For the issue of suicide, these elements of the trans-personal matrix were so therapeutically effective when the suicide of a famous young person was mentioned in the group. Reporting about the death had been watched closely on the Internet, and the effect of the loss had been unusually disturbing for one member in particular, who had been out of sorts since the death. Although there was speculation about the cause of death, he and the group believed it had been by suicide.

This event in the supra-personal matrix caused a resonance about vulnerability that had been so difficult to reach in this group member's own life experience, and that of the group generally.

Bringing in the young person's death introduced a resonance with direct significance for other members of the group; there had been one parent lost through suicide in the group, and another suicide attempt prior to joining. These issues had never really been fully engaged with while in group. Now they were here via a distant event causing considerable disturbance in someone who had significant difficulty connecting to emotional life.

Personal Resonance

There was also a surprising personal resonance – I too had been grieving the young person's death in a most unexpected way. I did not know him. Why was I so upset, and for so long! He died in a lonely manner that seemed bleak beyond what was bearable. Somehow the hopes he carried for people died with him, in the same way they seem to when other well-known and admired people die tragically and unexpectedly. He symbolized something very important, and very personal.

In trying to comprehend what was going on in the group around this issue of the young person's death, especially as it had affected the group so much where there had been a distinct lack of feeling, I thought about similar losses of a global significance, such as Kennedy, King, Monroe, Diana Spencer, the iconic figures everyone knows perhaps because they have somehow taken on a symbolic Father/Mother significance at an universal level.

When something happens to such people, it can feel so personal; perhaps because we are suddenly and unexpectedly forced to take back our projections.

The sadness of the event can become part of the cultural history.

The impact of this event in the group made me realise the power of the matrix and the breadth of its influence. It had brought in the very issue the group had most difficulty engaging with, namely, loss.

To date, this group had been inclined to disparage lost objects as a defence against the pain of mourning 1 as Hopper has noted. Recently the group had been very dismissive of a member who had left suddenly. One said he did not know what she had been coming to group for. The others expressed regret at varying degrees, but not intensely so. I, on the other hand, had been very upset about the departure.

On the evening when the issue of the young person's suicide was revisited, the discussion led another member to talk about a deceased parent, and how she felt that she was like the parent in lack of motivation and inability to finish things.

The thought that crossed my mind at that moment was that she was still carrying these dynamics for her this parent. She had carried the unresolved emotional conflicts across the generations, perhaps as a way of holding on to her parent and avoiding mourning of the loss.

A final statement during the evening came from the quietest member of the group. He said that this very evening was the anniversary of his father's death. His father had died by suicide.

I was really astounded by the capacity of the matrix to carry this subject across so many boundaries. It was like a domino effect. No one had been in contact with him on the day, to see how he was or if he needed any support. Perhaps it was just too difficult for anyone who knew him to talk about it. But the group analytic matrix gave the permission needed to say something very important for himself, and for the group.

End

When I began to think about what Foulkes means to me now, I wanted to write about the corrective emotional experience, then I moved towards the therapeutic factors in group and finally all my focus came onto the matrix and free floating discussion. These are really the two aspects of Foulkes that for me define his contribution to therapeutic work in groups. I value group analysis because it involves a number of people working together, and where each of them benefits there is a ripple effect for others in their interpersonal network. I value it more now because it has given me a confidence so that I am less intimidated in any group, and I have a capacity for responding to and in groups that feels grounded in the philosophy of mindfulness, respect and humanness.

From the beginning of training, Foulke's ideas became relevant to my work. I have found his ideas to be useful and pertinent, even in the most difficult and threatening situations.

It has also been most encouraging to hear colleagues say that the insights from group analysis have been enormously useful in transforming experiences at work that they have had difficulty with too.

I am about to conclude the training in group analysis now, and naturally, I wonder if my application to answer the invitation from London has been as much a way of avoiding the loss of going by trying to thrust myself into an even bigger group analytic space. Even if it is, I still feel sad and grateful, particularly for the gift of the thread with which I can negotiate my way through the emotional world of human relations. My monster of ignorance has been quelled. I feel at home now in a way I never did before, both personally and in groups. I feel an enthusiasm and confidence about group analysis that must be similar to what was felt on the wards in Northfield all these years ago, and in being here to speak like this I hope I have been able to convey part of this to you.

Liam Breen

Liam Breen's background is in social and community work. Liam would like to thank the IGAS group who read the paper, and in particular Ursula Bates for her thoughts and her time.

3.) Talk Given by Ana Luísa Santos at the Foulkes Study Day 2008

A Group Work Story

Good Morning!

First of all, I would like to say that is an honour and a pleasure for me to be here today, at the 32nd Foulkes Study Day. Thank you very much for the opportunity. When I first read the book *Introduction to Group Analytic Psychotherapy* by S. H. Foulkes (1948), I felt lost and didn't fully understand the message it was trying to convey. However, by locating the book in both space and time, I acquired a new perspective. I realised that the facts could only be understood by considering the context in which they occurred, the Total Situation, characterised by the reluctance of the British Psycho-Analytical Society to accept Group-Analysis and by an epoch of tension and oppression, already struck by the terrible events of the Second World War.

It was in this delicate and unstable environment that a new story of group work was evolving, the Northfield Experiment (1943–1945). Taking place at the Northfield Military Hospital, this story had Foulkes as its author and main character. Nevertheless, many others had contributed to the development of the actions that were taking place, some of them very famous and talented. We are talking, for instance, of the collaboration of Joshua Bierer (1) in the field of Social Therapy, and the participation of Harold Bridger (2), whose previous experience in the War Office Selection Boards (W.O.S.B.) was very useful to the Social Activities Department of the Hospital, in times of great change.

The Northfield Experiment made its appearance when Foulkes introduced Group Analytic Psychotherapy, as a form of treatment, in the hospital ward he was working on at the time. He gathered his soldier patients in small groups on a weekly basis, choosing a period of time that was convenient for all. Foulkes soon noticed that communication was flowing between the members of the group:

conversations were established with ease, and topics were discussed freely. Patients talked about subjects concerning the group itself, as well as the daily life problems of the Hospital and the Army. They also discussed broader themes, like the character of man, his morals, his cooperation and his attitude towards other military services. The results were remarkable. The patients who regularly attended Foulkes' small groups showed quick improvements. Their confidence was increasing and the ineptitude problems related to the military life, the reason why they were brought to Northfield, were diminishing. In face of the great success, some colleagues became interested and curious about this new approach, and started to attend with enthusiasm to Foulkes' small groups. Joshua Bierer, who was at Northfield at the time and had previous experience with group work, put on an additional effort. Namely, he tried to demonstrate to the Hospital staff the usefulness and value of group therapy and social therapy as forms of treatment. On the other hand, Foulkes started various groups and spread his action as far as he could reach.

Nevertheless, Northfield Military Hospital was now confronted with a new reality. The Second Front in Europe had begun and soldier patients were starting to arrive, tired and exhausted of the intense fight in the battlefield. Their suffering and trauma were noticeable and earned them the respect of everyone. It was then necessary to provide the soldiers with good treatment conditions, in order to help them in their recovery. In this way, numerous procedures were adopted to change the Hospital's infrastructures and to enhance work relationships, cooperation and communication among the staff. With the Second Front reaching its finale, Harold Bridger made his appearance and positively interfered in the process of change the hospital was undergoing. Based in his experience in the War Office Selection Boards (W.O.S.B.) and influenced by the ideas of W. R. Bion and John Rickman about leaderless groups, Bridger assumed the coordination of the Hospital as a whole and tried to change it into a sustainable community, in which everyone should participate and be made responsible. The staff started paying attention to the patients' needs and listening to their wishes. They also created conditions for the soldiers to perform several activities, like sports, arts and leisure. On the other side, patients had to participate actively on their cure, meaning that the execution, organisation and maintenance of any task would depend primarily on themselves. Foulkes supported these actions acting himself as an agent of change. He walked side by side with Bridger, helping him to break down barriers. In particular, he contributed to the

establishment of a close working relationship between his ward and the Social Activities Department of the Hospital. This close cooperation brought numerous advantages, like the creation of several activity groups, the collaboration between Psychiatry and Occupational Therapy and the demonstration, in practice, that treatment benefited many as a result of the application of knowledge from different areas. In respect to the work with small groups, Foulkes went even further. He volunteered to teach the principles of Group-Analysis to his colleagues and helped them overcome difficulties when they first started running their own groups.

As a result of these events, the Northfield Experiment reached its peak, existing in a very active and dynamic period. The group approach had spread and its effects could be watched, studied and used throughout the Hospital. Activity groups interacted intensively, promoting the cooperation and the exchange of experiences. Small groups enhanced and completed the therapeutic effect produced by activity groups. New communication channels were opened. Patients and staff talked and collaborated easily, walking side by side in harmony, in a path that could lead them all to a common aim.

Let me now explore a little about Foulkes' idea of "treating the group as a whole".

At Northfield, an ethos was created in which there was an acceptance that treatment be centred on the group, and that the group's interests come first. The challenging events of that moment demanded a quick and effective response from the Hospital, which could neither waste time nor resources. The soldiers had to be cured as soon as possible, so they could go back to the battlefield, and it was necessary that both patients and staff unite their efforts, so that the hospital's mission could be accomplished. All had to be involved and participate in the recovery process. Only by assuring the good behaviour of the parts could the success of the whole be reached. The work with groups was a precious help to this endeavour, because it decreased treatment time, dispensed with the observation of single patients, made the monitoring of treatments easier, contributed to the development of cooperation and extended communications to the whole hospital.

However, when I step aside from the Northfield specificities and consider the work with groups in a more formal setting, where therapist and patient are only concerned with following a treatment plan, the idea of always treating the group as whole becomes less clear to me. It was if adopting that position made me focus on the needs of the whole, the group, diverting my attention from the needs of each of

its elements, the individuals. Benefiting the whole would deprive the group of a necessary attention to the expression of the individual.

Foulkes argues that the Group Analytic Situation provides a space in which each one of the members of the group can speak freely about any of the present problems. The support given by the group, the exchange of information and experiences, and the possibility of recognising our own problems in others open up new perspectives and uncover the path of change. The Ego becomes stronger, insight emerges and the individual acquires newer and more adequate ways of living and being in society. However, Foulkes recognises a limitation to the method, arguing that because the situation is too centred on the resolution of present problems, we shouldn't stimulate the group to concentrate on the past nor invite regression. If any of the group members should ever need to walk along this path, he should be advised to leave (or not) the group and initiate an individual psychotherapy or an individual analysis. When I think of the concept of the Group Analytic Situation and confront it with my actual knowledge of Group-Analysis, I identify a close relationship between this form of treatment and what the Lisbon School calls Group Analytic Psychotherapy. They share the same setting and have similar definition and goals. On the other hand, Group-Analysis goes further, concentrating more on the past, inviting regression, and emphasising the resolution of the transference neurosis and its interpretation. I wouldn't like to finish this group work story without saying a few words about what it meant for me. This journey to the past was most stimulating and gratifying, in spite of all the difficulties and problems I faced along the way. I really recommend the reading of Introduction to Group Analytic Psychotherapy to anyone who wants to achieve a better understanding of the origins of Group-Analysis. Moreover, I found in this experience an opportunity to learn, satisfy my curiosity and look ahead to the future of Group-Analysis, never neglecting the similarities and differences between the Portuguese reality, my own, and other's realities.

Thank you very much for your attention and patience. I really enjoyed being here.

See you in the next chapter!

Ana Luísa Santos

Student member of the Portuguese Group Analytic Society

Student member of the Group-Analytic Society (London)

1.) Extract from a review of *The Day Hospital* by Joshua Bierer, London, H. K. Lewis, 1951

“This paper is a preliminary report of experiences in an experimental unit of the British National Health Service. In treating psychiatric patients the author administered all the various physical and psychotherapeutic treatments given to inpatients, but allowed the patients to return to their homes each evening. This is similar to a type of treatment which was instituted in Montreal in 1946 by D. Ewen Cameron, who coined the name “Day Hospital.”

Dr Bierer points to the obvious disadvantages of in-patient treatment of psychiatric patients. Among others, he asserts that the in-patient tends to become addicted to the hospital and, consequently, finds it more difficult to adjust to life outside. In considering the disadvantages of the usual outpatient treatment, the author felt that many patients needed more intensive treatment than was possible in the outpatient department and that formerly there was no alternative to this but hospitalization.

In the last section of the paper, the author sets forth theoretical considerations about what he terms “social psychiatry.” Some of his points may well be questioned, but everyone will agree with him when he says that it is not enough to see the patient as a whole. He believes the patient must be seen as part of “a larger whole,” this to include his social group and the fundamental patterns of his culture”. *Daniel C. Dawbs, 1952.*

Extract from Obituary of Joshua Bierer: Dr Bierer received his early education in Austria, training in Individual Psychology with Professor Alfred Adler and Dr A. Neuer. After completing his training-analysis he was appointed to the Teaching Institute in Individual Psychology in Berlin in 1928. At this time he carried out pioneering work in psychotherapy at mental hospitals in Vienna and in 1938 he was awarded his MD. With the rise of Nazism he left Austria for England. In 1938 he was appointed the first psychotherapist in a public mental hospital (Runwell). He founded the first therapeutic community.

2.) Link to Guardian Obituary of Harold Bridger:

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/2005/jul/12/highereducation.guardianobituaries>

Also:

<http://www.pschoanalysisdownunder.com/downunder/backissues/6/429/hbridger>

4.) Talk Given by Lionel Kreeger at the Foulkes Study Day 2008

My first awareness of Dr Foulkes was in 1957 when after several years of medicine and neurology I decided to opt for psychiatry as a speciality and started as a JHMO at Shenley Hospital in Hertfordshire. On my first day of work my then consultant chief Dr Gilsenan gave me the wise advice, “The first thing a psychiatrist must learn is not to disappoint himself”.

At that time S. H. Foulkes and James Anthony published their book “Group Psychotherapy – the Psychoanalytic Approach” in the Penguin Books series at the princely sum of 3s and 6d (19p in today’s money). It later appeared in the same series as a second revised edition in 1965 the year that I was appointed consultant psychiatrist and psychotherapist at Halliwick Hospital sadly now demolished. It is of interest that in the first edition the introductory chapter was written by Anthony, whereas in the second it was reworked and extended by Foulkes. I was intrigued and excited by their approach but felt it sufficient in itself and that there was no necessity to turn to the previous “Introduction to Group Analytic Psychotherapy 1948”. It was only later when I joined the Group Analytic Practice in 1967 as an Associate that I met Foulkes and came to appreciate the value and importance of his earlier work. I became a full Member of Management at GAP in 1972 and then became more involved and indeed respectful of his vital and inspiring contribution to our field of therapeutic and analytic endeavour.

I have to express my huge gratitude to the late Pat De Maré who died a month ago at the age of 92 and for whom I have written an obituary to be published in the next couple of weeks. He was largely responsible for both my appointment at Halliwick and joining the GAP, when he generously allowed me to share his consulting room for several years.

Foulkes was very kind and encouraging towards me, supportive of many of my interests, even when he was not too keen on my

enthusiasms. For example, Pat's and my interest in large groups was at first only tolerated as part of his general "life dynamic context", and indeed in May 1972 at the second European Symposium on Group Analysis held in London when Pat and I introduced a three hour session of the large group, he was heard to mutter in an aside that Pat and I were probably both "a bit crazy".

Nevertheless, when I decided to edit the book on the large group published in 1975 I asked him to write a short preface, but he declined politely and instead insisted that he prepare an opening chapter "Problems for the Large Group, Group Analytic Point of View" in which he clearly states his own earlier involvement "in the front line of events" even though he acknowledged his "personal pleasure" at Pat's and my contributions.

Foulkes was sometimes critical of me for being "over analysed". I had two analyses the first Kleinian for five years, the second Independent Freudian for four years, and indeed in that respect I do agree with him. I regret now that I did not have a shorter individual treatment, and then a decent period of time in a twice a week analytic group. I often do envy my analysands, particularly when I see them gaining huge insights quickly and dramatically in the hurly burly of the group dynamic.

I did however remember arguing the pros and cons of whether it is best to have individual analysis first (my belief) or better to start with a group and then if necessary turn to individual treatment to deal with outstanding neurotic or transference issues that remain (which Foulkes favoured). I sat in with him for a term of seminars for the Qualifying Course at IGA and thoroughly enjoyed the privilege and good fortune to have had the opportunity whilst he was still creative and charismatic.

James Anthony wrote of him admiringly even though "he could be difficult at times to understand, his inexplicable hesitations, mental detours, entangled syntax and tapering of thought processes that left you floating uncomfortably in the air". Another colleague used to refer to him as "the master of the unfinished sentence that required the hearer to complete the thought".

I am reminded of one of my favourite Yiddish jokes, which has that paradoxical and teasing quality often applied by Foulkes and indeed utilised in Robin Skynner's frequent use of the so-called "paradoxical conjunction". I should precede the joke with the definition of *dayan* which is the title of a rabbinical judge.

A husband and wife came to seek the help of a learned and experience *dayan* who had a young pupil observing the proceedings. Firstly

the wife was led into his study and she immediately plunged into a torrent of abuse about her husband's failings and unkindnesses ending with her demand for a divorce because she could not tolerate it any longer. The dayan listened and nodded gravely, and then told her, "you're right" and sent her out.

Next the husband entered ranting and raving about his wife who was a lazy, lying no good yenta and he could not stand it a minute longer and he must be allowed to have a divorce. The dayan paused for a moment and then said to him, "you're right". The husband left the room.

The student-pupil who had silently observed all this with increasing confusion said, "but revered dayan, you told the wife that she was right and then you told the husband that he was right. I do not understand how both of them can be right".

The dayan responded immediately – "you're right!"

I thought that Liesel Hearst in her response to Dieter's lecture was perhaps a little unkind to Foulkes over his last book, "Group Analytic Psychotherapy – Method and Principle". It was and is a bit of a mish-mash, indeed one severe critic said it was reminiscent of Heinz soups – thick and lumpy, but I remember Foulkes' plaintively saying in a seminar, "but I like Heinz tomato soup!" I should add that I do value his 11 maxims and comments on transference and counter transference.

To end this short vignette, the nickname that S. H. Foulkes was known by in his family and friends was "Michael", and this often causes confusion as to whether it was one and the same person that is referred. The nickname was given to him by his second wife, Kim, based on the novels of Dorothy Richardson, four of them published together under the title of "Pilgrimage" in 1938. Michael was always perfectly happy for this name to be used in his intimate and friendly relationships, but did not wish it to replace the "S. H." for professional purposes.

Perhaps I should add an apology for any inaccuracy or omission in this contribution, but I had not prepared a formal presentation for the Study Day and much of what I said was both spontaneous and unrecorded but I trust adequate for purposes.

Lionel Kreeger

Associate Member British Psychoanalytic Society, Founder Member Institute of Group Analysis. Psychiatrist, Psychoanalyst, Group Analyst with main focus on twice-weekly analytic groups. Additional interests in large groups and the dynamics of envy.

Reflections on The Foulkes Study Day

It is The Foulkes Lecture weekend again. A chance for a week-end in London; the possibility of an interesting lecture that will tax me and make me think and then a day of study groups, which I know from the past, will affect me; reinforce some belonging and leave me full of respect for my fellow group members. This year did not disappoint.

The lecture on Friday night is always a rushed affair. The drive from Wiltshire and a readjustment. A wish to meet up with people I trained with and the annual disappointment that I, and perhaps one other, are the only representatives. Some faces are familiar but not known. Was I in a group with this person last year or the year before? Big figure in the organisation move in and out of the crowd chatting and greeting. Quickly I establish that there is nobody I really know and that it is up to me to begin the process of introducing myself and finding some connection. People are friendly and I am grateful when someone well established in the organisation, greets me or includes me in their conversation. Suddenly it is time for the lecture to begin and the time has flown in friendly chat. Always a little afraid that the lecture will be too intellectual for me – am I the only one who feels this – I nevertheless look forward to it with good anticipation. This year it was especially interesting, accessible and clear. I warm to Dieter Nitzgen who seems to me to have knowledge, intelligence and lack of arrogance. Leisel's reply is unique, personal and funny.

On Saturday morning, I walk from where I am staying to Daleham Gardens. It is lovely to be in London again. I feast on the variety and the urban-ness. Having lived near here in the past, I have memories.

I turn up the hill past the school where the conference has sometimes been held, and cross on the zebra where I once saw that year's keynote speaker battling against the rain, so ordinary and human after the speaker status. The flower stall, where later I will buy flowers to take to my friends, is setting up. Near the Tavi three people stroll in the direction of Daleham Gardens. Something tells me they might be going to the conference. As I catch up I identify their language as Portuguese and marvel at their casual elegance. I say hello and am greeted with a friendly response. On the other side of the road, something about the tallish woman with a backpack suggests to me that we are bound for the same destination. I begin to see faces familiar from previous years or recognised from last night. Pied Piper like we are being drawn to No. 1.

At the door we are greeted by Julia's friendly face. To my relief we have been allotted groups. We gathered for the introduction to the day, given by our president. What a wonderful ambassador she is and red shoes are clearly de rigueur this year. We divide into our small groups.

My feelings at the start of a new group are familiar yet unique. The slight lethargy as tentative approaches are made. I make my usual mistakes and alienate at least one person. The difference this year is that I learn from it. The lecture is discussed. The group begins to settle and fairly soon I realise that, as usual, I am in the best group. We have Dieter in our group, which gives us extra access to information. One of the pleasures of the study day for me is in having the chance to be in a group with people who have been just names to me. The emergence of them as people is fascinating, sometimes surprising, but always interesting.

After an exceptional lunch – the nettles are from my garden – three group analysts in training give presentations. This is a new departure and each is inspiring and interesting. Generational issues are brought up and I get a sense of an emerging youthful energy. It is interesting to see who speaks. The mass of people now have individual faces and names. That man who just spoke, I was speaking to at lunchtime. That young woman who speaks such wonderful English has a real understanding of the problem. The group's variety is becoming apparent. Aspects of the topic are discussed – what's in a name – but the perceptions are not necessarily the same. The various accents, tones and rhythms are at moments symphonic; sometimes strident, tentative, angry but each one, important.

Back in the small group, it now feels familial. Too soon it will be over. Someone makes an emotional connection. It is received sympathetically but another is angry. Someone clarifies the difficulty. It is a misunderstanding. With no further time to explore it, feathers are smoothed. It is time to finish. Our gentle leader sums up and we depart.

The final large group. People seem a little tired. Old sores get raised but there is a different spirit this year. More humour, less anxiety. We've been back to basics. Someone thinks this is good and there is a strong sense of a wish to go forward yet to value the past. Sitting near the back, I am near a young woman involved in the training who speaks intelligently and energetically. If she and the others who spoke are representative, then the society is in good hands, I feel, and some of the stuckness of previous years is being challenged and embraced by everyone.

We say goodbye for another year. My small group are familiar now, but I know that next year they will be the faces I recognise but can't quite place. I leave though, feeling invigorated and pleased to be part of this society.

Di King

Poland: A Holocaust Survivor's Return. GAS Autumn Workshop 2008, Krakow

Friday 14th–16th November

When it was decided that the Autumn Workshop should be held in Krakow I was asked to convene an optional visit to Auschwitz-Birkenau the infamous concentration camp. My qualifications for this task are that I was born in a Nazi ghetto about 100km east of Auschwitz and Krakow. In July 1943 I was transported with my 4 year older sister and my parents to Bergen Belsen concentration camp, which we all survived. This formative experience as well as being brought up in a traumatised survivor family and community has given direction and purpose to my life which led me to my medical and Group Analytic training. For many years I have been working with child survivors of the Holocaust. We all continue to struggle with the legacy of our trauma and I am now referring to all of us.

The theme of the workshop is how traumatic experiences, relationships and events carve out a psychological landscape which leaves an imprint, a legacy, with which we work. The workshops will include a dialogue between Gerhard Wilke, the child of a Nazi, and me, the child of Holocaust survivors.

It will be an emotionally powerful visit which I hope you will be able to join.

Alfred Garwood

Auschwitz-Birkenau Website <http://www.auschwitz.org.pl/>

Virtual Tour <http://remember.org/auschwitz/>

Victor Frankl <http://www.rjgeib.com/thoughts/frankl/frankl.html>

In my Father's Office

Paper presented at the EGATIN study days in Oslo, 25–27 April 2008: Transmitting Knowledge and Engendering Enthusiasm – EGATIN in the Past, Present and Future

It is with great pleasure and with some anxiety that I stand here today. I've been asked to say something about the experience of being a trainee in the Norwegian group-analytic training, what my expectations were and to what extent these have been fulfilled? How useful it is for the clinical realities of today and tomorrow. I'm reluctant to call myself a representative of the coming generation of group analysts; although I am part of it and will attempt to say something about my own experiences and reflections and hope these will resonate both with earlier and current trainees.

I run my group in my father's office. This was part of the information I gave when presenting my group to a new supervision group at the beginning of my fourth year of training. On a superficial level it provides a bit of practical information as to where my group is held, but also, and more importantly perhaps, suggests that my work in some way is influenced by my father. When ending this same supervision group, my supervisor returned to this issue, suggesting that bringing one's group to supervision may for all of us feel just like that, like bringing it into one's father's office. And I think the metaphor easily lends itself to describe some of what is present when training to be a group analyst. In the small group where we enter transferences related to our fathers, and mothers, in the large group when questioning authority, in supervision when our work as therapists is rigorously investigated. To be in one's father's office may entail many things; support, discussions, reprimands. It may be a room filled with loving eyes, with critical eyes, with encouraging eyes. It will for sure affect the way we feel and work.

I think that one of the reasons that I've been asked to do this presentation is that I am, quite literally becoming a second generation group-analyst as my father is a group analyst and was part of a group of four psychiatrists who, in 1982 were asked by the psychotherapy committee to develop a group-analytic training in Norway. In this sense I grew up with group analysis, without having any idea what it was. When Malcolm Pines was in Norway the summer of 1982, I was singing in the back of the car, whilst he and my father were

discussing the possibilities of setting up a training here in Norway. It was a 1½ hour car journey to Oslo and they were heading for a meeting with the psychotherapy committee to discuss this. I was on my way to a birthday party.

The expectations

So: how did growing up with such a close relationship to group analysis affect my expectations to the course?

From 1984 my father spent five weekends a year away – first in training, and then as one of the teachers. I thought it must be something quite extraordinary that took place during these weekends as my father kept going back for years. The weekends were held in a hotel called Soria Moria. I don't know how familiar this term is to those of you who are not Norwegian. Soria Moria is from a Norwegian fairytale by Asbjørnsen and Moe about a boy called Hallvor, and his search for the castle of Soria Moria. In the fairy tale Hallvor finds the path, kills the troll, frees the princess and succeeds to the inheritance of Soria Moria, the golden castle. Soria Moria castle is portrayed as a symbol of perfect happiness and fulfilment. In some way I thought my father went to some golden and exciting fairytale those weekends. He never said he was going to the group-analytic training, it was always just called Sora Moria; which is still what I call it now inside at least, even though it is now held in a different hotel called something much drearier: Voksenåsen, the grown up hill!!

In stark contrast, group analysis was also something very ordinary in my life. I didn't know what it was, but it was such a familiar term that it never occurred to me to ask. I assumed that everyone attended group therapy, that it was part of living.

I remember the drained look on his face the Monday following these weekends. And about six years ago I worked with two colleagues who were doing the training and recognised the same drained look on their faces certain Mondays throughout the year. So I was under no impression that this was an easy course. Somehow I came to understand that these were weekends where trolls were battled. Hard work!

I think these three elements, the magic, the ordinariness and the hard work, sum up my expectations to the training, and might be familiar to others. Firstly, the childlike hope for it to be a magical place where I would find fulfilment and happiness. Isn't there a desire

in all of us for that longing to come through and a tendency to instil new projects with this hope.

Parallel to this there was an expectation for the training to be quite ordinary, five weekends a year for five years, a training which was necessary and important in order to run groups. And then finally, the expectation of a lot of hard work, long work days, many complex theoretical perspectives to digest, and setting up your own private group. Hard work also on an internal level; working with personal issues, I have at least at times found that the hardest work of all is to be a group member with no therapist-role to hide behind.

The realities

Well, what can I say? The training has been no Soria Moria, no golden castle of complete happiness. It has been characterised more by hard work, the battling of trolls and freeing of princesses. There are of course magical moments, or glimpses of being inside the golden castle. There are moments in the small group when a new understanding is reached, or there is a powerful meeting with another, moments of discovery in the large group, finding it makes sense, and there are moments in supervision and theory where it all comes together. But I think most agree with me in saying that these magical moments are rather short-lived! And perhaps “grown-up-hill”, or Voksenåsen is a better description of the process. A lot of it seems more ordinary, part of life.

I speak now of course of the parallel processes of inner work and professional development. I'm not alone in this experience as I see colleagues struggle through the anxieties that the small or large group may arouse. The hard work required in order to meet the professional standards required to pass the training; working towards your private group reaching an analytic level, which for me and many others has intensified the anxieties connected to theory and supervision group. This is a topic often discussed in our peer group, just how tough it is to run a group by yourself, understanding the levels, dealing with the issues.

I had previously been in group therapy for three years whilst training to be an art psychotherapist in England, so entering a group, large group/small group wasn't as daunting as it might otherwise have been. However, I can remember how it felt when I first entered this way of working. Many people that I've spoken to, like me, experienced that entering group therapy opens up a new world of communication, seeing and experiencing oneself as part of a group, whilst

talking about it opens up insights and opportunities. This can feel so exciting that it becomes difficult to not want to do it every where with everyone and can thus invade private relationships, friendships and work teams in a way that becomes overwhelming for others thus cause some problems.

When unfamiliar with group therapy, another reaction for some is that the training becomes too intense and overwhelming. Three full days of intensive group therapy is no joke, and most of us will have felt the urge to quit and leave, and indeed some do.

Clinical reality

It is of course important to reflect on the relevance of group analysis in clinical practice. Which challenges are we faced with and in what way does group analysis fit into this. How is the training relevant to the clinical reality we meet in our daily work? Many of us work within a system under intense pressure and constant reorganisation, based on finding ‘the road to cost-efficiency’. The patients we cater for within the health system suffer from severe personality disturbances and other psychiatric illnesses. To ensure patients get the treatment they need, every assessment results in a grading of the patients needs for treatment and assessing whether their problems qualify for “the right to treatment”. Whilst this ensures patients do get treatment it also determines who doesn’t if their symptoms are not severe or lengthy enough to qualify. It also means that when a patient is said to have a right to treatment that this has to be initiated by a certain date, and if it isn’t the institution may be penalised. Whilst of course useful, it also causes issues in that with a constant flow of referrals many patients have to be terminated early to make room for new. The result of this is that many of us work short term and with very disturbed patients and experience that analytic groups are at some distance from the needs and capacity of our patients. Attendance is a struggle, the level of insight and reflection is often low, and it is not easy to naturally flow between the here and now and the world out there. Even though Bion might have included them in his group, many of these patients are in need of more supportive type groups. However, within this reality, I think that group analysis can be relevant and play an important role in the way we think and practice. The aim of free communication and the study of its hindrance is a human value in itself. How can we think of a clinical reality where this value is not relevant?

I feel that group-analysis serves as an ideal that continuously guides my everyday work. Just as psychoanalysts working in institutions don't give pure psychoanalytic treatment to all of their patients, their work and their thinking will always be rooted in psychoanalytic thinking. Running a private group as part of the training, enables me to fully appreciate the group-analytic form and I constantly strive towards getting the group onto an analytic level. However in my every day work my aim is to provide good groups which work for the patients at the clinic where I work. This means that they are, by and large not analytic groups, but psychotherapeutic groups, much informed by the ideal of group analysis. This is one of the reasons why I have found it meaningful to go into the final two qualifying years of the training, where running your own group plays a significant part. I have learnt more this year than in the previous three about the analytic group and it has changed the way I run the psychotherapeutic groups in my workplace.

In general I find that there is much interest in group analysis amongst colleagues at work. The perspective it offers often excites people and many seem keen to learn more and to implement some of it into their work, such as the importance of boundaries and on talking about the dynamics within the group. However, it can also frustrate colleagues. I have experienced several instances where the group analytic perspective has been put forward as a superior perspective. I have met many who feel that their work is looked down upon and does not quite reach the same level of importance, that their approach is inadequate, and that they can only become valued as therapists if they train in group-analysis themselves. These attitudes, whether coming from a trained group-analyst or others, can make cooperation difficult. Co-therapy in a group with someone unfamiliar to group-analysis may work in that the different perspectives can enrich each other, but can also cause problems and competitiveness where certain interventions are considered to have higher status or ranking have. I was recently in a group which I run with a very skilled individual therapist. After the group he was excited about how one of the group members had moved on in her directness, naming her dissatisfaction with the group. She had also used a lot of time in the group, which although not unusual, it had been some time since she had done this. My experience of the same group, which had had a new group member entering, was that the patient in question, along with the rest of the group had quite aggressively ignored the new patient and ignored all interpretations from me on the matter. We discussed this at great

length, feeling quite split, which at least partly reflected our different perspectives, his, based on the progress of the individual, mine on the dynamic of the group in view of a new member.

I think the training is also extremely relevant for understanding dynamics amongst staff, such as rivalisation and opposition to leadership and authority. Some teams talk about these processes, some don't, extremes can be found in both directions. I think however, that to reflect around what is going on dynamically in the team at present, whether internally or out loud, decrease acting-outs and helps containing difficult conflicting feelings. My flexibility and directness in a team has definitely been improved by what I have learnt about theory of group dynamics and what I have experienced regarding the roles I tend to take on in groups in my small group.

A colleague's experience from a workplace where the staff consisted of nursing assistants, all unfamiliar to group therapy and group analysis, found that they quickly embraced this approach. Her sense was that it felt familiar to them, that it simply described what they experience in all groups in life. In fact, I find this is often the response of friends or others who become acquainted with it through hearing about it. Perhaps is it because it so poignantly describes and deals with issues we as humans experience all the time.

A concrete problem in private clinical practice is the problem of recruiting patients to groups. It seems, at least in Oslo, that there are many group-analysts and many trainees, and not as many patients. This causes a problem when running a group is a pre-requisite to qualify for the last two years of the course. You also need to get a full group in order to achieve an analytic level. As Nitsun has said, most patients seek individual therapy and much work and a spot of luck is necessary to be successful in getting enough patients.

The group analytic training in Norway is about to change. Several of the teachers who have been there since the beginning are leaving, and the way the training is built up is going to change. I won't go into this as it is not within the scope of this presentation, but as I understand it, it will mean that fewer candidates will complete the last two years, year 4 and 5, but there will be options of other one year specialisation courses after completing the three years group psychotherapy training. I can see that this is a necessary development, and that offering shorter and more focused courses is perhaps an attempt to align course objectives to the clinical realities of today and tomorrow, where we meet an increasing demand for cost-efficiency with shorter treatment and techniques that this demands. Group analysis

of course is slow work and its aim is not mainly symptom reduction. But the building down of the full group analytic training, I think is a shame! Being half way in the last two qualifying years, I feel that it is the most important bit in shaping me as a group therapist. These last two years are by many referred to as the dessert. To run your own group gives an experience which differs from that of running groups as part of the institution, with a co-therapist. We often talk of how it awakens feelings of an overwhelming sense of responsibility, fear of failure, feelings of love as described by Yalom “the Schopenhauer cure”. It has certainly sharpened me as a therapist. Isn't it the dessert which completes the perfect meal?

I recently came across a report on the group psychotherapy training in Norway 1985–1990. In view of what I have just said I found it interesting to see that in a study investigating trainees experiences of the training, the satisfaction with all aspects of the course increased with length of study. Their conclusion was that the more the trainees learnt, and the deeper involved they became in their own therapeutic process, the more meaningful the training became.

Ending

This coming Monday I am moving office. I will be renting a group-therapy room with two colleagues, one of them being my father. We have reached decisions together when it comes to chairs, locks, lighting etc. My group will no longer be held in my father's office, but, we will both be running our groups in the same room. The terms have changed and have reached a more collaborative form. Five years of training provides time for maturation, from dependency towards a more equal form. I find myself more balanced in the way I respect and integrate my IGA teachers' input, whilst also at times disagreeing with them.

Norway is a small country, so is the Norwegian group of group analysts. It is inevitable to meet work colleagues in the training, also amongst the teachers, and this is often spoken about as something difficult and limiting. It is not easy to challenge someone you rely on getting on with the next day. It is difficult to feel exposed when next to people you are hoping to work closely with in the future. The teachers are of course also both therapists and teachers, persons who support you, but also the ones who decide on whether you pass or not.

So, when finishing the training new possibilities will open in terms of collaboration and practice.

I might in time increase my own private practice, in which case I will get my own office. However, I'm hoping that one day I will inherit the beautiful furniture from my father's office, the ones he inherited from his father. I think they would provide my office with some weight and sense of tradition. There is a vast amount of theory on group analysis. However, the oral tradition of fairy tales also plays an important role in how group analysis has been transferred from one generation to another. My father told me that Dennis Brown told him that he was in the group in which Foulkes died, and how he was blinded on the right side of his vision, the same side as where Foulkes was seated. This story impresses me, even more so as it is personally transmitted to me, conveying the commitment and presence of Foulkes, and the impact a group can have. Our teachers were students of teachers who were students etc. In this way the actual content of group analysis is passed on through the generations, and forms the matrix of group analysis. With this in mind, I think that the new generation of group analysts will benefit from sitting in the chairs of their predecessors while thinking about the ways of the future of group analysis.

Ingalill Johnsen Borley, Melumveien 71, 0760 Oslo

Connecting Sounds and Dividing Seas

Recollections from the 6th Nordic Group Therapy Conference

At the height of summer and on the eve of the GAS-London Conference in Dublin, these recollections from the 6th Nordic Group Therapy Conference in Stockholm last August come in the hope that a voice from the remote North may help vitalise our thinking about groups beyond the confines of geographic and linguistic constriction. As regards language: This Nordic Conference is carried out in a mixture of three major Nordic languages: Swedish, Norwegian and Danish. Speakers of any one will, by and large, be able to understand the others if speaking slowly and distinctly. Thus this is an event calling for special attunement. The well-known 'I can't hear you!' of the first large group session, gradually evolving into mutual understanding, receives a particular poignancy here.

The conference was organised as a joint venture between the Swedish Institute of Group Analysis and the Swedish Association of Groups and Psychotherapy and Group Development. With an early sold-out attendance of 135 people coming from Sweden (63), Norway (51), Denmark (20) and Finland (1), the theme of this triennial event was 'The Possibilities and Impossibilities of Groups'.

The conference was inaugurated by a nestor of Swedish group analysis, Oluf Dahlin, speaking with erudition about what it is that keeps groups together. His main contention was that the ideological shift from a collective and divinely sustained understanding of humanity towards Cartesian individualism and Hegelian mitigated collectivism has now seemingly devolved into a liberalist consumerism that raises questions about the very possibility of groups, and by implication perhaps of group work itself. Indeed, it is worth noting what connotations 'group' evokes in society today, where in Denmark, for instance, it sustains a tinge of dated lethargy as a consequence of relentless liberalist pounding of the individual's rights above all. Following this lecture, the conference strolled, accompanied by Swedish folk music to an exquisite opening reception viewing the summer night against the Stockholm archipelago.

The theme of the group's possibility was pursued in plenary form the following day by the Danish group analyst Jan Nielsen speaking from a more clinical perspective about a group of young adults. Addressing a life stage marked by separation, rupture and mobility, the therapeutic group offers a counter-balance to which it may seem daunting to commit oneself. Working in a university clinic, the difficulties of attachment are strikingly illustrated and aptly placed within a larger sociological context of Giddens and Thomas Ziehe's notion of cultural emancipation. How does the group become a point of orientation, when it also precludes the opportunity for instant switching?

The third plenary was a fish-bowl of dialogue between key-and lesser-key-players on the Nordic scene. This format of having a small group talking to each other at the centre worked well to enhance a focused and continuous discussion with a certain amount of flow. The persons choosing a seat at the centre would, for a while, become interlocutors in a conversation, open to newcomers and yet sufficiently small to enable sustained response to one another. A number of areas were addressed from research and efficacy, challenges of training to reflections on the transmission of analytic tradition across generations.

At the final plenary session, the conference opened its doors to the theme of migration and multiculturalism captured in a fine lecture by the Swedish politician Bengt Westerberg, known for his fervent opposition to the racial, cultural and religious discriminations that have increasingly marred the political landscape. He raised important questions about maintaining an ethical stance in an increasingly complex cultural setting, while also pointing to the challenges of living in sub-cultures.

Apart from the plenaries, the conference was organised with median groups and afternoon parallel sessions, ending the day with a large group. Thus a wide spectrum of local group therapeutic activity was unfolded and engaged with in discussion. As is evident, this conference would have been inaccessible to most Contexts readers due to its geographic and not least linguistic delimitations. It being a Nordic conference enables such a fascinating and unique meeting of Scandinavian tongues. It is truly of great value to struggle and be able to understand each other across linguistic confines that however also mark national identities partly forged through conflict and warfare involving occupation and subsequent fairly recent independence, e.g. Iceland (1944) and Norway (1905). But there are also profound differences between the Scandinavian languages, and the approximate understanding that occurs is at times insufficient for engaging in deep and complex discussions. Hence it remains a dilemma whether this Nordic conference should succumb to the ubiquitous English language as against the native and autochthonous Scandinavian tongue. Opting for English is, with a tinge of sadness, becoming still more common. Furthermore, however, one must bear in mind that Finnish and Icelandic are not readily accessible to the Scandinavians and, increasingly, vice-versa. This may account for the singular Finnish participant and none from Iceland. These linguistic remarks will hopefully fuel further reflections on the intricacies of cross-linguistic and cross-cultural understanding, also in a 'purely' English-speaking context.

In conclusion, it seems however, proper to try and convey the most striking and memorable feature of this conference, and that is to do with water. The seaway has brought the Nordic peoples in touch with each other, just as water has marked boundaries and division. This conference was held on a small island in the middle of the spectacular Stockholm archipelago. The venue was a small maritime vocational college protruding into the water so that you could sit surrounded

by the flickering light from the water. Coming from Copenhagen, a city itself surrounded by water, this made you think of Stockholm as a city surrounding the water, with its various parts and isles meeting with the water from various angles. As a tribute to the hard-working local organising committee, they could be seen indeed, like Stockholm itself, as guiding points of reference surrounding the sea of the conference, keeping together a truly memorable event, whose ramifications will surely be felt well beyond the North!

Michael Münchow, IGA-Copenhagen

XXXV IAGP-SEPTG Symposium: A Bridge called Mediterranean

We 250 participants met for the Conference that ran from the 28th of February till the 2nd of March in the beautiful city of Barcelona. It took place in the World Trade Centre, a wide and modern space located next to the Mediterranean Sea with huge windows from which we could see different boats coming and going. The beautiful view was very suggestive and invited us to fantasise especially having in mind the title of the Conference “A bridge call Mediterranean”.

THIS was a multicultural encounter since participants from 27 countries were present: Germany, Netherlands, Turkey, Italy, Bulgaria, Serbia, Israel, Croatia, Spain, Brazil, Norway, Portugal, Ireland, Finland, the United Kingdom, Slovenia, Greece, France, Chile, Argentina, Austria, Sweden, Australia, Mexico, Switzerland, the United States and Ireland.

From the beginning we could feel the warmth, the joy of meeting and talking to each other, fundamental matters in this encounter of “building bridges of dialogue”. This easy going communication I think was assisted by the existence of the Internet email list. All participants registered at the Conference were invited to take part in it and it was also possible to register only for the Internet list. This list was very active during the weeks before the Conference and acted as a warming up exercise. Participants introduced themselves, connected with each other, shared and discussed many issues in a free and associative manner.

After the official opening of the Conference, we had a very creative welcome workshop with active techniques, music and dancing which facilitated communication and had a very high level of participation.

Work developed around three big issues and were present in the three spaces of plenary lectures. The first one was “Building bridges between groups”, fundamentally about Group Analysis and its development in Spain. The second was “Migrations, social change processes and change resistance” and the third “Conflict Resolution Processes”. The three of them were most interesting and followed by a very active discussion and as usually happens time left for sharing was too short. The three lectures as well as the welcome and farewell workshops were the only activities which had simultaneous translations of English-Spanish and had no other parallel activities. The rest of time many activities coincided and at times this made it difficult to choose which to attend. There were workshops, papers, panels, and symposia in different orientations such as Group Process, Group Analysis, Psychodrama, Transactional Analysis and Integrative.

The language barrier was obvious and evident especially when verbal communication was the main tool with which to work. Dialogue seems to be slower, is less free, somehow losses spontaneity and wins frustration at first, when one has to wait for the translation of what is said. In most cases, the majority of people were patient, reaching to understand and to be understood by others. Little by little people were getting more involved and confident and able to assist others making an effort to use the two languages whenever possible. That gave me a great feeling of hope. We were grateful for the great help of post-graduate students who helped on a voluntary basis in every activity of the Conference. We also had the collaboration of the post graduate students in Dance Therapy who were delightful and provided a touch of fresh air with their dances, music and performances.

At the end of each day there were four ongoing reflection groups with the recommendation to take part in the same one every day in order to experience a coherent and continuous group process. Two of them were Psychodrama orientated, one Transactional Analysis and one Large Group, from a Group Analytic orientation.

In relation to social events, the Ajuntament of Barcelona hosted us in a wonderful venue with wonderful scenery very appropriate for the occasion. An official representing the town hall of Barcelona gave us

a welcome speech and we were very gratefully surprised when we realised that the person knew a lot about us and our work.

The gala dinner took place at the Avenue Palace, a classic in Barcelona where we had a great aperitif, exquisite dinner, best companionship, music and dancing.

It has been a very interesting experience for our Society and we still have a lot to think about and elaborate. We have sent out an evaluation inventory sheet but don't have the results yet.

The Spanish Society of Psychotherapy and Group Techniques (SEPTG) has experienced the honour and the challenge of been the host and organizer of the III Conference together with our annual Symposium. We have worked and contained hard and it has been very rewarding experience for us. Although the work has not been completed nor been perfect, we take the consequences as matters to think about and learn from with optimism and joy and as opportunities of improving and learning.

I hope this short report will give you an idea of what happened in Barcelona and if you want more information you can find it in the web page of the conference.

With warm regards,

Concha Oneca

President of the Spanish Society of Psychotherapy and Group Techniques (SEPTG).

EGATIN Report

This year I became more aware of how important Egatin is for the practice of Group Analysis. It is a forum developing the support we need to combat the political lobbying of CBT with its implications for funding. I also became aware of the urgent need for qualitative research in Group Analytical practice. This seems to be the situation in most countries. However, good research has been done in Germany (where consequently Group Analytical Groups are funded within Psychiatry). Egatin is also hoping to fund research comparing CBT groups with Group Psychotherapy.

The UKCP (United Kingdom Council for Psychotherapy) also presses for research, but I think it has a much stronger focus on

individual psychotherapy. Thus the exchange of results of qualitative Group Analytical Research from other countries is vital to us, and to our position within the UKCP.

It has become clear that it has been possible to adjust the model of group analysis to meet the needs of different patient populations. It has also become clear that the shape of the trainings also need to adapt to the changing needs of trainees and the needs of the environments that they will be working in.

Egatin's aim is to promote group analytical culture beyond training people, and to help Group Analysis flourish in a variety of contexts while holding on to its core principles.

The theme of the Study Days was "Transmitting Knowledge and Engendering Enthusiasm", and as it was the 20th anniversary of Egatin there were several speakers from the time of its inauguration, including Brian Boswood. The idea of Egatin had developed in part as a protest against the imperial power of the IGA. Several of the European trainings felt 'colonised' and resented being called 'oversees trainings'. After a period of hostility from the IGA the atmosphere had changed with the IGA deciding to become part of EGATIN with Brian being the first IGA representative on the working party.

We heard a very interesting introduction to the theme by the chair Kristian Valbak from Denmark, who described the process through which it came to be decided that Egatin ought not to be involved in the power politics of accreditation. Rather, it was a setting in which one could have relatively open and critical discussions about the nature and purpose of training. To this end it set out a number of minimal guidelines for aspiring trainings to utilise.

Next, we were delightfully surprised to be shown a lovely 'Happy Birthday Egatin' film put together by our host from Norway, Kjersti Lyngstad. Accompanied by lovely music we saw photos from the past with very young versions of some people we know, data of presentations, achievements and aims of EGATIN.

Following this, there was a fishbowl discussion with people who had been involved in Egatin from its inception; and to me it was lovely to hear how this organisation has managed to keep a democratic structure where real exchange and dialogue can happen, and I am sure this is due to resisting becoming an accrediting organisation.

There was discussion about the future roles of EGATIN. For example, how could it help in the present crisis of psychoanalytical

therapy in relation to CBT? What could be done about the fact that psychoanalytic training courses in general are getting fewer applicants? and so on.

We heard that Sweden for example, who previously had a well functioning training course announced its resignation from Egatin as its government funding connected to its licensing had been withdrawn.

How can we help? To support qualitative research and expose the senseless research done by governments?

Egatin also needs to find its position in relation to the EFPP (European Federation for Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy) with the present pressure for regulation.

On Saturday Brian gave a presentation on 'Handing over to the next generation' and reflected on how we deal with this process within our trainings and organisations. He described some of the different ways of talking about this process: the passive form of 'handing over' a thing, to the active 'handing on' of a tradition, or the notion of 'handing down' which pointed to a status difference. There are also the 'hand-me downs' of sibling clothing. He used the image of the handing over the baton in a runner's race where the moment of passing on is very delicate for both sides.

Brian talked about the importance of mutual respect between student and teacher, how important it is for the teacher to have enthusiasm, but not too much – else it turns into dogma; and how to get the right balance of not too little nor too much information to be passed on. He talked about the delicate handling of passing on referrals with understanding of and acknowledgement of the attachment that has happened, and how important it is not to pass on too much information. And that taking over requires letting go. We need to let go of the knowledge as we transmit it to the students, as they will use it in their own ways as feels right to them.

As this meeting happened in Oslo we had several presentations from Norway, including a lively presentation of a student (Ingalill Johnson Borley) in her final qualifying year with the title 'In my Father's Office'. She talked about her experience of growing up with her father training to be a Group Analyst, and now in his footsteps attending the same training. It was interesting for me to hear her describe how the 'analytic level' reached with her private training group was very different to the groups she does within the psychiatry, and how important it is to adjust to this.

Thor Kristian Island from Norway talked about the challenges to keep our work in the public eye, to face the competition from Coaching and to integrate the new findings from Neuroscience into our knowledge base. He also talked about how quantitative research can be very deceptive, in managing to look more substantial than it actually was. We were also told that the IGA in Norway is now offering a new three year training after which people learn to work with specialised groups, like ‘addiction, eating disorders, schizophrenia, personality disorder’ etc.

Rudi Olivieri from Switzerland who calls himself one of the first ‘protesters’ against the IGA, talked about ‘To which generation do I belong?’ He told us about the ‘creative generation confusion’ in his own family, where he has become father again after becoming grandfather. He raised the question: How do we cope with similar confusions in our professional identities? Rudi talked about ‘secondary identifications’ where he believes we have a choice about which mirrors we want to identify with, and the importance of ‘sibling relationships’ in the process of becoming citizens.

Paula Carvalho from Portugal presented the training in Portugal to us, and the difficulties they encounter. What was very interesting was the questionnaire they had produced in order to find out what the needs of the students and practitioners were. Again it involved the whole Group Analytic community and engendered a democratic process.

I hope that in some years we can invite Egatin to come to Bristol to organise the hosting together with IGA London and Turvy, and may be we will be able to present our training to them that time.

I found it very useful and helpful to hear about the range of different trainings offered in Europe. Egatin has decided to produce a questionnaire in order to get a better and more accurate picture about the training courses that constitute it.

Last not least we had fantastic hosts: the days were held in the first psychiatric hospital in Norway, with beautiful tranquil surroundings, still feeling much more like a ‘sanatorium’, rather than a hospital. Anne Marit Gleditsch, director of this hospital, and a group analyst, gave us a warm welcome. On Saturday evening we went up a mountain (with the tram), which was still covered in thick snow, and we had the most delicious Norwegian banquet!

Next year Egatin Study day and AGM will be held in Heidelberg, Germany, 24–26 April. This will be more affordable, and I think

it would be good if students and other members of GASW would join me.

Angelika Gölz
Psychotherapist and Group Analyst (UKCP)
4 Glenarm Terrace • Totnes • TQ9 5PY.

The GAS Forum

The Forum is now becoming a more active and interesting space within which fellow GAS members discuss issues, share understandings, experiences and information, and agree and disagree. If you would like to join this lively community follow these instructions:

The first step is to send an email to me at: birchmore@yahoo.com

I will then sign you up to the GAS Forum and you will begin to receive messages from the Forum.

The most important second step will involve you setting up your own Google account and this will allow you to change your email settings, unsubscribe if you wish, to read the files placed on the GAS Forum Google Group site, and generally to take control of your own administration. This will be expected of you.

So, you now need to create a Google Account in order to do what you want with your subscription to the GAS Forum. You will need to follow these steps:

Visit the Google main page at: <http://www.google.com/>

Any Google main page will be fine, however, Google.de, Google.co.uk, Google in Chinese, etc., etc.

Click on “Sign In” at the top right hand upper corner. On the page that loads click on “Don’t have a Google Account? Create an account now”. You then need to type the email address you have used to sign on to the Forum and choose a password. Easy!

You can then, from the Google Main Page, click on “more” at the top of the page, then on “Groups” – the GAS Forum will then be displayed and you can enter the site and change your email settings, view past messages, and view the files placed on the site by members.

Recent “Threads” Posted on the Forum

- Colin James
- Themes
- Are We Ready For the Times Ahead?
- Foulkes Lecture and Study Day
- Publications By Members
- Social Justice
- New Website
- Tapping Energy

Terry Birchmore

CULTURE

GAS/IGA Film Group

19th September. The Kite Runner

The film follows the story of Amir (Ebrahimi) and Hassan (Mahmidzada), two young boys growing up in Afghanistan in the late 1970s. While Amir is the son of a rich businessman, and Hassan is the child of their family’s servant, the boys are united by friendship and a love of competing in kite competitions. However, other people don’t look so kindly on two boys of different social castes mixing, and when Hassan is brutally attacked and raped by a group of older boys, Amir doesn’t try to help him.

Amir’s shame over this moment of cowardice fractures their friendship, and when the Soviet forces invade Afghanistan in 1979, Amir leaves with his father, never expecting to see Hassan again. Many years later, he and his father have relocated to America, and Amir (now played by Abdalla) is married and has started to make a small living as a writer. However, when he receives a call from a friend of his father’s, it sets off a chain of events that eventually leads him back to Afghanistan to try and make amends for his mistakes as a child.

Discussed by Sarah Tucker and Bob Harris, Group Analysts.

17th October. Chinatown

Directed by Roman Polanski and starring Jack Nicholson and Faye Dunaway this masterpiece is made in the tradition of the film noir. Faye Dunaway is the femme fatal tossed into the chaos created by her father and her lover. How much can one man possess? This film is packed with greed, lust and revenge, the potion of intrigue.

Chinatown sees Jack Nicholson give a career-best performance as the improbably named Jake Gittes, an LA private eye who digs too deeply into the affairs of a mysterious woman (Faye Dunaway) who hires him to spy on her husband. Chinatown can be enjoyed on multiple levels. It's a first-class detective story about a man killed by drowning in the middle of a Los Angeles drought. On top of that, it's a disturbing parable about the pressure put on the human heart, with private detective Jake Gittes (Jack Nicholson) doggedly pursuing the elusive facts about Evelyn Mulwray (Faye Dunaway) and her deep-seated reasons for hiding the truth from him. "You may think you know what you're dealing with," intones John Huston as the depraved millionaire Noah Cross, "but believe me, you don't."

The central discovery about Evelyn is both illicit and amoral. But that's what gives the film its staying power – not just the shock of discovering those peculiar depths of humankind, but that slight intangible thrill of moving toward it. "There's something black in the green part of your eye," says Jake, right before he kisses Evelyn for the first time.

Discussed by screenwriter Andy Clifford.

21st November. The Savages

A powerful, incisive, often very funny look at ageing, ailing family dynamics, superbly acted. A portrait of an estranged brother and sister forced to come together to look for a nursing home for their ailing father as he slowly slips into dementia. Has there been a relationship on screen quite as realistic and complex as the one between Wendy, the aspiring playwright and major drama queen and her older brother John, the 42 year-old Doctor of Philosophy reduced to college English and theatre teacher?

Phillip Bosco plays the father of Wendy and John who are suddenly called to Arizona when he begins slipping into dementia. The brother and sister, both writers with high falutin' dreams (both want more than anything to get a MacArthur grant) and barely disguised competitiveness, haven't had much to do with their father it seems, for years (nor he with them). When they arrive at the home where he

is staying Wendy is more concerned about caring for the Mylar “Get Well” balloon she’s brought along than with her father’s condition. It’s true to life details like this that give Jenkins’ tart script its resonance with real life. Later, when the siblings are forced to move the father to a nursing home the bitching starts and the fights, recriminations, and guilt. Bosco, in his moments of lucidity, provides the reason why John and Wendy are both so emotionally needy.

Discussed by Rachael Davenhill, psychoanalyst.

12th December. Little Miss Sunshine

Little Miss Sunshine is part of an emerging trend that taps into the very real and urgent concerns of working people in increasingly pauperised Bush’s America. This dysfunctional family road film emphatically links internal pathology to the greater economic stress and inequities over which they have little control.

The yellow brick road in ‘Little Miss Sunshine’ leads to a girls’ beauty contest for Olive (Abigail Breslin), a cutie who’s nonetheless not quite pageant material. Olive’s entire family piles into a wheezing van to deliver her to the competition for the titular crown: Uncle Frank (Steve Carell) recently survived a suicide attempt, mum (Toni Collette) is loving but overextended, dad (Greg Kinnear) is an aspiring self-help guru and therefore a nightmare, brother Dwayne (Paul Dano) is a mute and sulking teenager, and grandpa (Alan Arkin) is crusty and foul-mouthed.

Discussed by David Wood, Group Analyst, Child and Adolescent Psychiatrist.

All films shown at The Institute of Group Analysis, 1 Daleham Gardens, London NW3 5BY. Friday evenings monthly starting at 7.30 p.m.

RESEARCH

IGA and GAS Systematic Review: History and Interim Feedback at the GAS Symposium in Dublin in August

We are delighted to inform colleagues about the commissioning of an independent systematic review of research literature into the

effectiveness of psycho dynamic group psychotherapy and group analysis. This important investment was undertaken in response to the concern of UK based practitioners that the Department of Health's emphasis on 'evidence-based' therapies was a major threat to therapies that cannot be manualised and where 'gold standard' research is very difficult to achieve. We envisage the systematic review being the first stage of a longer process of engaging our group analytic colleagues in evaluation and research such that we can build the case for group analytic treatments continuing in the public sector and maintaining the confidence of the wider public in the value of group analysis as a psychotherapy.

The Group Analytic Society (GAS) expressed a strong interest in working with the IGA and this collaboration has taken the form of GAS contributing to the planning, funding, management and dissemination of the review. We put the review out to tender in November 2007 and, from a strong field, appointed the team from the Centre for Psychological Services Research and School of Health and Related Research, at the University of Sheffield: Prof. Glenys Parry, Prof. Michael Barkham, Chris Blackmore and Claire Beecroft, with the help of Prof. Digby Tantam and Eleni Chambers. They began the process of the review in February, 2008 and in keeping with the Cochrane guidelines are working in collaboration with an expert panel. The members of the Panel are:

- Paul Calaminus: manager of services with insight to the needs of commissioners.
- Elizabeth Faulkner: expert by experience as well as psychologist and researcher.
- David Kennard: group analyst and expert on therapeutic communities.
- Prof. Steiner Lorentzen: researcher, from Oslo, and group analyst.
- Steve Pilling: group analyst working at UCL and involved with NICE guidelines.
- David Taylor: psychoanalyst working at Tavistock Clinic and responsible for a randomised trial on depression.
- Prof. Volke Tschuschke: researcher, from Cologne, group analyst and psychoanalyst.
- Jenny Potter: (Chair), IGA Council representative.

The Expert Panel first met in March 2008 and focussed on the search terms for the peer reviewed articles to be examined for the systematic review. Both quantitative and qualitative papers are being collected by the reviewers. The next meeting of the panel will be in July, and the reviewers will present their research methodology at the GAS Symposium in Dublin, on Tuesday 19th August. Claire Beecroft will describe the process of the systematic review, and Chris Blackmore will present initial findings about the numbers of articles that have been collected in the different search categories. There will be time for discussion following the presentation and we look forward to psychotherapists' input on the findings they would be most interested to hear about and suggestions for further dissemination of findings.

The review will be completed in November 2008, and submitted for publication in a peer reviewed journal. We plan to have at least two workshops to disseminate the findings: one for group analytic psychotherapists and one for the public. There will also be a summary of the findings published on the websites of both IGA and GAS, and a report in *Group Analysis*.

The reviewers have been asked for their recommendations as to how best to take research forward following on from the review.

Finally, I also want to acknowledge the very helpful and important contribution of Chris Evans, Chris Mace, Earl Hopper, Morris Nitsun, Mark Ashworth, Kevin Power, Gerda Winther and Marcus Page.

Jenny Potter
Systematic Review Project Lead
jenny.potter@slam.nhs.uk

Research Papers

Marcus D. K. & Kashy D. A. (1995). The social relations model: a tool for group psychotherapy research. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 383–389.

Abstract: The social relations model presented in this article provides a solution to some of the problems that plague group psychotherapy research. The model was designed to analyse non-independent data and can be used to study the ways in which group members interrelate

and influence one another. The components of the social relations model are the constant (i.e., group effect), the perceiver effect, the target effect, the relationship effect, and error. By providing estimates of the magnitude of these 5 factors and by examining the relationships among these factors, the social relations model allows investigators to examine a host of research questions that have been inaccessible. Examples of applications of the social relations model to issues of group leadership, interpersonal feedback, and process and outcome research are discussed.

Markin, R. D. (2007). Application of the social relations model to the core conflictual relationship theme in group psychotherapy: evaluation of the social microcosm theory. Full study (all 132 pages) is available at: <https://drum.umd.edu/dspace/bitstream/1903/7142/1/umi-umd-4190.pdf>

Abstract: The group therapy literature is plagued with methodological and statistical pitfalls. Likewise, researchers have struggled to develop an accurate method of assessing transference. The study at hand used The Social Relations Model to circumvent common problems in group research and is proposed as a way of measuring transference in group therapy. We used the Central Relationship Theme, a derivative of the Core Conflictual Relationship Theme, as a measure of transference. Additionally, while the social microcosm theory is the cornerstone of interpersonal-process groups, few studies exist to support it. This study assessed the social microcosm theory by comparing group members' central relationship themes with other group members to their central relationship theme with a romantic partner outside of the group. The results suggest that transference is present in member to member relationships. Mixed results were found to support the social microcosm theory, i.e., that a group member's transference themes outside of the group are repeated within the group.

A bibliography of Social Relations Papers can be found on the following website: <http://davidakenny.net/ip/srmbib.htm>

These papers explicitly use the Social Relations Model to analyse the data of the study.

IGA/GAS Library Update

The Library Committee has met in April and June 2008, being chaired by Kevin Power, and we are pleased to welcome to the committee Harpreet Gill and Julia Upton. We would still be happy to acquire a member to represent the student body – a current, or recent, student – and a distant, or ‘corresponding’ member. The next committee meeting will be in October 2008.

We have established the Higher/Further Education license as being the appropriate form of Copyright Licensing Agency license for our needs, and are finalising arrangements: this will enable the library to work more effectively for students and tutors.

As I write, the new library system [Softlink Liberty3] is in the early stages of installation: the data from the various catalogue databases has been sent for data transfer to the new system, and the parameters relating to borrowers, loans, recall, reservation arrangements etc., have been supplied to enable creation of the system. I should add that the existing parameters have been used, as being familiar to members, but these can be amended if usage indicates that changes are needed. I would be very grateful for regular and prompt return of loans to ensure that in due course all stock can be checked against catalogue entries. Current database entries are rather minimal and the long but fruitful process of data enhancement will follow.

A ‘current awareness’ listing of journal articles, covering November 2007–June 2008 sourced from journals received in stock, has been maintained, and was circulated to members in mid June.

Elizabeth M Nokes
Librarian
IGA/GAS Library
1 Daleham Gardens
London NW3 5BY
Tel 020 7431 2693
Fax 020 7431 7246
Email: elizabeth@igalondon.org.uk
Available at the following times:
Tuesday and Wednesday: 10.45 a.m. to 17.15 p.m.

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
Email: admin@groupanalyticsociety.co.uk

Autumn Workshop 2008

Organisation:
Group Analytic Society – London
and
Institute of Group Analysis ‘Rasztów’ – Warsaw
Trauma: Individual and Group Experiences

An exploration of the consequences of trauma in the experiences of individuals, groups, societies and generations

Friday 14th to Sunday 16th November 2008

Venue: Krakow, Poland

Jagiellonian University
Institute of Applied Psychology
19 Józefa Street
31-056 Krakow

The workshop is intended as a space to reflect on how traumatic experiences, in terms of both traumatic events and traumatic relationships, carve a psychological landscape and how we work with their consequences.

It will be conducted in Krakow which for centuries was the capital of Poland and the seat of kings, drawing great scholars and artists from the around world. This contributed to the multicultural character of the city which is a treasury of unique historical relics, and which reflects the most important trends in European culture.

There are direct flights from London, Bristol, Liverpool and many European cities including Amsterdam, Barcelona, Brussels, Budapest, Frankfurt, Milan, Oslo, Paris and Prague, and train connections from Warsaw.

Auschwitz-Birkenau [optional] visit on Friday
the 14th of November from 9:00 to 14:00

Alfred Garwood Polish born Holocaust and concentration camp
survivor will be the convenor.

For further information please contact Alfred Garwood:
dragarwood@aol.com

or Łukasz Dobromirski: dobromirski@gmail.com

Lecturers: Werner Knauss, Maria Orwid

Workshops Conductors: Dieter Nitzgen, Alfred Garwood,
Gerard Wilke

Large Group Conductor: Earl Hopper

Small Group Conductors: Helena Klímová, Joanna
Marczewska, Sally Mitchison

Registration: Institute of Group Analysis “RASZTOW”

fax: +48 022 644 76 81

Email: instytut@rasztow.pl

www.instytut.rasztow.pl

GROUPS AT WORK ORGANISATIONAL CONSULTATION FORUM

Monthly forum, commencing on October 15th
from 6.00 p.m. to 9.00 p.m.

The Institute of Group Analysis
1 Daleham Gardens, London NW3 5BY

Fee: £750 (Six Sessions)
IGA members less 10%

The aim of the forum is to enable managers, consultants, coaches and other professionals to further their understanding of individual, group and organisational dynamics, and to develop their skills in consultation and coaching.

Members will be able to reflect on their practice and how the complexity of the working environment impinges on their work roles and relationships, on those of their staff and clients, and how to develop strategies to manage more effectively.

Members will be expected to bring issues of concern or dilemmas related to their work and roles. These will be explored from a psycho dynamic, systemic and group analytic perspective so that both theoretical understanding of individual and group processes will be enhanced. The emphasis will be on task, process and “putting into action.”

The forum will act as a learning community and will explore the dynamics of the group as they arise. There will be a theoretical input as well as case presentations. Managing transitions and uncertainty, leadership, authority, succession, difference and sustainability will be explored.

The Organisational Forum will meet monthly at the Institute of Group Analysis. Fees will be £750 for six sessions. (IGA members less 10%) CPD certification.

Consultants: Dr Marlene Spero and Professor Barry Curnow
For further information please contact:

The Administrator
Institute of Group Analysis
1 Daleham Gardens
London NW3 5BY

Tel: 020 7431 2693
Email: iga@igalondon.org.uk

Groupworks

A Continuing Professional Development Group for experienced therapists & counsellors

Opens Autumn 2008

Fortnightly in term-time

Tuesday mornings 9.45 a.m. to 11.15 a.m.

[18 meetings in the year, totalling 27 hours CPD]

**At the IGA /SAP, 1 Daleham Gardens, London NW3,
near Swiss Cottage tube**

A rare opportunity for experienced therapists and counsellors to meet peers in a reflective practice group to digest and learn from experience. The group will be conducted on group-analytic principles which allow us to encounter others in a rich way, and over time to build a supportive and challenging working community. We will

- Consider the links between our professional and personal development.
- Reflect upon the impact on us of our work and of the organisational settings in which we practise.
- Become more comfortable and effective in groups by experiencing and learning about group processes.
- Wrestle with dilemmas, paradoxes and ethical issues raised by the work.

Minimum commitment 18 sessions; CPD Certificates provided

The group will be conducted by Christine Thornton, a group analyst [Member of the Institute of Group Analysis, UKCP reg.] with extensive experience of leading professional development groups.

For more information and an application form, go to
www.groupworks.org.uk or telephone 01962 620573.

5th World Congress for Psychotherapy

*October 12–15, 2008
Beijing, P. R. China*

East Meets West: The Global Challenges in Psychotherapy

Under the Auspices of
The World Council for Psychology

Organized by

China Association for Mental Health
Chinese Psychological Society
Department of Psychology, Peking University

More information on our web site:

www.wcp2008.org

OPUS International Conference

Organisational and Social Dynamics:
International Perspectives from Group Relations,
Psychoanalysis and Systems Theory

21st & 22nd November 2008

Ambassadors Hotel, 12 Upper Woburn Place, London, WC1H0HX

The two day Conference provides an opportunity for innovative and fresh thinking in the field of organisational and social dynamics and we encourage contributors to take this approach.

The format of the Conference is that on each of the two days there is a Keynote paper in the first Session, followed in the next Session, by a facilitated Discussion Group which is intended to take the thinking of the paper forward through a reflective process. The afternoons consist of two Sessions of parallel papers. These derive from a Call for Papers and a selection based on academic and appropriate content. We select up to twenty four papers which provides members with a selection of six papers in each Session.

Registration and Payment:

The Administrator, OPUS Conference 2008
43 Ormside Way, Redhill
Surrey RH1 2LG
United Kingdom
email: conf@opus.org.uk
Website: <http://www.opus.org.uk/confernc.htm>

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

Please see the GAS Website at:

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