

CONTEXT

International Newsletter November 1993 Issue No: 1



THE GROUP-ANALYTIC SOCIETY



Please send two copies of contributions.

Articles should be on A4. Typed on one side only
If possible the pages should not be numbered.

Contributions for the next edition should be
received by March 1st 1994

The editors reserve the right to withhold all or
part of contributions received, and make
appropriate editorial changes.

Contributors who would like to discuss their
contributions must send material well before the
deadline.

Editors Anne Harrow Sheila Thompson
The Group Analytic Society [London]
1 Daleham Gdns London NW3 5BY
tel. [071]4312693 fax.004471 - 4317246

This newsletter was produced with help from
The Centre for the Arts and Contemporary Studies
Faculty of Cultural and Education Studies
Leeds Metropolitan University



LEEDS METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY

CONTENTS

Editorial		1
Who shall be the new president of the Society ?	Bryan Boswood	3
Constitutional changes	Secretary GAS	4
Sponsorship of professional colleagues .	Kevin Power	5
Statement re- Dr. Radovan Karadzic		6
Freud's thoughts on War and Death	George Renton	7
Reports from Heidelberg :		
Overview of 9th. European Symposium	Peter Bott	8
Shifting 'Boundaries and Barriers' in a L-A-R-G-E Large Group.	Liz Jupp	11
Report	Paul Sepping	14
'Meeting the challenge of the case' Workshop February - May 1993	Marlene Spero	16
Thoughts on convening the Large Group. Spring Weekend 1993.	Teresa Howard	19
Prague -Group Analytic Workshop September 1993	Sheila Thompson	21
A thought	Peter Gonggrijp	22
Correspondence:		
Alexandros Kokkinidis		24
Ian Martin		25
Forthcoming Events		27

EDITORIAL

1993 has been witness to many changes, both externally in the world and internally within the Society. It may be that some of us feel sense of being in a turbulent environment. Perhaps the reality is that the environment and the organisations we belong to are not subject to changes every now and again: disruption followed by periods of calm; but rather are in a constant state of transition. This seems to be the case with the Group Analytic Society. The movement to change and convincingly acknowledge our international identity has been brought about after long and thoughtful discussions in many places. This thinking culminated in Heidelberg in September when constitutional change was put to the AGM and ratified, [apart from the name] under the chairmanship of Bryan Boswood, whose clear and tactful management continues to be highly valued. The gesture by the committee to drop London from the title of the Society, was voted against by European members. It would be interesting and helpful to hear the thinking behind this. Some changes are not so welcome!

However we thought this an appropriate time to introduce change in our newsletter, not only in the format but also in the name. Our aim was to celebrate the change in the Society and also we hope that you will find the new format makes the newsletter easier to read.

The name came to one of the editors in Heidelberg , when it seemed so important to get things into perspective and so into context:- or CONTEXT !

You will have feelings about the changes and we hope you will express them. We also hope that you will feel and join with the creative energy that is in the Society and engage with each other in story ,argument and debate within these pages. We would like to see short articles and research projects; It is possible for the newsletter to be used to try out ideas before they are expanded for publication in journals elsewhere. We have no copyright restrictions.

If you have thoughts -'Get them into CONTEXT', and perhaps we can continue our large group dialogue on paper.

Anne Harrow Sheila Thompson

G A S I S S U E S

Who shall be the next President of the Society?

The responsibility for choosing the next President of the Society lies with every Full Member. My three year term of office ends in May and it is time now for the Society to begin thinking what kind of person next should fill the role.

I am willing to serve for three more years, as the Constitution allows, if the Society wishes that. We would be foolish however to heave a sigh of relief, and assume that we therefore need not give thought to the question until 1997. The personality, the temperament, the experience, the background which seemed right in 1991 may well not be right for 1994. For example, it may already be time to underline further our commitment to our international responsibilities by electing now a President who lives outside the United Kingdom.

Think about it. Talk about it. Do not just settle for the devil you know. Let other names come forward and at the AGM next year let a real decision be made.

Bryan Boswood

President

CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES

At the second part of the Annual General Meeting of the Society held in Heidelberg on 1st September 1993, the members present and those who had been asked by colleagues to act as proxies, voted on accepting all the proposed changes in the Constitution which had been put forward by the European Standing Committee, with one exception. The exception was in excluding the proposal to change the name of the Society by omitting "(London)" from the title. So the name of the society remains "The Group-Analytic Society (London)".

The new constitution will be printed in A5 booklet format, and distributed to all members upon the receipt of next year's membership fee, and also given to all new members as they are accepted into the Society.

There is a debt of gratitude to acknowledge to the members of the European Standing Committee - Tom Hamroque, Werner Knauss, Rudi Olivieri-Larsson - for the work which they have done over the past five years. The changes in the Constitution which they had drawn up required an extensive trawl of opinion among members, and having to accept that some of their ideas did not reflect what the membership at large wanted. The final draft of the changes which was accepted by the AGM had been through many revisions, the last of which was that regarding the change of name. Werner and Rudi did hand in their resignations from the ESC to the President because of this. As the ESC's remit was for five years, it has now reached the end of its working life. However a continuing but altered purpose will probably arise, in the form of a European Development Committee the exact remit for which is still being discussed.

It would be most useful if members with views concerning further development in Europe will write to the Committee and/or the Editors of "Context" to share these with the membership at large.

Sincerely,

Kevin Power, Hon. Secretary.

SPONSORSHIP FOR PROFESSIONAL COLLEAGUES

I want to put before the Membership the possibility of sponsoring a group of up to ten professional colleagues living in a country which does not enjoy stable currency exchange with the west European countries, yet who desire to be connected to the Society in order to further their professional ties with group-analysis. Such sponsorship was mentioned by Bryan Boswood in the previous Bulletin.

The person who is leading this application for Group Membership is **Dr. Ljiljana Milivojevic**, and she and her colleagues work in Belgrade, Serbia. She attended the symposium in Heidelberg this September as, I believe, the only participant from that country. It seems to me that this is an admirable opportunity to demonstrate the Society's commitment to building bridges with other professionals in a country whose national reputation is not at present what it once was, yet has many people ready to change this in the future. They will need the support which contact with the Society can bring them.

They will need one or more than one person who can sponsor them. This may be an opportunity for a number of members who themselves work together to initiate sponsorship and a professional correspondence which will be mutually beneficial. Please contact me via Daleham Gardens if you wish to pursue this further.

Kevin Power.

Hon Secretary.

Dr Radovan Karadzic

There has been mounting concern in the Society during the past year that Dr Karadzic, the political leader of the Bosnian Serbs, is an Associate Member of the Society.

It was alleged in Committee that his conduct in that role fell below the standard which is required of a member of the Society. A letter was written to him setting out the specific allegations which had been raised against him and inviting him to refute them.

No reply was received from Dr Karadzic and, at its meeting on June 14th, the Committee decided, nem.con., to terminate his membership forthwith.

Bryan Boswood President

Iford Mill,

Bradford on Avon, BA15 2BB

12 June 1993

There being no letters column in our Journal Group Analysis may I in the context of the Special Section series: In times of National Crisis comment by remembering and quoting Freud?

Sincerely,

George Renton.

Freud S.

Thoughts for the Times on War and Death

I- The Disillusionment of The War. SE Vol 14 pp 275- (c.1915)

In the confusion of wartime in which we are caught up, relying as we must on one sided information, standing too close to the great changes that have already taken place or are beginning to, and without a glimmering of the future that is being shaped, we ourselves are at a loss as to the significance of the impressions that press upon us and as to the value of the judgements which we form. We cannot but feel that no event has destroyed so much that is precious in the common possessions of humanity, confused so many of the clearest intelligences or so thoroughly debased what is highest. Science herself has lost her passionless impartiality ; her deeply embittered servants seek for weapons from her with which to contribute towards the struggle with the enemy. Anthropologists feel driven to declare him inferior and degenerate , psychiatrists issue a diagnosis of his disease of mind or spirit. Probably, however, our sense of these immediate evils is disproportionately strong, and we are not entitled to compare them with the evils of other times which we have not experienced.

PETER BOTT, MRCPsych., MInstGA [Lond]
Group Analyst

Tel (02) 419 8426
Fax (02) 487 1099

33 Orchard Rd, Chatswood
N.S.W. 2057, Australia

21/9/93

OVERVIEW OF THE 9TH EUROPEAN SYMPOSIUM IN GROUP ANALYSIS

As it is just three weeks since the Symposium, and my digestion of the experiences of these macro-events carries on for some years, I will try to outline some of the issues that are uppermost for me at present-- a kind of incomplete shopping basket of ideas. The processing of these ideas in terms of the management of the boundaries, roles, structures, staffing and content of these Symposia is for later.

In the life of the Group-Analytic Society [London], these Symposia can be seen as nodal points in our very large network, and provide the context, or transitional space in which we can meet, share ideas and experiences, and go away to think about them.

The management of the transitional space, in this particular Symposium, was very much in the hands of the Local Organising Committee, a European Committee, a significant devolution of power and authority from London, which represented a major shift in the Society's direction.

Yet at the special AGM of the Society, despite the amendments to the Constitution, which effectively internationalised the Society, being passed overwhelmingly, the proposal to change the name to "The Group-Analytic Society", dropping the "[London]" tag, was rejected quite definitely. Consternation!

A number of reasons have been advanced for this -- the meeting was held in the middle of the highly charged atmosphere of the Symposium, with its daily large group of 400+. Perhaps there was an acting-out of antagonistic feelings towards the organisers/large group conductor.

But perhaps we did not appreciate the boundary between the administrative functions of the Society, and who are perceived as being able to carry these, on the one hand, and the Culture of the Society, particularly who are perceived as being able to fulfil the role of Culture-carriers. Interestingly, the editorship of the Society Bulletin remains firmly London-based, and it is the Bulletin which functions as the transitional space for our Society in the three years between each European Symposium. So whilst we had a devolution of administrative power, there was no devolution of Cultural power, either at the operational level [no International Editorial Panel for the Bulletin was proposed] or the Symbolic level [the "no" vote to dropping the [London] tag.

So could our current position be seen as resulting from an idealisation of the British? or an anxiety about "Europeanising" the culture [concern about the "Europanic" reflected in some of the decisions of the EC, or concern about the helplessness of Europe to stop the horrors in former Yugoslavia?]. Perhaps it was an intuitive understanding that we are not ready to do things differently from the way London has managed things so far? Perhaps a feeling that London is not Europe, and can remain outside-enough to see what is going on?

I was horrified to think about issues concerning the use of power when I heard the story of how Heidelberg was spared the bombs as the Americans wanted this beautiful city as a headquarters, whilst all around was destroyed. Talking about this with colleagues in Japan the following week, I learned the Kyoto and Nara were also spared for the same reason.

However, the news, during the Symposium, that a Section for Group Analysis had been formed within the IAGP, during their Committee [?headquarters] Meeting held in Heidelberg just prior to our Symposium, raises the issue of whether this will facilitate a sharing of power, or a shift of power, within the Group-Analytic Movement. In explaining what I meant, to my Japanese colleagues, I used the analogy of the meal we were having. A sharing of power was equivalent to pushing the next table against ours. The others could combine their food with ours, we could then sit together around the two tables and all share in the banquet. Power shifting I equated to lifting one corner of the table, so all the food slid down to the opposite corner. Tilting the balance, so to speak. We shall have to wait and see how the boundary between the Society and the new IAGP Section is managed, [if it is managed at all]. Perhaps the Section will provide a locus of identity for IAGP members who are not psychodramatists, and confuse things even more, or perhaps it will provide an opportunity to establish the identifying boundaries of what Group Analysis is, and is not [Foulkesian/European vis a vis North American schools].

The German-Jewish issue was partially dealt with in the Large Group. I think we almost got beyond the feeding off the six million Jewish dead that has been going on for the last half century [do we know as well just how many Germans died as a result of civilian bombing in the Second European War, and how many Russians died as a result of Stalinist purges? Do we??], and reached the beginnings of an understanding of the universality of the victim-persecutor-victim cycle.

However, this got bogged down at the position of forgiveness-and-not-forgetting, rather than reaching a position of forgiveness-and-understanding.

I think that a cultural frame of forgiveness and understanding might provide the kind of boundaries to contain the violence that is within us.

As an example of this violence, take the way the young man on the balcony was dealt with. He had come looking for his mother [who was in my small group], but as he had transgressed a perceived boundary of the Large Group, he had a violent reaction from us, collectively, was shaken by the experience and came out the following day in a skin rash. When this was discussed we ended the matter with well rationalised 'he deserved what he got' statements. Not much forgiveness and understanding from the Group Analytic Society in this instance. Perhaps some boundary management from the Large Group Conductor might have been appropriate here.

There was the interesting question of the expulsion of one of the leaders in the conflict in former Yugoslavia, from membership of the Society. Did we actually make connection with him over this, or did we unilaterally, autistically, reassure ourselves that we had no links with that sort of behaviour. Yet there were links so I understand, through some who have had to carry the blame for some negative aspects of the last Oxford Symposium. It is also of interest to note the absence from Heidelberg of the central figures in the Organising Committee from this last symposium. Forgiveness and understanding?

I suspect the issue of the name change for the Society focuses lots of unaddressed questions which we need to understand more about, before we can begin to work out what the answers might be.

So perhaps we ought to focus, in the next three years, on the Society as an organism worthy of some close examination. To put it in a metaphorical fishbowl and wonder about the culture, processes, boundaries and barriers that make the society what it is.

Peter Bott.

Ed. Comment. The society newsletter Context [formerly The Bulletin] is not, as stated, London based. It is now edited and printed in the north of England, in Leeds, Yorkshire.

Shifting "Boundaries and Barriers" in a L-A-R-G-E Large Group

Most of all I think the large group will be my over-riding memory of Heidelberg. It was a moving experience for many of us - not without pain. I would like to convey the creativity and immediacy of a group of 400 people trying to communicate freely. I doubt I can, at times I doubted we could. However from the first meeting unable to hear, we seemed to come a long way in five daily sessions. This is my recollection of how it unfolded.

We had to begin with what seemed a major upheaval, physically shifting ourselves to hear. Our seating plan reminded us of the adversarial flanks of the British parliament with short cross benches. We adapted it by claiming new territory on the fourth side behind the vacant plenary podium. We laid down the pillar of a lecturn that obscured our seeing each other. We shunned use of "high tech" microphones so we had to learn to speak more clearly, projecting and deepening our voices and slowing our speech down. In the second session we started with such clarity, with an enquiry about who is going to conduct the choir. It must have soon frightened us to think we might be heard. By the end of it we had degenerated into a sort of madness. Chaos ruled. No one could be heard. We shouted over each other. The conductor seemed to have opted for silence - though if he had spoken I doubt he would have been heard. I think there was a sense of history repeating itself through derision.

At the start of the third session the conductor was sitting hidden in the central aisle of the cross benches. He was asked why he was sitting by the exit. He replied robustly something like, "I am in the centre, I think you are all eccentric."

Moments of intimacy and sharing of pain seemed to touch pain in others and could not be tolerated for long. I missed the German voice,

and that of the women at the beginning of the week. There were tensions between us. Jewish and nazi family recollections brought guilt, relief and reconnection. There were sacrificial scapegoats and unifiers. One scapegoat persisted with an inaudible standing presence until invited to "Stand up!" and shortly afterwards was recognised by a woman who remarked, "We are partners, you and I, I have the voice, you have the attention. Tell me what you want to say, and I will say it for you." The following day it was good to hear from him in a stronger voice having reintegrated himself. The personal emerged from the cultural, the cultural from the personal. Some shared their tears, or historical shame hidden away until now, others were touched, myself amongst them.

At times I felt torn by the tensions within the Group Analytic Society. It seemed to have a tidal momentum of its own, and bewilderingly hidden from those who were not members, especially the 53 on scholarships from the eastern block. We were liable to alienate one another. We tried to cope by being rational rather than irrational, supportive rather than spontaneous. The expression of utter exasperation from a first time participant who puzzled whether she would gain anything to take back to her work from this week, was a salutary experience.

We reached monstrous proportions when reference was made to the picture of an ox fornicating with a woman. Or was it a fox? - much laughter, although others had not heard the joke. Did we want an orgy, or was this yet another reference to Oxford, a previous venue, and another hidden history for many of us. It wouldn't have been a sterile ox, it would have been bull.

With our conductor much like Foulkes a shadowy figure, the large group found itself monitoring its own boundaries. Who was the man watching us from the forbidden seating on the balcony? Did our

spotlight on him chase him away; and was it cruel; was it a fact that he developed spots next day? We heard he was someone's relative. Were we being infantilised? Some felt infantilised. I found it refreshing to hear from our conductor next day that he didn't mind being infantilised, and he didn't mind infantilising us. He reckoned we needed to be in touch with those child parts, and our primitive savage impulses.

On the last day I discovered my comforting assumption, that our conductor had led large groups of this magnitude before, to be unfounded. He shared that this group had behaved very differently from his own expectation of usually rather silent defended beginnings. We had clamoured to speak, there was hardly a pause for reflection, we certainly became mindless in patches. The group was finally able to move through the despair of having no conductor and wanting to consider having many conductors for such a large group in future, to the appreciation that our conductor had not defended his lonely position by manic interpretations. He had let us be, he had let us reach and voice much disturbance, and welcomed from the outset our senseless outbursts amongst other contributions. By the end I was one among many who felt a participator, not just a by-stander, in a very real dialogue which fills me with inspiration. We surprised ourselves, I think, by the genuine warmth of our parting after a week together.

I shared my hunger for regular large group experiences back home. Is this an ideallistic illusion? - or worth striving for to break through our prohibitive barriers, and create new bounds.

Liz Jupp

Group psychotherapist

Brighton

September 1993

- Day 1. Exhilarating
- Day 2. Exhausting
- Day 3. Wonderful
- Day 4. Sad
- Day 5. Joyful
- Day 6. Hopeful
- Day 7. Fulfilling

These 7 words describe my personal response to the 7 days of the Heidelberg Conference - the 9th European Symposium in Group Analysis - "Boundaries and Barriers".

After checking into my hotel, near the main square and beautiful river, I wandered down the pedestrian precinct wondering if I'd disappear in this German crowd, only to bump into Marlene Spero, who, arriving a day earlier with the "London Gang", marginally less disorientated, having just been for a river cruise! Sunday evening, Malcolm Pines kicked off with the Jews and the Germans. 400 of us from almost every conceivable nation (there may have been no outer Mongolians) were treated to a worthwhile talk which, along with the discussion, invoked Goethe, Ishmail, Foulkes and child sacrifice. Then we got down to the real proceedings, the Begrufingsbuffet (welcoming buffet), wines and dishes of "yummy" type sustained a loud "hub! hub!" of cross table talk for several hours before we remembered we all had to be sober for the morning's (every morning's !!) small groups 8.15 to 9.45am.

These multinational small groups were, for me, the highlight. The cultural barriers between people, and their differing languages, were a principal topic. How much would these cultural barriers ultimately divide people. I remembered Leisl Hearst's Foulkes lecture and felt that understanding might be possible, if, and only if, the depth of these cultural barriers were not underestimated.

The Monday Plenary began with Sir Peter Ramsbotham's discourse on his experiences in the eye of several storms from Yalta through Suez to the Iranian revolution - an intriguing insider's view of some famous personalities and their cultural blind-spots. Earl Hopper was discussant and did his best (which was impressive) to respond without much notice, to some of the points raised. I learned about Malcolm's "we/ego" concept. Several Middle Eastern members felt the British view represented by Sir Peter needed modifying with insights from the Third world experience of these momentous events.

The coffee break arrived just nicely. Edward Klain then told us of large/medium group therapy under civil war conditions in the former Yugoslavia. How, we asked ourselves, could anyone be a therapist with their own civil war - how do you hang on to sanity in an insane society? Mittagessen - again - just in time (but student style!). Michael Schroter, a sociologist, then told us about Elias' influence on Foulkes from when he was still Dr Fuchs till the 40s. My feelings for the "Old Man" warmed even more when I heard he and his brother were enthusiastic sportsmen in their youth, and when I also realised how courageous was Foulkes' initiative in pioneering the group format, whilst remaining analytic. Rather like Einstein remaining friendly to Newton whilst turning him up-side down!

Have you ever been in a large group of 400 people, surviving 5 daily one-and-a-half hour meetings, and lived? Well, 400 of us did. The turn-up was almost complete and Josef Shaked was superb; also (over the week's meetings) he was a devil, an eccentric, a daddy and the Invisible Man!

Then, the fishbowl on the historical review really got the fish watchers going, with Peter Bott (a fairly big Australian fish) being the fall guy, Earl diving for cover and Leisl standing up to the criticism, which curiously highlighted the least verbal fish (Vibeke Nathan). Were women being kept down, one South African wondered. So did others.

Rudnitzki then gave a talk on: had public institutions become places of secret violence and shame in the battle for power? Christopher Rance drew out similarities between work and therapy groups, before numerous attempts to shoot down his assertions.

Another student lunch!

By Wednesday, the weather was hot and sunny, so after Holmes, Gross and Moraitou had bravely criticised their current training courses, and Werner and Karaolidou had debated the status of "abstinence", we decided to go swimming and avoid lunch! What a great feeling to swim in a warmed open air Olympic sized pool surrounded by trees and lawns and flowers - the perfect antidote to the conference. We also avoided the AGM, I confess!

Thursday morning was the men/women divide which carried on the debate about single sex versus mixed sex groups, their advantages/disadvantages and where they may eventually shake down into the therapeutic spectrum. Sheila Ernst and Beate Rasper spoke enthusiastically. Violence and transsexuality were the afternoon's offerings. We went swimming. (I really must be made of putty!)

Farhad Dalal stood up to Adele Mittiwock over culture and alienation. Susan Heenen-Wolff discoursed on the Death wish. We heard that cultural identity allows the necessary simplifying of the universal human identity but also necessarily had its drawbacks if used in a rigid way. Ruidi Olivieri-Larsen told us there were circa 2,000 living languages but only circa 200 states. That xenophobia had passed its usefulness as a tribal protective mechanism. That a "home" feeling may be necessary, even for the present GAS. Also that: fathers apparently come in handy to "disturb and rescue the primitive narassistic relation between mother and baby".

Friday - so soon!

The joining of Jew with German, Christian with Muslim, North with South; all this coupled with my own fragmented family inheritance of Anglo-Saxon, Antipodean and Teuton to make it seem like an anima/animus connection which had given new life and wholeness. Russian, Dane, Greek, Swiss, Italian, German and British. We all came together in our small group and fondly said our goodbyes. We felt changed for the better.

Thank you Werner, Ursula and your efficient fellow colleagues! We were really treated to an unforgettable week's experience.

Paul Sepping

MEETING THE CHALLENGE OF THE CASE

(Workshop - February to May 1993)

The workshops were a follow up to the "What Do Consultants Do?" event that was run last year run by Phillip Boxer and Barry Palmer. They were held over three weekends during a four month period. The aim was to enable participants to develop their skills and understanding and to put new ideas and theoretical perspectives into practise by working with current case material. There were 11 participants from diverse backgrounds including the NHS, Social Services, consultancy and business. The hard work entailed and the questions that were raised for everyone made it a truly worthwhile experience. We all made a significant shift in our ways of understanding how we worked as consultants and the issues that consultancy raises.

The first weekend focussed on the role of the consultant. Three types of consultants were identified:

1. The Bird consultant - who is seen to have all the answers and will fly in and out of organisation solving its problems.
2. The Guru consultant who is asked to identify what the real problem is behind the presenting problem and to make recommendations as to what to do about it.
3. The Process consultant or Fool who does not know what the real problem is nor its solution, but who with the client goes into the darkness of shared ignorance" and learns with him how things can be different.

Each was linked to different organisational contexts and structures, different sets of relationships and expectations on the part of the client system, and different frames of organising knowledge; this was reflected in the processes of speaking and listening (including listening to our listening) which could effectively restrict or open up the conversation between the consultant and client system.

The workshop focussed on the Process consultant or Fool as Boxer and Palmer prefer to call him. The overriding question facing the Process consultant is that of having to deal with uncertainties and ambiguities as he tries to identify the certainties and the realities of the clients position and his problems. The challenge was to develop the ability to question our values and theoretical frameworks/stances as we learnt through experience and worked with the unknown. As Palmer suggests the torch (psychoanalysis or whatever other perspective we adopt) that we shine, only illuminates a certain field and helps us choose a certain path. It also ensures that we don't see things and fall down holes (because of the narrowness of the beam and the restricted wave length of its light) Our task was not only to widen the spread

of the beam but also to develop an awareness of and a sensitivity to our preferred ways of "shining the light."

The first weekend focussed on the role of the consultant and the difficulties and anxieties encompassed in working in the field of the unknown by both the client and consultant. We started with some theory to enable us to explore new ways of understanding and conceptualising the work and then worked in small groups. Members of each group took on the role of the client (the consultant presenting his problem), the consultant who would ask questions to clarify the problem and the observer who was called a plus one. The role of the plus one became crucial in questioning the process and asking questions about what had not been asked thereby attempting to push the boundaries of knowledge and realities or uncertainties that little bit further. The challenge was to build up a picture which could be seen as an ongoing process or conversation with the client as well as to understand the way we responded to and contributed to this process. The consultant was thus seen as part of the process/system. We were presented with numerous questions that we needed to consider to enhance our understanding and clarity. For example the need to clarify the problem; to identify the symptoms; to decide who owned the problem; what was being missed out; what was understood or not; our role in the problem; whether we were being drawn into the process and colluding with it or disagreeing and becoming highly critical of it; whether we were just depending on one account and whose account was it anyway and so on.

As consultants we had to listen critically to the client's description of what was going on and how the client system viewed the problem, asking ourselves some of the above questions, trying to find out what was being ignored and whether we could get beyond the presenting problem. This was the task in the little groups whose membership rotated thereby extending the experience of working in the various roles. There was time for reflection and feed back from the plus one. The problems presented ranged from those connected with an ecclesiastic group facing issues of change and dilution, a social service department having to restructure itself, a team development programme for a group of area sales managers, a therapy organisation coping with change, a family business faced with the problem of succession, a health department dealing with new legislation and reorganisation.

The second weekend focussed on the client system and the different ways the client could view the problem. This was linked to the differences in the structure of knowledge, information and power within organisations and how individuals could get stuck into "being obedient to a particular form of speaking and listening." Attention was paid to issues of time and space and the fact that the frame/context could change as well as the location of the problem within the organisation. But more important was the question of "where to draw the line or to make the cut?" What and who was to be included or excluded? What was "intimate" or "extimate" to the problem - or in Foulkes' words part of the individual or group matrix. Were the symptoms to do with the individual or with something going on in the organisation? Where was the problem located? Where was the

"body"? What was the problem; how did we know it has been solved; why was it problematic and what action needed to be taken?

Case material was once again presented and the same roles re-enacted of client, consultant and plus one in the small groups. We reported back on how we had progressed; on the questions that were still unanswered; on how we now saw the various dilemmas and on the metaphors we were using to understand the organisations that we were working with. The whole process of engagement was systematically reviewed and assessed. The plus ones once again reported back on the process - on the conversation between the client and consultants attempting to reflect "what had been left out"

The final weekend gave us the opportunity to explore what we had learnt from the process of working as consultants during the four month period of the workshops and how our own positions and perceptions could limit what we could do with the client. We looked at the questions that had been raised for us; where we had gone wrong; where we got stuck; the questions that we still needed to answer as well as what could not be said. In the final session the group had to listen to how the presenter interpreted what had been going on including his/her own part of it so as to enable him/her to verify whether he/she had been able to move beyond the problem as presented initially.

To summarise - in the first weekend we "imaginarised" what was going on; in the second weekend we began to share ways of "symbolising" what was going on and in the third weekend we made aware of the moments of "realisation", the moments when we became aware of the certainties in our consultancy as well as of our difficulties and stuckness. We felt more assured of what we needed to do next. We were also very struck by the importance of considering how language structured the reality of the organisation as well as the consultative process and expressed a wish to pursue these ideas further.

The group is meeting again in September to review their work progress and to decide on whether we should organise more workshops to pursue these ideas. We are hoping to re-run the core workshops in 1994, so if anyone is interested, please could you get in touch with me.

Dr Marlene Spero (Ph.D)

2nd August, 1993

Some thoughts on convening the Large Group Spring Weekend Study Day

This year, the Scientific Programmes Committee decided to change the format for the Study Day. Instead of a series of small groups, there were two large groups encompassing all the participants in the hope that the process would reflect the nature of the topic that had been set by Liesel Hearst's Foulkes Lecture, 'Our Historical and Cultural Cargo and its Vicissitude in Group Analysis' and further expanded by Farhad Dalal in his response and Luc Michel in his Study Day paper, 'From Outside to Inside Marginality in Groups'.

As a result of its size, the large group evokes a cultural dimension and therefore provides an opportunity to think about and discuss culture within a structure that facilitates the questioning of our own embedded cultural assumptions within the context of a developing dialogue that makes it possible to build bridges across the differences. Maybe it was a very tall order for the day but unusually, most people returned after lunch for the second group.

The first group was started with a reflection about the rich material that had been presented and an invitation to use the groups for discussion. I was aware that many people had strong feelings about what had been said but, despite some encouragement, there was no direct follow on from the obvious differences in perspective of each of the speakers. Instead, people free associated to the material. I am aware that discussion about culture inevitably raises issues of racism and sexism that leaves many feeling uncomfortable.

The theme of marginality from Luc Michel's paper was immediately taken up. The first comment reflected on the difficulty and importance of the therapist remaining marginal to the group.

Amidst the halting beginnings that followed, a fervent hope was expressed that people, whose first language was not English, could speak and that we might find a way of understanding. I reflected that most of us find it difficult to speak in this kind of setting, even those of us for whom English is our first language. Finally, an Italian spoke very lyrically in her own language. Many were entranced but some were not. Terror was evoked in one woman from Czechoslovakia. For her, the Italian language had evoked memories of second world war fascism.

Luc Michel said that he had thought of asking an English person to read his paper for him but, on balance, had decided that he wanted us to struggle with his pronunciation so that we would have to deal with feeling marginal in relation to him.

A sense began to emerge that there were many differences despite little direct expression of them. An accompanying fear was given a voice that if we could not bridge our differences and hear each other violence may erupt. Would we have to resort to a blood bath to remove those who were too different to make it possible to speak? Did we really wish for some ethnic cleansing? Did a group like ours really have these thoughts so close to the surface? Maybe a large group so full of obvious difference so close to home was too shocking and threatening to contemplate.

A large drawing was spread across the floor to show how each person is in fact part of a number of multiple groups and therefore does have the power to make a difference if each can find a voice. The drawing drew a powerful response. Was it an assault on the group process? Was its initiator being provocative, or violent? Should it be taken up?

In the break, I was asked if it was my decision or the that of the Scientific Programmes Committee to remove the drawing from the floor. I felt very firmly that it was a decision the group had to make.

Trying to make this decision took the group a long time. It was uncomfortable and many wished that I as convenor would put them out of their agony by making the decision for

them. But, is it the role of the large group convenor to become the only person who guards the group in the way that the conductor of a small group might? If she responds to the anxiety in the group in this way, she runs the risk of becoming a dictator. Learning citizenship is not easy. For the group to be able to take on the important task of taking on the responsibility of dealing with its members in a democratic fashion, each person taking their vote or voice seriously enough to express their view takes time and patience.

I noted that tolerance seemed to be a forbidden idea in this group at which point it was acknowledged that nobody was actually going to kill anybody in the room. It was a relief to finish on this note.

In the reflections afterwards, it was suggested that large groups raise very powerful id feelings. With memories of Hitler's rallies in my family's mind, I realise that what we do with these instinctual forces is a controversial issue for society, reflecting very directly on the large group and its role. Do we really want or need to give these feelings their full unabated natural voice within the context of the large group?

The large group structure is one in which cultural assumptions are evoked and made conscious. It provides the possibility of learning to think despite the assumptions that we bring with us. One of the most universal ideas in the therapy world is that when chairs are set in a circle, the only acceptable currency is talk about feelings. This assumption can sometimes lead to a flight away from disagreement and the clash of cultural assumptions that inevitably exist in the large group. Conversely we can insulate ourselves within the familiarity of the small group never dealing with the pain of intense cultural difference which leads to some of the horrors of the world.

According to de Maré, the task for the large group is not to express our feelings as if we are inarticulate children but to learn to be articulate adults engaged in social intercourse, a complex *multilectic*, as opposed to dialectic, process that takes time and practice because it is not a natural process.

Some people expressed a wish for the usual small groups on the Study Day because they felt that it had not been possible to talk in the large group. Maybe it was more work in the large group but it did create an environment that held the difficulties inherent in the subject. A wish for discussion groups without feelings and feelings groups without concepts being discussed was also expressed. Isn't this a split?

A large group of this size does evoke powerful feelings, thoughts and ideas. In contrast to the small group, it provides an opportunity to feel the powerful feelings that a group of this size can evoke in each of us, and to transform them into energy for discussion. After the initial silence, we soon became aware of the intense frustration about not being able to get a word in edgeways, then intense hatred. Of course the hatred could be expressed full force but not many people would have been able to stay in the room.

Transforming these very powerful feelings and finding a way of negotiating our differences is no easy task. It takes practice and gradually tells us something about our own cultural assumptions. The energy derived from this transformation can be used for thinking. To quote from de Maré, the large group creates 'a cauldron of energy in a state of chaos' from which new ideas get generated. To my mind this outcome is greatly preferable to unending battles.

Teresa Howard

GROUP ANALYTIC WORKSHOP in PRAGUE - Sept 24 - 26 1993
 conducted by Irene Bloomfield, Kevin Power and Sheila Thompson

We are just back from a three day workshop at the Psychoterapeutické Středisko in Prague, at the invitation of Prof Skala and Dr. Vaclav Burianek, organised largely through the initiative of Helena Klimova who some members will remember meeting at a January Workshop two years ago.

Each day we gave a theoretical presentation with discussion, followed by two small groups and ending with a median group. We had prepared a lot of notes which we left to be translated and circulated, and a collection of books donated by the Society.

With only a minority able to communicate easily in English, we had to rely on translators, something in which we had no experience. This was frustrating for everyone at first but by the end of the third day we were getting more skilled and beginning to find ways in which this could be used creatively.

The changes in psychotherapy in the Czech Republic have come very rapidly after the many years in which any form of psychoanalytic work was proscribed, and all that was sanctioned was a therapy based on a Pavlovian psychology and geared to produce social conformity in short order. The more experienced psychotherapists at the workshop had all had their training "underground" as part of what they called "islands of positive deviation." They spoke of the pressure they feel under to make up for lost time.

We were trying to present and demonstrate an approach which seemed to them to be very different to the psychotherapy in groups which they are practicing now. There was some bafflement at first followed by a growing interest in group analysis both as a form of therapy and as a means of approaching the wider problems of a society undergoing rapid change.

There was a strongly expressed wish for more workshops in Prague and a hope that some of them would have opportunities to come to workshops in London. The problem at the moment is shortage of money

We were asked to thank the Society very much for the books which they said would be invaluable to them.

Sheila Thompson.

A thought

- I. To have been looked after by elder enough children and to have been looking after younger enough children - younger and elder enough for the elder ones really to be interested, and the younger ones really to enjoy this interest - is to have been co-parented and co-parenting children, building bridges between adult dependability and infant dependency.
- II. To find adult dependability again we need find the co-parented and co-parenting children, and help them find a place well looked at. Bunches of places well looked at.
- III. The step from large to small families is an understandable one, but the loss of co-parenting is unbearable. And unnecessary.
- IV. Is, yes is it an infantilisation that children and now also adult children learn not to listen in a large group and speak (of the needs of parenting and co-parenting), learn not to look in a large group and see what is necessary for child co-parenting not only but also for adult co-parenting ?
- V. Are the adult co-parents, the friends, the relatives, the in-laws now denigrated, now ridiculed, now dismissed ?

Has marriage now, diminished, become a whimsical contract of two isolated beings, and has education been reduced to

educating the not-in-law in the making ?

VI.

Does this happen through force of circumstances unlooked at,
and will this continue to happen as long as we don't look
after
the circumstances that our in-laws-in-the-making grow
up
in, and grow out of ?

Peter Gonggrijp, engineer, architect.



The illustration is from "Bergasse 19" by Edmund Engelman 1976.

The Bulletin
 Group-Analytic Society (London)
 1 Daleham Gardens,
 London NW3 5BY

A FRENETIC GROUP-ANALYTIC ACTIVITY IN THE GREEK NAVY?

Dear Editor,

I would like to clarify a few things regarding group analytic activities in the Greek Navy after reading Dr. Menoutis' article "Group Analysis in a Psychiatric Department of a Naval Hospital" (Bulletin, No 35, pp. 19-23).

My first comment is a serious dispute about the existence of all the presented group activities, (172 group sessions for the patients, 19 group sessions for the hospital staff, and 5 for Naval officers and prisoners' groups, on a monthly basis). I do know the potential and the facilities of that particular unit because I worked there from 1984 to 1989, in the last year with Dr. Menoutis as an assistant who took over from me when I took my sabbatical, and therefore I can not figure out the way that Dr. Menoutis was able to operate on a month's time (160 working hours), 196 group sessions, carry on at the same time the administrative duties, and the treatment of the individual cases that they do not participate in the groups.

My intention is not to correct miscalculations nor to denounce his missappropriations of somebody else's work but I feel obliged to point out that when I returned to the hospital after my sabbatical in U.S.A., Dr. Menoutis handed over to me three staff members and just three patients! Both these three-member groups had no idea of this frenzy group-analytic activity described in his article. Furthermore and after some investigation I found out that under Dr. Menoutis leadership a steady decline of the patient population occurred in the preexisting Therapeutic Community, as gradually all groups had been replaced with quick individual sessions, with the therapist (Dr. Menoutis) sitting behind his desk with the staff on his side, and after some discussion with the single patient, the therapeutic session was over.

Another point is that Dr. Menoutis claims that he introduced group analysis and group psychotherapy into the Greek Navy, which is not true because he, as a former assistant to me in the same unit, knows very well that the project that he is trying to present as his own started in 1984, four years before his arrival to the Salmis Naval hospital. The interested reader is been referred to a paper of mine "A Therapeutic Community in the Greek Navy" ("The Intern Journ of Therapeutic Communities", 1988, Vol. 9 (4) pp. 299-306), as well as to other articles commenting to this, i.e. "Model and task" and "TC a la Greque" in the same issue which he fails even to mention.

I know that Dr. Menoutis had many misfortunes as a trainee in the I.G.A. Athens and also a rather controversial membership to our society (see Bull. 27), and most probably is due to these things that he tries to impress as a zealot to Group Analysis. The problem is that at the same time he is entertaining the idea of an expert in T.C. However in his detailed enumeration of the groups in the described "therapeutic community" there is no trace even of a single community meeting, which after all is the cornerstone of any community.

I believe that the predicament of the unit and the exaggerations (to say the least) of his article are due to his personal strivings in to which the actual survival of the unit unfortunately was not in his priorities.

Sincerely,



Alexandros Kokkinidis, M.D.
 Commander, M.C. Hellenic Navy
 Psychiatrist-Group Analyst
 Member of I.G.A. Athens

IAN H. MARTIN

M.D., F.R.C.PSYCH., F.R.A.N.Z.C.P., D.P.M.,
MEMB. INT. PSY. ANALYT. ASSOC (1969)

25

228 WILLIAMS ROAD,
TOORAK, 3142,
VICTORIA, AUSTRALIA.
Telephone: (03) 827 9630
Facsimile: (03) 826 6589

Honorary Consultant Psychoanalyst,
St. Vincent's Hospital, Melbourne.
Private Practice.
Member, A.A.G.P.(1973)

1 July 1993.

Dr. Ronald Sandison,
c/o The Bulletin G.A.S.(London),
1 Daleham Gardens,
LONDON NW3 5BY.

Dear Ronald,

Ave Valeque, from one who enjoyed the Bulletin over many years, and then meeting you in Melbourne at the 2nd P.R.R.C.

We of the A.A.G.P. admired the grace with which you and those of your colleagues from G.A.S.(London) who were at the 2nd P.R.R.C. entered into our ways and enriched them. As your subsequent Editorial showed, already there was development afoot within the "Historical and Cultural Cargo" of G.A.S.(London), to which you referred on page 3 of Bulletin No.36, June 1993. This echoes in the Editorial of the new Editors. I liked their quotation of William Gifford's words "This insatiate itch of scribbling." I had meant to scribble to you before; but I do have that itch.

The warm response to my "Experiential Group Supervision of Group Psychotherapists" at the 2nd P.R.R.C. encouraged me to scribble about it. Ms. Chris Hill, one of that first group of supervised, who then participated, has joined me in the next development of this model. She is now Co-Supervisor, beginning as the "Sorcerer's Apprentice" but with the "Sorcerer" present and verymuch awake to the additional value, when many of the new groups of supervised are, or will, practice as Co-Therapists. Progressively, she has felt her way into the role of "Co-Supervisor:.. This is a 'first' in our area. I wonder if others have tried it.

I have "scribbled" the draft of a paper on the origins and development of this model of supervision, and Chris has a copy with an invitation to provide her input. Always, the origins and developments carried the input from those supervised, making it a joint enterprise.

...2/

As you and your colleagues were able to observe, at the 2nd P.R.R.C., it is a way of supervising, which enhances observation of, and empathy with, what is happening in the treatment group being worked with by the one(s) being supervised. Also, that it is applicable to any group psychotherapists practicing any Applied Psychoanalytic method. The various frameworks, such as "Group Analysis" or the "Psychoanalytic Group Psychotherapy" model which some of ^{us} lean to, are background, not the central focus.

In view of the open-minded responses, at and since the 2nd P.R.R.C., some of us favour offering the paper to the new Editors of the Bulletin (G.A.S.London), which appears set to continue your broadening of perspective.

In any case, as a gesture to our friend Ronald, I will send you a copy.

As you mentioned, distance from London poses difficulties. Consequently, only a few of our number have managed return visits. Some will come to Heidelberg. My next venture will be to the 3rd P.R.R.C. in Taipei in September this year, where I ^{hope} I shall encounter many friends, old and new.

With warm greetings to you and best wishes for a retirement busy enough to keep you active.

Yours sincerely,

Ian
Ian H. Martin.

5

FORTHCOMING EVENTS

March 25th-27th 1994

"BEYOND PREJUDICE: NETWORKING VERSUS RIGIDITY IN GROUP ANALYTIC TRAINING."

E.G.A.T.I.N. - Study-Days in Moskow

Information: IGA Zürich, Bahnhofstr. 106, CH-8620 Wetzikon, Switzerland

March 23rd - 25th 1994

"BEYOND PREJUDICE"

Transcultural Group-Analytic Workshop in Moskow with participants
from Western and Eastern Europe.

Information: IGA Zürich, Bahnhofstr. 106, CH-8620 Wetzikon, Switzerland

STAFF :
Egon Ginter
Kerstin Jurek
Christa J.
Paul J.
N.

AGENTS :
Karin K. Frensch-Adler

THE GROUP-ANALYTIC SOCIETY (LONDON)
1 Daleham Gardens, London NW3 5BY

Telephone :

From U.K. (071) 431 2693

From other countries +44 71 431 2693

Fax : (071) 431 7246

22nd LONDON WORKSHOP
29th DECEMBER 1993 - 1st JANUARY 1994 (INCLUSIVE)
AT DALEHAM GARDENS

BEING TOGETHER BRIEFLY
AN EXPLORATION OF SHORT-TERM APPROACHES
WITHIN THE GROUP-ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK

VENUE :

The Group-Analytic Society (London)
1 Daleham Gardens, London NW3 5BY

Angela Molnos & Pamela Ashurst

CONVENORS :

STAFF :

Ewa Gottesman
Rocco Pisani
Cynthia Rogers
Paul Sepping
Michael Sevit
Sally Willis

FEES :

- £225 G.A.S. Members (before 31st October 1993)
- £250 Non - G.A.S. Members (before 31st October 1993)
- £275 All bookings after 31st October 1993

Details and application forms from Mrs. Brenda Ling at the above address

Please enclose a stamped addressed envelope

————— DIALOGUE IN LARGE GROUPS
————— DIALOGUE IN LARGE GROUPS
————— DIALOGUE IN LARGE GROUPS
DIALOGUE IN LARGE GROUPS

4 more Large Group Study Days have been arranged for 1993/4, open to any one who is interested in developing communication in this larger format.

DATES

Sat. 23rd October. Sun. 28th November. (N.B. no room available on the Sat.) Sat. 29th January. Sat. 5th March.

PLACE

G.A.S. 1, Daleham Gdns. N.W.3

FEE

£25 per Study Day, including coffee, light lunch, tea and wine at the close.

This is the fourth year that we have convened these experiential groups. We have kept the name Large Group although so far the groups have been median rather than large. Approximately half the participants are members of the G.A.S., and some have been coming regularly. There has been a rich mixture of occupations and life experience. We are finding that spreading the larger group over a whole day brings more structure and coherence, allowing time to pick up and rework themes from earlier in the day.

Kevin Power (081 451 6742)
Sheila Thompson (071 607 1646)

Group Convenors.

.....



THE INTSITUTE OF GROUP ANALYSIS (APPLIED SECTION)

1 DALEHAM GARDENS, LONDON NW3 5BY
TELEPHONE : 071 - 431 2693

THE MANAGEMENT DILEMMA. "WHOM DO YOU NEED TO PLEASE MOST?!"

A workshop for those supervising and managing staff who deliver direct services and who experience the squeeze between senior management and service delivery.

DATE : FRIDAY 18th MARCH 1994
TIME : 10.00 am - 4.00 pm
VENUE : 1 Daleham Gardens
London NW 3 5BY

SPEAKERS :
RUTH FASHT
(Director of a national voluntary childcare organisation)

CHRISTOPHER RANCE
(Organisational consultant)

CONVENOR :
MARLENE SPERO

Small groups will be conducted by members of the Institute of Group Analysis.

The Applied Section of the Institute seeks to look at the application of group analytic principles to organisations.

This Workshop is aimed at people in social services, health and education departments, voluntary organisations and individual consultants who are responsible for the support and management of groups of staff.

Issues to be addressed :

- Facilitation and Enabling of staff groups
- Implementation of Agency policy
- The manager as a person
- Stress and Energy levels
- The influence of service users

There will be an opportunity for participants to share individual experiences in a group setting.

Fee : £75

To : Brenda Ling, Administrative Director, The Institute of Group Analysis
1 Daleham Gardens, London NW3 5BY

I wish to attend the Workshop for managers at the I.G.A. on Friday 18th March 1994 and enclose a cheque for £75 (made payable to The Institute of Group Analysis).

PLEASE USE BLOCK CAPITALS :

NAME : _____
ADDRESS : _____

TEL : _____
PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND : _____

SIGNATURE : _____ DATE: ___/___/___

PLEASE ENCLOSE A STAMPED ADDRESSED ENVELOPE FOR A REPLY



THE INSTITUTE OF GROUP ANALYSIS

1 DALEHAM GARDENS, LONDON NW3 5BY
TELEPHONE : 071 - 431 2693

"THE SOCIAL UNCONSCIOUS - GROUP ANALYSIS AND POLITICAL LIFE."

DATES :
FRIDAY 21ST & SATURDAY 22ND JANUARY 1994

TIMES :
FRIDAY: 7.00pm - 10.00pm.
SATURDAY: 10.00am - 5.00pm.

VENUE :
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON, INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION,
JEFFREY HALL, 20 BEDFORD WAY, LONDON WC1H 0AL

SPEAKERS :

EARL HOPPER :
Formerly a sociologist and now a full-time psychoanalyst and training group-analyst. Past Chairman of the Group of Independent Psychoanalysts of the BPAS, he is now President - elect of the International Association of Group Psychotherapy.

SUSIE ORBACH :
A psychotherapist, and co-founder of the Women's Therapy Centre in London and the Women's Therapy Centre's Institute in New York. She writes a column on emotional issues in the Guardian Weekend.

ANDREW SAMUELS :
A training analyst of the Society of Analytical Psychology and a Scientific Associate of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis. His most recent book is *The Political Psyche* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, September, 1993)

All three speakers are the authors of numerous books and articles.

LARGE GROUP CONVENERS :
DENNIS BROWN & SHEILA ERNST

WORKSHOP CONVENERS :
GILL BARRATT & BARBARA ELLIOTT (Discussant)

The Psychoanalytical study of groups developed in response to the realization that human beings are rooted not only in their bodies and species but in their families, language, class, race and gender roles. Mainstream psychoanalysis has still not integrated the fact that unconscious processes are constrained from the beginning and throughout life by social facts. Through the exploration of individual and group processes, the effects of these social facts on intra-psychic and intra-group life will be considered.

FEE :
£60.00 (non-members).
£55.00 (I.G.A. / G.A.S. members).
There is a 33.3% discount for students.
(Please enclose proof of student status).



To : Brenda Ling, Administrative Director, The Institute of Group Analysis,
1 Daleham Gardens, London NW3 5BY

I wish to attend the Workshop on Friday 21st and Saturday 22nd January 1994 entitled
"The Social Unconscious - Group Analysis And Political Life", and enclose my cheque for £_____ made payable to
The Institute of Group Analysis.

PLEASE USE BLOCK CAPITALS :

NAME : _____

ADDRESS : _____

TEL : _____

PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND : _____

SIGNATURE : _____ DATE: ____/____/____



GROUP-ANALYTIC SOCIETY (LONDON)

1 DALEHAM GARDENS, LONDON NW3 5BY
TELEPHONE : 071 - 431 2693

CO - THERAPY : "THE DYNAMICS OF WORKING TOGETHER"

Friday February 25th 1994
6.00pm - 9.00pm.
Saturday February 26th 1994
10.00am - 5.00pm.

Convenors:
GILL BARRATT
JOHN WOODS

With

ANNE MHLONGO
MICHAEL KELLY

With contributions from other members of the
I.G.A. and G.A.S.

Co-therapists develop a capacity to tolerate conflict with each other.

Sometimes clients and patients project their internal conflicts which are too painful or difficult for them to face and this tends to split the therapists.

Understanding the interplay between therapists can therefore be an important factor in therapeutic work. Bringing together different aspects of the co-therapy can facilitate better integration of the client's personality.

The workshop takes as its model the co-therapy pair working with a group or family and this may be useful to staff from residential or day care settings, for example, where team work is important.

We will be addressing mainly practical issues using experimental techniques with some theoretical input.

Fee: £75 (£70 for members of I.G.A. & G.A.S.) includes light supper, light lunch and refreshments.

To : Brenda Ling, Administrative Director, Group-Analytic Society (London)
1 Daleham Gardens, London NW3 5BY

I wish to attend the Weekend Workshop, Co-Therapy "The Dynamics of Working Together", on February 25th and February 26th 1994, and enclose a cheque for £____ (made payable to "The Group-Analytic Society (London)").

PLEASE USE BLOCK CAPITALS :

NAME : _____
ADDRESS : _____
TEL : _____
PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND : _____
SIGNATURE : _____ DATE: ____/____/____



Median Group Section
The Group-Analytic Society (London)
1 Daleham Gardens London NW3 5BY

Programme of weekly meetings for 1993-94

The Median Group method applies principles of Group Analysis, formulated by S H Foulkes and later expanded by Patrick de Maré, to groups of between 10 to 30 people. A group of this size provides an opportunity for each person to develop the ability to think clearly and to speak their mind in an atmosphere that aims to be friendly.

Most of us express assumptions about ourselves and those around us that we are hardly aware of. As a result our relationships with others are restricted and our choices limited. The Median Group brings to life the opportunity to question these assumptions in a context that evokes larger group experiences.

There are weekly meetings during term time, lasting an hour and a half. Everyone is expected to attend regularly. The group meets in a circular, face to face seating arrangement and is convened by a non directive convener without a defined topic or task. The objective, is deceptively simple; learning to talk to each other.

WEDNESDAY EXPERIENTIAL GROUP

The Experiential Group currently meets on Wednesday evenings and is convened by Teresa Howard. Applications are invited for this group throughout the year.

TUESDAY THEORETICAL SEMINAR GROUP

The Theoretical Seminar Group meets on Tuesday evenings and is convened by Dr Patrick de Maré. This group continues to develop the theory for the Median Group method as described in Pat de Maré's book, *Koinonia: From Hate through Dialogue to Culture*. Applications are invited for this group from people who have spent at least one year in the Experiential Group.

OPEN EVENING

On the last Tuesday of each month during term time, the Median Group Section invites those interested in the work of the section to come to an open evening of the Theoretical Seminar Group.

TERM DATES FOR 93/94

Tuesday Theoretical Seminar Group

Term 1; 21 September to 7 December (12 sessions)
Term 2; 11 January to 22 March (11 sessions)
Term 3; 26 April to 13 July (12 sessions)

Wednesday Group

Term 1; 22 September to 8 December (12 sessions)
Term 2; 12 January to 23 March (11 sessions)
Term 3; 27 April to 14 July (12 sessions)

VENUE AND TIMES

All meetings are at 8.15 to 9.45pm in Room 2 at 1 Daleham Gardens, Swiss Cottage, London NW3.5BY



THE INTSITUTE OF GROUP ANALYSIS (APPLIED SECTION)

1 DALEHAM GARDENS, LONDON NW3 5BY
TELEPHONE : 071 - 431 2693

THE MANAGEMENT DILEMMA.

"WHOM DO YOU NEED TO PLEASE MOST?!"

A workshop for those supervising and managing staff who deliver direct services and who experience the squeeze between senior management and service delivery.

DATE : FRIDAY 18th MARCH 1994
TIME : 10.00 am - 4.00 pm
VENUE : 1 Daleham Gardens
London NW 3 5BY

SPEAKERS :
RUTH FASHT
(Director of a national voluntary childcare organisation)

CHRISTOPHER RANCE
(Organisational consultant)

CONVENOR :
MARLENE SPERO

Small groups will be conducted by members of the Institute of Group Analysis.

The Applied Section of the Institute seeks to look at the application of group analytic principles to organisations.

This Workshop is aimed at people in social services, health and education departments, voluntary organisations and individual consultants who are responsible for the support and management of groups of staff.

Issues to be addressed :

- Facilitation and Enabling of staff groups
- Implementation of Agency policy
- The manager as a person
- Stress and Energy levels
- The influence of service users

There will be an opportunity for participants to share individual experiences in a group setting.

Fee : £75

To : Brenda Ling, Administrative Director, The Institute of Group Analysis
1 Daleham Gardens, London NW3 5BY

I wish to attend the Workshop for managers at the I.G.A. on Friday 18th March 1994 and enclose a cheque for £75 (made payable to The Institute of Group Analysis).

PLEASE USE BLOCK CAPITALS :

NAME : _____

ADDRESS : _____

TEL : _____

PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND : _____

SIGNATURE : _____ DATE: ____/____/____

PLEASE ENCLOSE A STAMPED ADDRESSED ENVELOPE FOR A REPLY

What Makes Consultancy Work? Understanding the Dynamics

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

SOUTH BANK UNIVERSITY, LONDON • 28-30 JANUARY 1994

In the current turbulent environment, organisations are undergoing fundamental and complex changes - some with the help of consultancy interventions. The complexity of these changes places increasing demands and pressures on the work of consultants, and raises key questions about both the nature of the assistance organisations require, and the way consultants work.

KEY ISSUES

Do we understand what makes 'good' consultancy for the client and the consultant? How does the nature of the relationship between client and consultant affect the process and outcome of the consultancy? What influences the choice of interventions by the consultant? What impact can these choices have on the development and capability of the client system? To what extent are dynamics that are "beneath the surface" - within and between individuals, groups and organisations - really determining the thinking and acting arising from the relationship? How does this impact on the ultimate outcome of the interventions for the client organisation - it's long term performance?

This conference will shed light on these questions in discussions and workshops stimulated by papers from a wide range of leading consultancy practitioners and writers on organisational change.

AIMS

The conference will:

- examine the interventions that can be used in consulting to individuals, groups and organisations
- consider the effects of consultation on the dynamics of an organisation
- explore the complex relationships between the consultant, the client and the client system.

THEMES

The work of the conference will focus on the following themes:

- new perspectives on organisations and their implications for consultancy approaches
- what are the new approaches to consulting, and how and why to choose them
- what is the nature of the professional relationship
- what goes on between the client, the client organisation and the consultant(s) - the dynamics
- what goes on inside the consultant and it's impact
- learning and development of consultants

PARTICIPANTS

The conference is designed to bring together people from across the range of consulting roles who are engaged in organisational change work. The programme will provide participants with opportunities to share aspects of their work and to develop and apply new theories to their work.

CONTRIBUTORS

Conference contributions will include lectures, seminars and case presentations from Ashridge Consulting Group, Bath Consulting Group, Gestalt Centre, Grubb Institute, Institute for Group Analysis, Metanoia in Organisations, Sheffield Business School, South Bank Business School, Tavistock Institute for Human Relations, William Allanson White Institute and others.

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

Conference proceedings will be published by South Bank University Press.

FURTHER INFORMATION

Kamil Kellner, Conference Organiser

Tel: 071-815-7784

Fax: 071-815-8280

Antoinette Dixon, Conference Administration

Tel: 071-815-6908

Fax: 071-815-6999



SOUTH BANK UNIVERSITY
· LONDON ·

The Business School, South Bank University
103 Borough Road, London SE1 0AA, UK

TRAINING VIDEOS
GROUP PSYCHOTHERAPY

YVONNE AGAZARIAN - Systems Centred Group Psychotherapy

1 Systems Centred Group Psychotherapy (180 mins)

A three hour video showing Yvonne Agazarian working with a group over three sessions. Deals with subgroups; boundaries between reality and irrationality; group development etc. Available subject to being used for research and training purposes only. COST £35 (INC. VAT+ UK postage)

2 A training video by Yvonne Agazarian (60 mins)

Introduces key concepts of systems centred group psychotherapy; examples of group dynamics and leadership behaviours. COST £141 (INC. VAT+ UK postage)

3 Yvonne Agazarian and Anne Alonso in Discussions
Around Shame in a Shamed Group. (6 Tapes)

An on-going training group which has been meeting with Yvonne for three and a half years in Philadelphia with the goal of experiencing, observing and understanding the group-as-a-whole as a system, and the impact that dynamics of the system have on the individual. COST £352.50 (INC. VAT+ UK postage)

Please send orders and cheques made payable to UNIVERSITY OF YORK to: Mrs Liz Wilson, Department of Social Policy and Social Work, University of York, Heslington, York YO1 5DD

