

**THE CHILD ANALYTIC TRADITION OF THE SOCIETY
OF ANALYTICAL PSYCHOLOGY – BIRTH, DEATH AND
BEYOND**

MELISSA JANE MIDGEN

**A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of
the University of East London for the degree of Professional
Doctorate in Child Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy**

December 2016

Abstract

This thesis seeks to chart the creation, development and eventual demise of the child analytic training of The Society of Analytical Psychology (SAP), the foremost Jungian Society in the UK. The brainchild of the Society's founding director, Michael Fordham, the creation of the child training drew on the talents and persistence of many committed individuals. Through oral history interviews and archival research I weave together a narrative that will serve as testament to this achievement and offer first hand recollections for posterity. Through these sources the narrative also explores the difficulties that the training faced and which ultimately led to its eventual demise. Additionally I interrogate the current status of this tradition of child analysis and ask the question whether or not the tradition continues to exist and if so in what ways; I conclude that currently the tradition can only be said to exist in an attenuated form and that the future is bleak. In the course of the thesis I locate the SAP training within the development more generally of child analytic provision within the UK, the relationship of that to the child guidance movement and to the psychoanalytic diaspora, which made it possible. I describe the current obstacles faced by the child psychotherapy discipline as well as psychoanalytic psychotherapy in the NHS.

Key words: Society of Analytical Psychology; Michael Fordham; Child Psychotherapy; Psychoanalysis.

Contents

<u>Chapter One: Introduction</u>	1
Rationale	1
Methodology	2
From the strictures of linguistic analysis to the openness of the life-story	3
Oral History and Life Writing	10
The Interviewing Method	13
Documents and Archival Research	15
The interviews and data analysis	18
<u>Chapter Two: Historical Context and Theoretical Roots</u>	24
Jung's Analytical Psychology	24
Child Analysis and its roots in psychoanalysis	26
Developing Training in Child Psychotherapy	28
A Registering Body	31
Michael Fordham	33
<u>Chapter Three: The Society of Analytical Society</u>	36
The new model	41
The emerging theory of primary self and its actions: deintegration and reintegration	42
The Foundation of Child Training at The Society of Analytical Psychology	43
The training starts	46
Defences of the Self	48
Infant Observation	50
<u>Chapter Four: The People</u>	54
<u>The Pioneers</u>	55
Dorothy Davidson	57
Mary Coghlan	59
Hugh Gee	62

<u>The Consolidating Pioneers / Pioneering Consolidators</u>	66
Barry Proner.....	66
James Astor.....	69
<u>The Outside supporter</u>	72
Gianna Williams	72
<u>The Absent Presence</u>	75
Jane Bunster	75
<u>Those near the beginning / Those near the end</u>	77
Miranda Davies.....	77
Elizabeth Urban	80
<u>Those gone – a solution</u>	83
Oliver Foster	83
<u>Those holding the mantle</u>	86
Alessandra Cavalli	86
<u>Those at the sides – the extractors</u>	90
Marica Rytovaara.....	91
Judith Woodhead	94
The People: beyond the SAP	96
<u>Chapter five: Rupture, repair, remains</u>	97
The Ending – ‘death’	101
The Current Picture – ‘beyond’	104
Final thoughts	109
References.....	113
Appendices.....	121

Acknowledgements

Sincere thanks are due to the interviewees who so generously gave of their time and memories: this is really in large part their story and I am grateful to have told a version of it. Dr. Mark Curthoys - tennis partner extraordinaire – deserves a mention for having listened to the slow evolution of this project, endlessly, between forehands. Nina, Barry and Meg for Thursday night discussions. To Matthew, Abigail and Theo I owe everything, always. Lastly, and most significantly, Professor Barbara Harrison has tolerated my procrastination and uncertainty; without her unwavering enthusiasm this project would never have seen the light of day.

Details of Organisations Cited in The Thesis

The Anna Freud Centre

Now known as the Anna Freud National Centre for Children and Families (see www.annafreud.org) it was originally founded in 1941 by Anna Freud in the guise of the Hampstead War Nurseries. The Hampstead Child Therapy course started in 1947 and in 1951 The Hampstead Clinic opened at 12, Maresfield Gardens from where the centre still operates. The Clinic changed its name in 1982 after Anna Freud's death. It is now an international centre of excellence for both mental health provision and research having developed strong links with University College London (see below).

The Association of Child Psychotherapists (ACP)

The Association of Child Psychotherapists is the main professional body accrediting the trainings of psychoanalytic child and adolescents in the UK (see: www.childpsychotherapy.org.uk). It was founded in 1949 in recognition of the need to establish an umbrella organisation to oversee professional standards of the developing profession of child psychotherapy. It continues with this remit today representing a register of over 900 members, but in addition works hard to represent the profession within the NHS and the external political environment.

British Psychotherapy Foundation (BPF)

The British Psychotherapy Foundation is a psychoanalytic and Jungian organisation formed in 2013 through an amalgamation of three pre-existing psychotherapy organisations: The British Association of Psychotherapists, The London Centre for Psychotherapy and the Lincoln Centre (see: britishpsychotherapyfoundation.org). The British Association of Psychotherapists, which was founded in 1951, began its own child psychotherapy training in 1982. This now exists under its new name of The Independent Psychoanalytic Child and Adolescent Psychotherapy Association (IPCAPA). IPCAPA is introduced below.

Institute of Child Psychotherapy

The Institute of Child Psychotherapy, founded in 1929 by Dr Margaret Lowenfeld, was the third founding member organisation of the ACP and remained so until its closure in 1978. Dr. Margaret Lowenfeld is introduced in the main body of the thesis (page 30).

The Independent Psychoanalytic Child and Adolescent Psychotherapy Association (IPCAPA)

The Independent Psychoanalytic Child and Adolescent Psychotherapy Association (IPCAPA) is one of the four professional and training associations within The British Psychotherapy Foundation. Within the BPF, IPCAPA is the single association that focuses on the field of psychotherapy with children and their families. IPCAPA is the current incarnation of the original BAP child psychotherapy training founded in 1982.

The Society of Analytical Psychology (SAP)

The Society of Analytical Psychology, formed in 1949, is a professional body for Jungian analysts and psychotherapists. It has four main activities: training new analysts and psychotherapists; registering and supporting members; providing a low-fee clinic (through the C.G. Jung Clinic); and running events and conferences, both for professional clinicians and the public. It established a training in child psychotherapy in 1978 (see: www.thesap.org.uk).

The Tavistock Centre and Clinic

The Tavistock is an internationally renowned centre of excellence providing treatment and training in psychological therapies. It is an NHS provision as well as an academic organisation (see: www.tavistockandportman.nhs.uk). However, it was originally founded Dr Hugh Crichton-Miller in 1920 as an organisation influenced by both Sigmund Freud and C.G. Jung. The Portman Clinic was founded in 1931. It offered clinical services for people who suffered from problems arising from delinquent, criminal, or violent behaviour, or from damaging sexual behaviour or experiences.

In 1949 Dr. John Bowlby and Esther Bick established a child psychotherapy training there and it was the first to be accepted by the ACP.

University College London (UCL)

University College, London is a highly respected university offering academic degrees across the board. It is relevant in the story told here as it houses an increasingly active and renowned psychoanalysis unit comprising research and academic endeavour, (see: www.ucl.ac.uk/psychoanalysis). It has forged links with the Anna Freud Centre collaborating in research and also now accredits the IPCAPA child psychotherapy doctoral training.

Chapter 1: Introduction:

Rationale

The idea for this thesis was borne out of witnessing and, to some extent, living through, as I saw it, the potential demise of a tradition of child psychotherapeutic thought and practice that had evolved over time at the Society of Analytical Psychology (SAP) – the foremost Jungian training institute in the UK. Originally trained as an adult analyst at the SAP I subsequently trained in child and adolescent psychotherapy at the Tavistock Centre: a well-established institution famous for its various trainings steeped in psychoanalytic thought. Partly I made this decision purposefully to locate myself amongst the central conversations happening within child psychotherapy, and partly I made the decision through necessity: should I have wanted to train at the SAP in child analysis that option was no longer open to me – the training closed once the final candidate qualified in 2006, from the cohort which began training in 1999.

From the moment the decision was taken to close the training a perhaps previously unasked question was simultaneously created: how would a tradition still extant (however tenuously) continue to exist in a future where no new child psychotherapists would be trained in that tradition? It is this question that began to preoccupy me and which I increasingly felt demanded some attention. ‘Doing the splits’ (Carvalho, personal communication) as I did, and still do, between the SAP and the Tavistock encouraged me, perhaps in some act of reparation or attempt at unification, to examine and record, for posterity, something of the history and unique contribution that the SAP made to the development of child psychotherapy in England. I had a sense of a lineage with no heirs to inherit and carry forth, so I also wanted to capture the personal memories of those actants involved in the unfolding of the story of the training – its inception, its unfolding, its eventual demise and the aftermath: the ‘birth, death and beyond’ in the title of the thesis.

Therefore the core of this project revolves around a series of interviews I undertook to hear the personal impressions and subjective narratives of those who lived through the various incarnations of the SAP child training. There are those who assisted in delivering the training, those who trained, those who took the decision to close the

training and those dwindling few who continue to practise as ‘SAP child psychotherapists’; inevitably these categories overlap. These interviews are narratives that are caught in a moment of time both about events that took place many years ago but also seek of the participants some answer to the question of the current status, ontologically, of the SAP child analytic tradition. So the primary task of the thesis is to tell a story of this tradition, but the associated research question, as intimated above, is to examine what remains and in what form. The reason this is a question at all is because of the idiosyncratic nature of the training. Throughout its existence, as will become clear, it remained a niche training attracting small numbers of applicants with small cohorts. It is this particular characteristic that both singled it out amongst the registered child analytic psychotherapy trainings and which undoubtedly contributed to its downfall.

In addition to the interviews I had access to the SAP and the Michael Fordham archives at the Wellcome Institute. This houses what is left of the written historical legacy of the child training ranging from minutes of meetings suggesting the embryonic idea of forming a child analytic training at the SAP through the negotiations with the Association of Child Psychotherapists, adverts for recruits and records which testify to the many administrative tasks inherent in structuring and running such a training (Appendix i).

This project therefore relies on the combination of the primary sources of ‘interview’ and archival material sources, and some secondary sources from those who have written already on this matter (for example Astor, J., 1988, 1995; Davidson, D., 1986, 1996). It is in marrying these primary and secondary sources together that a story can unfold (a timeline of key dates in the Child Analytic Training can be found in appendix viii). A full discussion of the methodologies employed is written below. This includes discussion of narrative analysis; life-story work and the use of the oral history interview; and archival research including the use of documents as data.

Methodology

I will write about the procedure I adopted for undertaking the interviews in more depth later on. Here I will examine ideas that have helped me navigate myself around the huge

amount of data I mined through interviewing those that I did. Over time I have moved my focus of interest from the objective history of the child training to the subjective experience of those telling me the story. Therefore my reading in terms of methodology has taken me from the beginnings of the rather technical discipline of the linguistic analysis of narrative through to the freer approach of oral history and into life story work. In terms of managing the data itself I have drawn on, but not strictly adhered to, qualitative methods such as grounded theory and thematic analysis.

From the strictures of linguistic analysis to the openness of the life-story

There is a clear intellectual axis starting from those whom I refer to as the technical founders of narrative analysis through the proponents of the various developments in the discipline arriving finally at the increasing interest paid to life story work. My presentation is not exhaustive but I intend to show the vagaries of my particular journey along this axis of the narrative discipline.

‘Narrative Analysis’ focuses on the ‘ways in which people make and use stories to interpret the world’ (Lawler, 2002, p.249). It is not interested in narratives as sets of truths about sequences of events, i.e. historical account, neither does it concern itself primarily with the veracity of a story. In this way sociologically it is closer to social constructionism than more positivist approaches. Following on from this, narratives are therefore understood as artefacts emerging out of social phenomena and constructed by people living through these. They will be constructed according to the specific historical, social and cultural locale in which events take place. Narratives are interpretative mechanisms enabling people to depict themselves and their stories both to others and themselves.

Moving on from this, ‘Narrative Theory’ asserts that these depictions that people construct about themselves are ‘storied’ and that accordingly, inevitably, the social world is also ‘storied’. Ricoeur (1983) argued that narrative is one of the primary methods recruited by people to construct their identity. However, since the interviews that interest me are likely to be ‘storied’ - that is to say deliberately open-ended in order to allow participants to respond according to their own thoughts and feelings using their own words – therefore effectively in narrative form, and while narratives link the past to

the present for us, and since there is no unbiased account of the past, narratives are inherently problematic.

So, the question remains: how do we characterize ‘narratives’? Narratives transform over time and involve (as do all ‘dramas’) action and characters that together entangle into a plot. That is to say there is a multifactoral operation out of which narratives emerge. Multiple, disparate components are involved but which will result in a ‘message’ of some sort (i.e. there is a point to narrative).

What then are the methods that can be employed both to gather and to understand narratives? I will write more in depth about the particular approach to interviewing I employed but in general terms research concentrating on the role of narrative will usually involve life story research or oral history. These approaches typically adopt more qualitative approaches using semi-structured or flexibly open interviews rather than questionnaires for example. (Emerson and Frosh, 2004) argue for an open form of questioning allowing for ‘flexible and rich talk’ (p. 32). The researcher might say very little, primarily acting as an attentive listener. Nevertheless, this does not obviate the fact that all narratives are co-constructed, emerging from the dynamic interaction between the narrator and the audience, regardless of whom the audience is; even if the audience is an imagined other, or oneself.

As already suggested the ways in which researchers have approached the study of narrative has evolved. The development of the original ‘famous’ technical work, interested in a structural analysis of text, by James Gee, Vladimir Propp and William Labov for example is well documented in the literature. These pioneers were interested primarily in linguistic approaches to understanding narrative, producing methods that break text into stanzas and strophes thus identifying mini-narratives within larger stories helping to show what stories do and how they function. Still used in narrative analysis in social science these are linguistically driven methods.

William Labov distils his own work in an essay entitled *Oral Narratives of Personal Experience* where he writes:

The study of narrative extends over a broad range of human activities: novels, short

stories, poetic and prose epic, film, folk tale, interviews, oral memoirs, chronicles, histories, comic strips, graphic novels and other visual media. These forms of communication may draw upon the fundamental human capacity to transfer experience from one person to another through oral narratives of personal experience. (Labov, 2010, p.1)

He goes on to explain his interest in analyzing ‘unmonitored speech’ and how he deconstructed the structural organizations of such accounts based on his original works with Waletzky (1967). He looks very closely at micro sentence structure (grammar and syntax) extrapolating techniques narrators use (one might say unconsciously) to convey feeling senses in their stories by introducing emphasis and nuance. While the technical aspects might be off putting and perhaps obscure Labov has always paid homage to the importance of ordinary story telling not just focusing on established writers for example. He says:

A focus on spontaneous recounting of experience was greatly stimulated by the development of sociolinguistic research in the 1960s, designed to capture the closest approximation to the vernacular of unmonitored speech. Narratives of personal experience were found to reduce the effects of observation to a minimum (Labov, 2010, p.1).

Earlier in the twentieth century Vladimir Propp was interested in the centrality of the fairy tale as a way of understanding narrative plot, showing that the characters are not important so much for their personalities and qualities but rather for the role they perform in the plot. The criticism of Propp’s approach is that it reduces all narrative to a set of structures devoid of emotion, subjectivity and certainly those aspects that are prized by the life historian.

Gee’s 1999 work lays out the objectives of this approach showing once again that ‘discourse’ (that is writing, conversation or any communicative ‘event’) is defined in terms of coherent sequences of language use: the grammatical and linguistic tool kit a narrator has at his or her disposal (sentences, propositions, clauses etc). He is particularly keen to examine ‘naturally occurring language’ so rather than focusing on text linguistics in his discourse analysis aims at revealing socio-psychological

characteristics of a person through the structure of their narrative (or discourse).

Jerome Bruner's polymathic, decades long interrogation of narrative and its use embodies almost entirely the very axis I am positing - from the technical to the illustrative - demonstrating perhaps that it is a false dichotomy. Interested in the capacity of children to crack the linguistic code he took this sort of research out of the laboratory into the field, using what was considered at that time the revolutionary idea of home videos. Bruner (1985) became interested in the narrative construction of reality and wondered about the functional aspect of narrative – what is the work of stories in people's lives. He suggests that narratives solve problems, reduce tension and resolve dilemmas: they allow us to re-imagine turbulent and disorderly events and experiences into every day stories thereby rendering them intelligible and benign (1990). It is almost like an act of experiential digestion

Bruner summarized his views in a newspaper interview (Crace, 2007):

“Why are we so intellectually dismissive towards narrative?” he asks. “Why are we inclined to treat it as rather a trashy, if entertaining, way of thinking about and talking about what we do with our minds? Storytelling performs the dual cultural functions of making the strange familiar and ourselves private and distinctive. If pupils are encouraged to think about the different outcomes that could have resulted from a set of circumstances, they are demonstrating useability of knowledge about a subject. Rather than just retaining knowledge and facts, they go beyond them to use their imaginations to think about other outcomes, as they don't need the completion of a logical argument to understand a story. This helps them to think about facing the future, and it stimulates the teacher too.” (The Guardian 27th May 2007)

Bruner is interested to show us that the self is a story that we are continually rewriting and that we are all constantly engaged in ‘self-making narrative’. He argues that we become the autobiographical narrative by which we ‘tell about our lives’. Interestingly this links with the idea of case study research that Oliver Sacks has popularized in his many published accounts over the years of the patients he encountered in the clinical work he undertook as a neurologist. Sacks has staunchly defended his use of the case

study to complement his rigorous scientific research because of his commitment to the subjective, lived experiences of his patients, which by their very nature were inherently idiosyncratic. Perhaps because of the fraught relations between the subjective and the objective in scientific endeavour the case study has had a mixed reception in academic circles. Case study research has generated its own controversy within the wider fields of psychology and the social sciences engaging researchers in important debates about the generation and meaning of knowledge obtained through such designs. It has offered a corrective to the clunky adherence to the methodologies of natural science, which early researchers favoured but has had to weather all manner of critiques about the reliability and generalisability of the results it generates. In the psychoanalytic field Michael Rustin has passionately defended the use of the single case study as a valid research tool likening the consulting room to the laboratory, and asserting that different scientific endeavours will alight on the research method most suited to its aims (Rustin 2001, 2003, 2014).

Catherine Kohler Reissman also adheres to this more holistic approach to narrative thinking about storied lives, and the function of stories generally in shaping identity and subjectivity. She adopts a looser method that looks at the story across a whole interview, for instance, rather than micro-sequences within interviews, reflecting her interest in both family and narrative therapy. She writes (2005, p.5):

Analysis of narrative is no longer the province of literary study alone; it has penetrated all the human sciences, and practicing professions. The various methods reviewed are suited to different kinds of projects and texts, but each provides a way to systematically study personal narratives of experience.

Narrative inquiry has gained increasing popularity among researchers and academics in the last decades. In her tour-de-force *Narrative Methods for the Human Sciences* (2008) Riessman offers an exhaustive presentation of both the history of narrative inquiry and guidance on narrative methods. She addresses the increasing ubiquity of narrative inquiry as an academic discipline and the associated inevitable unwieldiness in terms of definition. She deftly addresses its multiple definitions and functions showing how the field of narrative has evolved to meet the challenges of contemporary societal demands.

Riessman helpfully identifies three layers of both analysis and inquiry in narrative research. She shows how there are firstly stories told by interviewees (that is the participants in the research); secondly the accounts which are subsequently interpreted by the researcher (that would be a narrative interpretation of the original narrative); and thirdly the final reconstruction done by the reader of the research (a further mental narrative overlay of the narrative research itself). Furthermore she outlines four main methodological approaches that she argues transcend different approaches to narrative research.

Firstly, she identifies thematic analysis for which the actual content of the narrative is of paramount importance. There is very little interest in the how of the narrative - that is how it is written or spoken. This method of analysis is a close relation to grounded theory although it maintains the story in its original form and will use pre-existing theoretical concepts. Therefore the themes and the aim of the narrative are privileged over the use of language and the structure of the text.

Secondly, she alights on structural analysis. Although structural approaches will interest themselves in content they also will look at the form of the narrative in an attempt to glean half-hidden meanings implicit in all acts of communication. Here structure might mean genre, or stories, or linguistic form; it will involve close awareness of the features of speech in order to understand how the narrative is shaped. The attention paid to how the content is arranged allows the researcher to develop hypotheses beyond the merely or explicitly 'said' in a narrative.

Thirdly, she discusses dialogic/performance analysis. In this analysis who is narrating, and when and why, are centrally important questions. In dialogic/performance analysis narrative is viewed as produced and performed through dialogue and hence sees the stories emerging out of that as social artefacts. These emergent social artefacts inform equally about the social and cultural context out of which they emerged as the person or group involved in the dialogue. These analytic approaches particularly concern themselves with the inter-dependence and interactivity inherent in social reality.

Finally she turns to visual narrative analysis. Here words are integrated with the visual image such as paintings, collages, filmed narrative sequences and photographic images.

The aim is to examine and understand how our identities – both individual and collective – are constructed and enacted visually. Linking back to her original three layers idea cited above Riessman identifies three objects of analysis for visual narrative analysis: the narrative or story of how the image was created; the actual image itself; and finally how the produced image is understood by its audience.

Again, in ways that are reminiscent of the arguments for and against the use of the case study, critics argue that narrative research has a tendency to over value the interior self and somewhat fraudulently offer itself as an authentic voice, thereby over-personalising the personal narrative, ignoring the possibility for subjective contamination. Therefore some would argue that it is not suitable to recruit narrative approaches in the study of large numbers of anonymous subjects, although the recent reflexive turn represented by Riessman's work shows us the use narratives have in not so much mirroring the past but refracting it, through the lens that a particular story teller tells the story. This is narrative as interpretation of the past rather than reproduction of the past. So the truth or rather 'truths' of the multiple narrative accounts, precisely the materials that I will be drawing on, are not going to be found in the objective representation of a past series of events but rather how shifting connections are forged within that past and the present retelling. This is the enmeshment of personal biography and the history of an organization.

Molly Andrews (2014) writes about this 'narrative turn', this interest in the 'storied' nature of human life, which she suggests has been widely acknowledged to have taken place over the last few decades. Her interest is in the addition of imagination into the narrative mix and how without this we are 'forever doomed to the here and now'. Inevitably 'imagination' is always present in the manner in which we recount our storied lives and might be viewed as a contaminant to narrative. If imagination is influenced by our own particular experiences then equally our particular experiences will be inter-layered by our imagination as we tell and re-tell (in the form of remembering) our narratives both to others and ourselves. This is pertinent to my own research where I was asking the participants to recount events from many years ago which inevitably have been 'memoried' - that is remembered through the emotional legacy the events bestowed upon them. This phenomenon that I call 'memorisation' – of events being remembered in increasingly emotionally layered ways - is partially addressed by Frosh and Emerson who describe interpretative research through the lens

of psychosocial thinking (2004) acknowledging the unconscious processes inevitably present in any qualitative research.

In *Using Narrative in Social Research* Jane Elliot (2005) adds voice to the validity of narratives themselves. She outlines how narratives distinguish themselves from other discourses by three key elements. In his review of the book Leen Beyers (2006) describes how she deconstructs narratives and prunes them into three characteristics: firstly, narratives are ‘temporal’ i.e. sequential, with a beginning, a middle and an end; secondly narratives are ‘meaningful’ which links to their temporality since they order events into a time line culminating in some sort of resolution or conclusion – in this way they are also ‘causal’; and thirdly they are ‘social’ since they are produced for specific audiences – they might only be meaningful to the audience for which they are intended.

I have briefly described the journey of ‘Narrative’ from its incarnation as a very technical, linguistically driven discipline to its use as subjective testament, of interest particularly to those who are interrogating personal, ‘storied’ accounts of history, of whatever that history is. There are complex arguments about the validity of narrative as testament running alongside issues of data management and how best to manage, analyse and draw on the emerging information. This is contingent on the function any individual researcher is demanding of the material. I will be looking at ways of managing the data later on, but before that I will say something about what can be seen as perhaps the most pared back of narrative inquiries: the territory of oral history and life-story work.

Oral History and Life Writing

The recording of life stories is a naturalist approach. It is interested in what subjects recount and that these accounts or life-stories will reveal phenomena about the external world. A study of 15 artisanal bakers in rural France whose way of life was constantly under threat from mass bread production (Bertaux and Bertaux-Wiame, 1981) showed how these individuals’ lives and even the structure of their days inter-connected through a shared craft. These otherwise unknown about micro-producers were given a voice and visibility by the act of listening to narrative by the researchers.

Thus, life-writing and oral history are democratic expressions of the lived experience of the actants in whatever particular drama is being considered. They are radical in the way they empower the ordinary citizen to be part of history: life-writing using the panoply of the written word; oral history using voice. Both are multi-disciplinary in approach, draw on multiple sources and recognize the importance of subjectivity: in fact an explicit aim is to rescue subjectivity from the persecution of the objective and offer a corrective to conventional forms of, largely academic, (hi)story telling.

Life-writing ‘involves, and goes beyond, biography. It encompasses everything from the complete life to the day-in-the-life, from the fictional to the factional. It embraces the lives of objects and institutions as well as the lives of individuals, families and groups.’ (Oxford Centre for Life-writing’ n.d.). Life-writing draws on all primary sources written and oral: these will be autobiography, letters, journals, dream diaries, schedules, memoirs; they will include eyewitness accounts of events both small and large, oral testimony (perhaps given in press interviews) and also anthropological data. Life-writing is therefore important and can be used by disciplines from the arts to the sciences involving academics spanning philosophy, sociology, anthropology, psychology and history in all its forms.

Oral history is the voiced sibling of life writing:

Oral history is a history built around people. It thrusts life into history itself and it widens its scope. It allows heroes not just from leaders, but from the unknown majority of the people. It encourages teachers and students to become fellow-workers. It brings history into, and out of, the community. It helps the less privileged, and especially the old, towards dignity and self-confidence. It makes for contact - and thence understanding - between social classes and between generations. And to individual historians and others, with shared meanings, it can give a sense of belonging to a place or in time. In short, it makes for fuller human beings. Equally, oral history offers a challenge to the accepted myths of history, to the authoritarian judgement inherent in its tradition. It provides a means for a radical transformation of the social meaning of history. (Thompson, 1988, p.21)

Oral history gained popularity in the UK in the 1960s and 70s with the formation of the Oral History Society and its associated journal. It was a reaction against what was

viewed as the professional and highly academic nature of historical endeavour characterized by university departments privileging the objective collecting of 'facts'. Oral historians began instead to consider what was 'silent' or forgotten, valuing the oral and the role of imagination and the symbolic as a means to understanding subjectivity. Interestingly, but not surprisingly, oral history developed with the introduction of the portable recording machine. Frisch contends that what is of primary importance is that projects take 'seriously the task of involving people in exploring what it means to remember, and what to do with memories to make them active and alive, as opposed to mere objects of collection and classification' (1990, p.188). In this oral history positioned itself as a challenge to the unreconstructed version of history practised in the academy. As Portelli (2003) contends oral history is essentially the dynamic process of relationship creating between narrators and narratees: the relationship between past events and the narratives in which those events are recounted. Therefore the historian is charged with working on two planes simultaneously: 'the factual and the narrative planes, the referent and the signifier, the past and the present, and, most of all, on the space between all of them.' (Portelli, 2003, p.15).

Oral history, by its very nature, can pay attention to the manner in which stories are told in ever more heightened ways: able to interest itself in what is not said, and to infer meaning from silence. Passerini (2003) speaks potently of the tone and texture of voiced memory and how the vagaries of oral speech and memory need to be taken into account when searching for coherent narratives. She makes a plea for the place of silence and hazards it not be confused with forgetting. She posits possible causes for silence, for example repressed memory as a result of trauma or simply that the conditions for telling what would lie in the silence are not conducive. Furthermore, she argues for silence as capable of adding depth to a story and that the patience demanded of the listener may deepen the relationship such that the story when eventually told will have added depth and meaning. This is relevant to my work in which people have spoken about events which had far-reaching emotional consequences and created a fraught and contested aftermath, which continues today. In addition Passerini tacitly introduces above an idea of unconscious tension running as a seam through any narrative, which from a psychoanalytic perspective, I would take as a priori.

The interviewing method

The researcher studies the lives of individuals and asks one or more individuals to provide stories about their lives. This information is often retold or re-storied by the researcher into a narrative chronology. In the end, the narrative combines views from the participant's life with those of the researcher's life in a collaborative narrative. (Creswell, 2008 p.11)

The interviews were undertaken both to understand an objective chain of events but also to elicit 'subjectivities', that is the 'memored' story of each individual. It was important that I kept in mind the 'narrators own self-definitions as they talked about their lives' (Personal Narratives Group, 1989, p.12). Riessman delineates very clearly what to her mind good narrative research entails (2008, p.26). For her the process of interpretation begins already during the interview process itself. She insists that a researcher engaged in narrative interviewing should not just adhere to a set of techniques but should rely on more instinctive processes with a commitment to patient, interested listening. She suggests paying attention to details such as the actual setting of the interview as a way of forging greater communicative equality. She also hazards against reifying the transcripts. In her view the researcher does not find objectively existing narratives but is involved in a co-creation of them: "investigators don't have access to narrators' direct experience but only to their imitations thereof" (p.22). She thus entreats researchers to consider how they can best facilitate storytelling in interviews.

Riessman is very clear that the facilitating of the story though interview is associated strongly with the appropriate state of mind in the interviewer. The interviewer must develop a sensitive approach to deepening dialogue that will allow a story to be told within the somewhat formal context of a research interview. She is less concerned with details such as how questions are worded and emphasizes the affective and attentional positioning of the interviewer. What emerges as key in these interactions are reciprocity and empathic engagement. She also is clear that expectations in relation to the set-up and framing are equally important, and that the participants respond intuitively to what is required in terms of length and depth of questions. However, she is also a proponent to some extent of letting the interview take on its own life to see where various narrative threads lead:

Creating possibilities in research interviews for extended narration requires investigators to give up control, which can generate anxiety. Although we have particular paths we want to cover related to the substantive and theoretical foci of our studies, narrative interviewing necessitates following participants down their trails. Giving up control of a fixed interview format - “methods” designed for “efficiency” - encourages greater equality (and uncertainty) in the conversation (2008, p.24).

Responding to this I adopted the oral history paradigm as a way of accessing the cultural memory (Harrison 1989) of those involved in the shared endeavour of the child training. Although I have been interested in establishing some sort of factual truth oral history would not make the claim that constructing this cultural memory will establish such a truth. As I have said historians have tended to privilege written evidence as it has the aura of objectivity and yet as Grele (1998) points out the belief in the authenticity of the written document is no proof of its greater accuracy. He asserts that the usefulness or not of any source depends on what questions we are attempting to answer. I was in the particular position of being neither inside nor outside of the story. I was a member of the SAP and I knew the participants involved in a variety of capacities (as trainers, teachers, supervisors, senior colleagues), and yet I was not privy to all of the events being described either. I was both attached to the story and its unfolding narrative, in that I cared about the outcome, while knowing the ending already and to some extent having lived through the ending. And more problematically I firmly locate myself within the continuing unfolding story. So, just as narrators construct and create a self for their listeners, I was deepening my own understanding of where I had come from as an analyst – the story of the SAP is also the back-story of my analyst self.

It was interesting that just as I was formulating the idea of this thesis a message was sent from the Association of Child Psychotherapists that a project had been underway at The British Library gathering recorded interviews from noted child psychotherapists as part of their ‘Oral History and National Life Stories’ programme. Established in 1987 ‘Its mission is 'to record first-hand experiences of as wide a cross-section of society as possible, to preserve the recordings, to make them publicly available and encourage their use'. Alongside the British Library oral history collections, which stretch back to

the beginning of the 20th century, National Life Stories' recordings form a unique and invaluable record of people's lives in Britain today' ([British Library, 2016](#)). The appetite for quite literally 'hearing' in this instance first hand stories is large: eschewing mediated commentary for authentic narrative. A full list of the recorded interviews available is appended (appendix ii).

Documents and Archival Research

As mentioned already, not only did I rely on recorded interviews for this project, I plundered the archive, which is housed at the Wellcome Library. There are two discourses pertinent to my experience of being within the archive both of which deserve some attention: firstly there is the consideration of the documents housed therein and how these are used and thought about; secondly there is the emotional, subjective experience evoked both by these documents and the archive itself as a containing yet liminal space (both actual and intellectual).

The use of the 'document' in social research is a well-trodden path of academic endeavour both relating to its practical use but also to its more problematic ontology: the fact that there is always a subject involved in interpretation of documentary sources such that even the most apparently objective record is open to scrutiny. A document is essentially inscribed text, which owing to inherent historical value becomes artefact (Scott 1990). In its simplest form the research arising out of these documentary artefacts are those procedures involved in extracting data from written records pertinent to any particular field of study. Often these might be official documents, which as alluded to earlier are on the one hand objective statements of fact but nevertheless are socially produced. Sources of documents are various but tend to be from public records; the media; private papers; biography; visual documents; minutes of meetings; reports and correspondence arising out of public bodies and organizations. Scott explained how when he came to use documentary evidence in his own research he realised the paucity of methodological discussion in this area and his book *A Matter of Record* (Scott 1990) arose out of his own experience. Scott drew a distinction between mediate and proximate access to data, with documentary sources providing mediate access. The document is the visible trace of a past occurrence and the researcher is mediating temporally in a way that is not necessary when a researcher has proximate access to an

event: this would occur for example if the research were a direct witness to events. He also outlined guidelines for ensuring the integrity of documentary research: authenticity, credibility, representativeness and meaning. Authenticity refers to the veracity of the source: that it is trustworthy; credibility refers to the source being consistent (i.e. not idiosyncratic); representativeness refers to the documents being a good example of a type; and meaning refers to the documents being intelligible.

A further exhaustive account of the 'document' in social research is Lindsay Prior's book *Using Documents in Social Research* (2003) in which he discusses the idea that documents are far from being static objects that we read as passive receivers of information but rather are dynamically created and shared amongst others in social settings. Hence he argues that we need to consider questions about the origins and creators of these documents: who created the document? For whom? With what purpose? All documents are written with specific purposes in mind and accordingly rely on assumptions about their use, which will determine the style and presentation. In order to understand properly the intention of the style and presentation the researcher needs to be fully cognizant of the origins, purpose and original audience of the documents (Grix 2001). Documents, of course, are not produced with future research in mind; their *raison d'être* is not for research purposes but rather for whatever the specific function they were serving contemporaneously. In this way they tell us something of the wider context out of which they were produced.

Documents in and of themselves are social agents which can be interpreted and manipulated: 'Our focus, then, will be on the study of documents in their social settings—more specifically on how the documents are manufactured and how they function rather than simply on what they contain' (Prior, 2003, p.4). Prior emphasizes the social power of documents and the importance of understanding how they have been used over time in different ways by different people; also why this might have been the case. For example he considers what the goals of the authors were when these documents were written and what the social context was within which they were written. In addition he suggests that that very social context could have been a contributing factor in them being written at all. Equally what has been the social power of such documents: how might they have affected the reader? In this way content and reader are involved in a dynamic process with unpredictable results. Prior argues then

for the potency of documents, that in subtle perhaps undetectable ways they order knowledge, social groupings, hierarchies and political power.

The document is the ‘thing’: solid, findable, literally touchable apparently objective and uncomplicated. But the experience of happening upon these documents in the archive is of another order entirely, giving rise to the less easily described moments of being a subject meeting an object and making something of it. I have written of my own experience of encountering the archive – its liminal, womb like nature; the documents therein existing in a suspended state like frozen embryonic projects unfrozen by the gaze of a reader, embedded in a womb-mind, gestating into a narrative - in a future section but others have noted these experiences. Most recently *The Archive Project* (Moore, et al., in press) has been written in acknowledgment of “the ‘archival turn’, the vast surge of interest in archives, memory and traces of the past that has occurred among both popular and academic audiences over the last few decades” (p.x). The six chapters cover all imaginable aspects of archival research: methodological, epistemological, ontological; there is advice ranging from the very practical (preparatory work that needs to be done, managing documents) to the more complex (naming the unpredictable nature inherent in confronting an archive) and includes examples of research done by the authors. One of the authors, Maria Tamboukou, describes having to adapt to the idiosyncratic nature of the archive itself (its opening hours, the rules and regulations of the library, the archivists themselves) and that this opens one up to new temporal and spatial explorations. But pertinent to my own experience is her expansion of the time spent in the archive to the time spent outside, and how a merger between inside and out occurs. While researching the experience of women garment workers in New York she describes how:

During the two summers of my research in the NYPL, I followed the rhythms of New York, a city that was the hub of the US garment industry in the first half of the twentieth century. Living in the ‘fashion district’ of middle Manhattan and walking up and down streets still full of garment workshops was thus a spatial experience that was entangled in the daily rhythms of my archival understanding. Indeed, spatial and temporal serendipities had an unexpected impact on my research. (p.80)

I too found moving in out of the archive both physically and emotionally disconcerting and unpredictably interesting. Bumping into unexpected documents and bumping into unexpected people at the Wellcome Library café all add to the complex web of meaning woven into undertaking research. We have to make choices about what documents we use (Tamboukou, 2011) which inevitably impacts on the story being told. As Tamboukou says, ‘a story never ‘is’ but always ‘becomes’. It is not that we have, listen or think of a story and then we tell it or write it; the story becomes in the process of being narrated; it further ‘becomes’ as we perceive it, although what we narrate or feel can never be the same story’ (Tamboukou, 2015, p.1). In this way she problematises archival research asserting consequently that any story told is necessarily told provisionally, and it is in this problematised and subjective spirit that I tell this story.

The interviews and data analysis

The interview as a research tool is a form of oral autobiography, which once transcribed, becomes ‘document’. My chosen participants were invited to take part in this study based on their involvement in some way with SAP child training, and eliciting both their autobiography and their biographical narrative was my stated and explicit aim. They were recruited through personal negotiation on my part initially being approached by an email explaining the project and what I hoped to achieve. There was no obligation whatsoever on those approached to participate, although out of twelve people asked only one person declined.

It is worth mentioning though that as practical as one attempts to be in relation to carrying out such interviews, ‘in preparing for and undertaking oral history interviews the researcher is enmeshed from the outset in complex decisions involving censorship and collaboration’ (Turnbull, 2000 p.19). I was put in relationship with people in a way that I would not have been had I not undertaken this research. There is something inherently intimate about two people dialoguing in the presence of the third, the recording device. There is a tacit invitation to be frank, courteously honest and open; and the setting can be dissembling: the ensuing conversation is not one that evaporates as soon as the words are uttered. In fact these words are recorded, kept, will be mulled over, dissected and used in at that moment unknown ways. Of course there are ethical guidelines and an agreement that the recording are only for the use of the researcher for

this project only. But at the time of the interviewing that project does not really exist. Turnbull (2000) talks candidly about the power dynamics of these interviews: where does the power lie in this inter-dependent dynamic between teller, the ‘tellee’ and the told. Who decides when the interview is over, who has had enough of speaking and listening. More importantly whose responsibility is it to censure what might need censoring. She says, ‘...at every stage both conscious and unconscious decisions on the part of myself and my interviewees impinged on the process in unanticipated ways.’ (p.31). It is hard for me to know even now how to assess the impact of this on my own research, as what struck me over all else was the uninhibited manner in which all my interviewees chose to speak. This phenomenon in itself is noteworthy, and tells me that this was a story that had been waiting to be told, and that people wanted to be heard.

Back to the practical, participants were issued with recruitment information. This included a brief outline and rationale for the research, and an informed consent form was signed by each participant (appendix iii). There was a clear agreement that the interviews were only to be used for the purposes of this thesis. As I wanted the interviews to be as non-directive as possible I did not issue questions ahead of the interviews. I did however construct an aide memoire for myself. A dicta-phone was used to record the interviews.

On receiving ethical approval from the University Ethics Committee the participants were approached formally by email. The nature of the research was explained and the participants were asked to contact the researcher if they were prepared to participate. Once the participants had confirmed they would be involved in the research they were issued with the recruitment information described above. Participants were interviewed in private at a time and venue convenient to them. It was reiterated that the interview would be recorded and the consent form was duly signed. After a brief unrecorded dialogue to clarify the aims of the research the recorded interview began.

The interviews were variable in length and largely unstructured. The participant was asked to speak to the aim of the project as they understood it. Questions were asked where appropriate if clarification was needed answers. The interview was viewed as a “directed conversation and not as a closely controlled, monitored and measured pseudo-experiment” (Pigeon and Henwood, 1996: p 89). Following the interview participants

were debriefed and thanked. The tape-recording of the interview was subsequently transcribed by the researcher in order to maintain confidentiality. As McWhinnie (1997) asserts although the tape-recorded interviews are available for listening in the future they cannot convey the non-verbal information to which the original interviewer was exposed. Obviously I had the privilege of seeing the facial expressions and body language that accompanied the words, but more significantly I was profoundly part of the experience of the teller telling his or her story. At the moment of interview, the interview is a co-constructed experience so the interviewer can never be simply a silent recipient of stories. I felt utterly implicated in the emerging event of that story being told. I was responsible for arousing in the interviewees memories, emotions and re-lived experiences, indeed I was actively eliciting these things.

As I have emphasized I became interested in the subjective stories being told in the interviews. However, this project is also interested in answering certain questions about a 'history' and therefore the data collected had to be managed in a coherent and viable way. This necessarily involved a certain tension between the uncovering of a sequence of events through the gathering of objective facts, and the 'memored' account of that for each of the participants. Choices had to be made regarding emphasis – between the 'what' is said and the 'how' it is said, the 'told' rather than the 'telling'. In thematic modes of analysis such as grounded theory the stories are collected and through induction conceptual groupings are created. Arguably this is anathema to all that I have previously written about oral history yet the exigencies of this project demanded data management. Therefore I am attempting to converge storytelling and narrative inquiry to better understand the 'why' behind the story. I have allowed the participants to put the 'data' into their own words and have not attempted to predefine the scope of what they might choose to say and I am acknowledging the context and attempting to understand phenomena through the meanings that people assign to them. However, I am also using the 'data' generated to cohere a story. With qualitative research methods integral to data analysis there are long recognized and accepted methods of analysis to undertake such a task, some of which I will describe below.

Grounded theory emerged in the 1960s when qualitative methods became more acceptable. Glaser and Strauss's *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research* (1967) remains the most influential of qualitative methodologies

including more recently in psychoanalytic psychotherapy. Michael Rustin is the researcher who has most strongly linked grounded theory as the primary method of data analysis in the use of the single case study to unpack the potential in psychoanalytic research (Rustin, 2001).

Strauss and Corbin defined grounded theory as a 'qualitative research method that uses a systematic set of procedures to develop an inductively derived grounded theory about a phenomenon' (1990, p.24). Reacting against the dominant positivist, deductive model of research which assumed the existence of 'one' objective truth Glaser and Strauss (1967, in Pigeon 1996) provided a set of analytic techniques for qualitative data analysis which would allow the researcher to generate ideas and hypotheses from the "ground" up. They examined the 'ground', i.e. the phenomenon, itself and built up theory accordingly. In this way the fallacy of frequency, central to quantitative methods, was challenged. However, the word 'systematic' is key to grounded theory as it ensures that although the method allows for the researcher to build up a subjective relationship to the data the research remains rigorous and is not driven by the researcher's idiosyncrasies. Grounded theory is often deemed optimal as the method for analyzing open ended interview data in order to remain open to the words and experiences of participants whilst being able to draw on guidelines to make meaning from this emergent narrative. Cresswell (2009, p.13) describes grounded theory as 'a qualitative strategy of inquiry in which the researcher derives a general, abstract theory of process, action, or interaction grounded in the views of participants in a study.' Citing Strauss and Corbin (1990) he expands explaining the many stages of data collection through which the information is gradually refined and categorized.

Studies employing their central concept of three stages of coding data culminate at the arrival of a selective code in order to 'construct a storyline representing a descriptive narrative about the central phenomenon of the study' (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p.119). Through very close and repeated reading of the transcript texts are broken down into 'meaning units' which are subsequently logged as 'open codes'. These are listed into process groups i.e. open codes that appear to share an underlying process. This grouping facilitates the movement of these codes into the more formal arrangement of 'axial codes'. Axial codes are further abstracted in order to arrive at the 'selective code' - the

‘story’ summing up the essence of the analysis. Grounded theory typically presents one with a complex and multi-faceted picture (McLeod, 1997) of the subject under research.

Anderson and Braud’s ‘Thematic Content Analysis’ (TCA) (2011) is a technique from humanistic psychology used to analyze any textual data such as interview transcripts, which was designed to be both scrupulous but recognize the layering involved in qualitative data analysis: it ensures thoroughness of analysis to produce transformative findings. They described TCA as “objectivistic” in nature although it is a qualitative technique. Given this objectivistic pedigree it could balance out the inherently subjective aspects of life-story work. They envisage the technique as gently hovering over the text. Similar to grounded theory it is an inductive method in which the researcher will group and distil from texts lists of common themes. This is in order to give voice to any common experiences across the participants involved. Attempts are always made to label or name the themes employing words actually used by the participants, and then to group themes in a manner, which is representative of the texts as a whole. Inevitably this categorizing and labelling of themes requires interpretation but in TCA interpretation per se is kept to a minimum. The thoughts, feelings and level of interest and curiosity of the researcher towards any particular theme are not considered relevant in TCA. It would not be until later on in the process of research that the researcher would offer any interpretation of meaning or significance of identified themes. They argue that their technique is much more straightforward to implement than many other methods e.g. grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006) or phenomenology (Giorgi, 1985), although clearly it owes much to these groundbreaking methods.

Thematic analysis (TA) is another method used for identifying and analyzing patterns in qualitative data. Since being formally identified as a method in the 1970s (Merton, 1975) numerous approaches to thematic analysis have been described (e.g. Aronson, 1994; Attride-Stirling, 2001; Boyatzis, 1998; Joffe & Yardley, 2004; Tuckett, 2005). Braun and Clarke (2006) are particular proponents of this method emphasizing its theoretical flexibility and viewing it as a mere analytical tool as opposed to a particular methodology. As a mere analytic tool it is freed up from any dogma as examining texts for patterning does not demand capitulation to any overriding theoretical position in relation to either language or behaviour. For Braun and Clarke, as an atheoretical tool, TA’s advantages then are four fold: i) it can be applied across a full range of

frameworks and be useful in multiple research settings; ii) it can be used to analyse the full range of data from primary transcripts to secondary sources; iii) it is useable with both small and large date-sets; and iv) it is possible to use it to create both data-driven and theory-driven analyses.

It was invaluable to consider the various modes of approaching the analysis of narrative data: the understanding of the methods available, and the intellectual rationale behind these, became embedded in my mind. However, having given due consideration to these various modes, I opted to reject them ultimately not adhering to any particular recognisable method of analysis. Confronted with my data, the participants' interview transcripts that formed the narrative to be used, I found that I wanted to privilege the people and use them as the organising principle in the telling of the story. The individual voices and their subjective appraisal of external happenings were the most compelling aspects and I decided to extract meaning and themes as they were repeated from narrative to narrative. These repeated themes and anecdotes, told in discrete and individual ways, yet pointing to a collective experience, enabled a story to unfold through its main chronology and events. In a way I have simply fulfilled one of the aims of oral history in giving voice (Thompson 2000) to the individuals involved, and allowed them to tell the story from their perspective. However, while I allowed the individual tellers to guide the story I also organized the narrative by placing them in categories based on action and activity within the overall story. I designated labels to describe these activities and their function in the unfolding story and in addition I amplified and contextualised their tales with historical chronology and context.

Chapter Two: Historical context, Theoretical roots

The story of the SAP child training has its roots in various places and people; these people and places, as a result of the vicissitudes of history, interacted in ways which allowed for a long thought about idea to come into existence. These roots lie in the analytical psychology of C.G. Jung; in psychoanalysis; in the pioneering child analytic work of Anna Freud, Melanie Klein and Margaret Lowenfeld; in Michael Fordham and his blend of analytical psychology and psychoanalysis; and in the establishment of child psychotherapy as a profession embedded in the NHS. All of these roots need to be understood in order to contextualize the existence at all of a child training within the SAP.

Carl Gustav Jung's Analytical Psychology

Analytical Psychology is how Jung (1875 – 1961) came to describe his method of interrogating and understanding the emotional life of his patients. As he practised over many years, evolving and expanding his ideas and techniques there is no simple way of summarizing his thoughts. His psychiatric work was rooted in his experiences at the Burgholzli Hospital in Zurich where, from 1900, he worked with particularly disturbed patients (for a full account of this see Kerr, J., 1993). At that time he first developed, through the use of the word association test, his ideas about complexes and archetypes. Complexes are over determined areas of psychic difficulty, usually related to difficult past experiences, which the patient has yet to process and resolve. He found they had common structural patterns and that our psychic experiences were governed by these patterns, which he called archetypes. He understood these to be at the core of each complex, for example someone with a 'father complex' might continually have problems relating to males in an authority role. Hence this person would be struggling with the father archetype, a meta-experience of those things reminiscent of paternal authority. While developing these original ideas of understanding human emotional experience Jung heard of the radical work being developed by Freud in Vienna and the two entered into a long and profound correspondence culminating in a meeting in 1906. Much has been written about this creative yet fraught and ultimately devastating professional and personal relationship, which ended in an irrevocable split in 1913.

Jung centrally believed that the mind and the unconscious were 'purposive' and thereby assisting the individual in their psychic growth. He contrasted this with Freud's view of a pathologised psyche damaged and disturbed by past trauma and/or sexual conflict. Jung saw symptoms, for example of anxiety and depression, as indications given by the psyche to the conscious mind of imbalances that needed addressing. This is purposive in the sense that it is helpful and ultimately working to the good, to health. Linked to this was his deep appreciation of the self within each individual: an unconscious sense of the personality as a whole and archetypally representing an individual's full human potential. For Jung the self is instrumental in the development of the personality and it is only by following it can one become 'individuated'. Individuation is a life long, never ending process as one continually learns to manage and accommodate, and grow alongside, new experiences and the demands they make on one self. Jung said "Only what is really oneself has the power to heal" [CW Vol. 7, para. 258].

Jung however did acknowledge the destructive and negative aspects operating in the individual, specifically psychological mechanisms and characteristics that had not been integrated into the conscious personality. He named this 'the shadow' to illustrate the way in which these unmetabolised, unprocessed aspects of oneself can lurk and catch one out. These are qualities and functions that are disavowed, being in effect, the parts of the personality that one would rather not have and therefore acknowledge. Complexes, archetypes, the self and the shadow are central to Jung's analytical psychology.

In addition to these there are other accessible and widely recognized theories that Jung developed which have become part of common parlance when describing personality and its attributes in the vernacular. For example type theory in which he identified four discrete functions that typified an individual's way of relating to the world. These are thinking, feeling, sensation and intuition. Individuals will have dominant functions and those that are less well developed: inferior functions. The process of individuation involves all functions developing for a rounded personality to emerge so that attributes do not remain lurking in the shadow with the potential to be projected onto other people. Jung was also responsible for coining the terms introvert and extrovert to describe two distinct attitudes to relating to the world, the former more interested in the interior world with the latter showing more exteriorizing, and involvement with the

outside world. Similar to Freud, Jung was fascinated by dreams but differed from him in believing that dreams did not disguise their content but rather offered ‘unvarnished, natural truth’ (Carl Jung, CW Vol. 10, p: 317) in the form of symbols. Undoubtedly linked to his interest in the self, dreams and symbols Jung’s interest in what could loosely be described as spirituality increased during his years of working clinically and thinking about the human predicament. He felt that ultimately psychological work (dealing with the ego) enabled the individual to build a deeper relationship with the self. Through individuation and psychological growth the self could finally be experienced as numinous, transcending personal concerns and thrusting the individual into deeper and more encompassing relationships with others and the world.

Clinically though the relationship between the analyst and patient was central to his thought and practice. He clearly understood the critical importance of the analytic relationship and the effect thereon of the analyst’s personality. He saw analysis as an interactive process, an alchemical process of two chemical substances coming together and reacting to each other (Jung, 1933) in which both are transformed by the relationship formed. He was the first person to insist that analytic training should involve the personal analysis of the clinician him or herself, acknowledging the emotional demand placed on the analysis and the psychological rigour and honesty incumbent on a clinician entering into the task of accompanying a patient on the journey towards individuation. This was a profound realization that has influenced all subsequent training in depth psychology.

The irrevocable split that occurred with Freud is one whose reverberations continue to be seen today in the separation of Jungian and Freudian ‘streams’ in various training organizations, and the existence of separate training institutions for psychoanalysis and analytical psychology. This is a long and complicated story in itself; it is relevant for my narrative in as much as it is the context out of which the Society of Analytical Psychology was founded and beyond that out of which Michael Fordham developed the SAP child training.

Child Analysis and its roots in psychoanalysis

Unlike many of his psychoanalytic colleagues Jung was not Jewish and, additionally he

resided in neutral Switzerland. He therefore did not experience, personally or politically, the sorts of pressures those Jewish analysts started to as early as the 1920s and intensifying in the 1930s in Germany (Edmunson, 2007). The increasing anxiety, and ultimately mortal danger, felt by Jews directly led to a diaspora of psychoanalysis with London becoming a key location for the assembly of these immigrant psychoanalysts. It is arresting to think how different the history of psychoanalysis in the UK would have been without the advent of the Second World War and the refugees thus created; with London hosting the most eminent of psychoanalysts – Freud and Klein. This is a critical factor when considering the emergence of child psychotherapy as a discrete discipline both within psychoanalysis and within the treatments of child mental illness.

As early as the 1920s Melanie Klein and Anna Freud, separately, began to consider the possibilities of applying Freud's psychoanalysis – both the understanding and the technique – to working with children. The case of 'Little Hans' is cited as the most famous example of very early work with children, although increasingly analysts considered more conducive techniques, besides the couch and verbal language, to explore and unpack the internal worlds of children. However, increasingly Anna Freud and Melanie Klein held different views about the structure and development of the child's internal worlds specifically in relation to the Oedipal stage and the death drive (The Freud Museum, n.d).

Melanie Klein collapsed the barrier of age within this emerging field of child analysis by introducing toys and play into the analytic domain. Although she was clear that she wanted to adhere to the central psychoanalytic tenants of attending to meaning and process via the transference and unconscious phantasies she brought into the mix the play box, which radically opened up the possibilities of working with much younger children. Paper, crayons, string, balls, dolls, animals and even water enabled a child to enact, through play scenarios, internal and external concerns without needing adequate verbal language to do so. Equally the analyst would be drawn into playing roles that would offer crucial information about the way in which the child was experiencing adult figures in his or her life.

The technique of child analysis that Melanie Klein developed was instrumental in the

further development of her theories, specifically her emphasis on the impact of very early psychic life on human development; that is the root of adult disturbance in infantile experience. In 1955 she wrote:

... my work with both children and adults, and my contributions to psycho-analytic theory as a whole, derive ultimately from the play technique evolved with young children. I do not mean by this that my later work was a direct application of the play technique; but the insight that I gained into early development, into unconscious processes, and into the nature of the interpretations by which the unconscious can be approached, has been of far-reaching influence on the work I have done with older children and adults. (Klein 1955, p.122)

Developing Training in Child Psychotherapy

Training in child analysis became popular and the Institute of Psychoanalysis offered training to its adult analysts in the techniques developed by Melanie Klein. Klein had moved to London in 1926 at the invitation of Ernest Jones who had been impressed by her innovative clinical work. She lived and worked in London until her death in 1960. To some extent moving to London so much earlier than the other migrant psychoanalysts, whose arrival began in the proceeding decade, had enabled Klein to develop her ideas independently of the influence and continuing dominance of Freud and his fiercely loyal daughter, Anna. With the arrival of the Freuds in London in 1938 the issue of theoretical orthodoxy and loyalty came to the fore. An attempt to broker these fraught differences was the idea of the now notorious ‘controversial discussions’ that took place in the 1940s at the Institute of Psychoanalysis between the Kleinians and Freudians. The impossibility of reconciling Klein’s view of early childhood involving the infant’s guilt at recognising the mother as the object of its destructive phantasies with Anna Freud’s emphasis on the child’s ego and the later development of its super-ego culminated in a decision to run three training streams for British psychoanalysts: Kleinian, Freudian and Independent. For a full and exhaustive account of these internecine struggles see *The Freud-Klein Controversies 1941-45* edited by Pearl King and Riccardo Steiner (1990).

The child guidance movement had been simultaneously gathering steam in the UK after the end of the First World War. This continued until the Second World War after which it was incorporated into the welfare state. The child guidance movement was particularly concerned with the issue of ‘maladjustment’ that was seen as originating from a dysfunctional child-parent relationship. It presciently placed the symptoms exhibited by children firmly within the family system and also saw the symptoms as being problematic for not only the child and family, but also society. Essentially it viewed itself as a philanthropic and preventative venture. (Stewart, 2009) Children were seen by teams of professionals led by a psychiatrist supported by psychologists and psychiatric social workers. Largely the approach avoided the use of psychoanalysis and staff had no additional training other than their core profession. Nevertheless, professionals involved in child guidance were interested in the insights of psychoanalysis, and with the advent of the National Health Service there was a movement to establish a profession of ‘child psychotherapy’ embedded within the new NHS.

Both the geographical locations of their founders and the idiosyncratic nature of psychoanalytic migration into this country, described above, meant that there were already two discrete traditions within child psychotherapy in the UK: that of Melanie Klein and that of Anna Freud. The separation was only compounded by the controversial discussions of the 1940s. While Melanie Klein had been concerning herself with early infant states and their implications for adult mental disturbance Anna Freud had been exploring her own approach to applying her father’s theories and practice to the psychic lives of children. In 1923 she began working with children in Vienna and by 1924 was teaching seminars informed by her findings and observations. Her first book on the subject was published in 1927 entitled ‘Introduction to the Technique of Child Analysis’. After seeking sanctuary in London with her father in 1938 Anna Freud’s commitment to working with troubled and traumatized children found expression through her founding of the ‘Hampstead War Nursery’, which she opened as a response to the suffering she witnessed (Midgely, 2007).

Therefore the situation after the Second World War was that Melanie Klein was establishing her ideas and associated training within the Institute of Psychoanalysis while Anna Freud’s centre of gravity shifted to her war nurseries. In 1947, to build on

the lessons learned and massive expertise accumulated, Anna Freud founded the Hampstead Child Therapy Course and Clinic. Her aim was to train child analysts and create ‘child experts’ (Pretorius, 2010). The first cohort of eight students was largely made up of people who had worked in the Hampstead War Nursery. The now well-known combination of personal analysis, lectures, seminars and supervision, which still make up the core of any child psychotherapy training, were provided by psychoanalysts from the Institute of Psychoanalysis but mainly took place in their homes away from the Institute. After purchasing 12, Maresfield Gardens in 1951 the clinic and training consolidated itself around a building and patients were seen there.

During this post-war period Esther Bick, supported by John Bowlby, founded a child training at the Tavistock Clinic with the express intention of establishing ‘child psychotherapy’ as a core modality and profession within the newly established National Health Service. Bick had proposed to Klein an adapted version of child analysis, whereby the child patient could be seen less frequently than the classic 5 times a week, while still working with a pure psychoanalytic model. Melanie Klein was persuaded of the virtue of this and the training at the Tavistock was established in 1949.

The third pioneering woman who warrants mentioning in relation to the growing commitment to improving the mental health of children, which, as I have shown, began in the inter-war years was Margaret Lowenfeld, a paediatrician, whose interest in child psychology, like Anna Freud, was sparked by becoming involved with children traumatized by their experiences of war (Urwin and Hood-Williams, 1988). Like Klein but entirely independent of her, Lowenfeld promoted the use of play over talk to understand the intra-personal dynamics of the child (Davis 1991). She established the Children’s Clinic for the Treatment Study of Nervous and Difficult Children in London in 1928 – one of the first child guidance clinics – and which in 1931 offered training through the Institute for Child Psychology (ICP). Lowenfeld is particularly important for her development of the sand tray technique which she wrote about in her first book *Play in Childhood* (1935) and which remains in print today. During the Second World War the ICP clinic relocated to Berkhamsted but was re-established in London after the war. It was funded by the NHS until its closure in 1977 due to government funding being cut (Urwin, 2004).

Although not responsible for setting up a training organization, D.W. Winnicott was an additional critical figure within the development of the theory and practice of child psychotherapy. He is also relevant to our story here as he and Michael Fordham were colleagues in the 1930s. Winnicott was a paediatrician and psychoanalyst who worked for over 40 years at Paddington Green Children's Hospital in London (Phillips, 1998). Rising to prominence during the Second World War and the time of the 'controversial discussions' mentioned above Winnicott was firmly located within the independent stream of psychoanalysis that emerged after the Institute split into its three discrete training streams (those being Freudian, Kleinian and so called 'Independent'). His work straddled pre-war, pre-NHS provision right into the more complex services that became Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS). Winnicott was interested, like Klein with whom he worked closely initially, in the psychodynamic understanding of relationships from the very earliest time of life. His whole approach was imbued with the understanding that environmental factors, rather than only instinctual conflict and envy (a critique he offered of the Kleinian approach) loomed large in creating optimum settings for child emotional wellbeing to flourish. He used straightforward language with mothers and their children to promote loving, facilitating, 'good-enough' relationships (Winnicott, 1953). Winnicott was known for his frequent radio programmes aimed at care-givers (specifically mothers in those days) and was therefore particularly visible to a broad public.

A Registering Body

By the end of the 1940s there were therefore three fledgling child psychotherapy training organizations: The Tavistock, The Hampstead Child Therapy Training and The Institute for Child Psychology. The need for a registering body was recognized and in 1949 the Provisional Association of Child Psychotherapy (Non-Medical) was created, becoming in 1951 the Association of Child Psychotherapists. This umbrella organization heralded and cemented the new profession of 'child psychotherapy' providing a professional body overseeing standards of training and practice.

The Tavistock training was the first to be accepted by the new organization, followed by the Hampstead Child Therapy training in 1950. The Institute for Child Psychology was the third founding member. The ACP took gradual steps to expand its remit and extend

its reach. The *Journal of Child Psychotherapy* was established in 1963 and was published in-house until being taken over by Routledge in 1994. A full register of members was produced annually from 1993. A very significant move for the ACP was the decision taken in 1974 to join the NHS. This led to child psychotherapy being recognized as a 'core profession' within Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS). The Department of Health recognized the ACP as the profession's regulatory body thus cementing its central and statutory role.

There have over the years been other training organizations established. As I will come to in much more detail the Society of Analytical Psychology, formed in 1949, established its training in child psychotherapy during the 1970s. The British Association of Psychotherapists, which was founded in 1951 to train clinicians in psychoanalytic psychotherapy for adults, further founded a new training in child psychotherapy in 1982 under the auspices of Anne Hurry. It received its accreditation by the ACP 1986. In 1993, a child training at the Scottish Institute of Human Relations was formally recognised, followed in 1995 by that of the newly formed Birmingham Trust for Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy. A new venture in 2003 was the formation of the Northern School of Child and Adolescent Psychotherapy established by the NHS to address the shortage of child and adolescent psychotherapists in the north of England; it too was recognised by the ACP. The Anna Freud Centre closed its training during the mid-noughties but a recent development has seen it collaborating in a newer training through its close working relationship with the Psychoanalysis Unit at University College London. The newly formed British Psychotherapy Foundation (an amalgamation of three psychoanalytic psychotherapy organizations: The Lincoln Centre, the London Centre for Psychotherapy and the British Association of Psychotherapists) has superseded the BAP child training in establishing The Independent Psychoanalytic Child and Adolescent Psychotherapy Association (IPCAPA). In September 2014 this training became a joint clinical doctorate programme between University College London, the Anna Freud Centre and IPCACA at the British Psychotherapy Foundation; and similarly to the Tavistock this runs alongside NHS training placement providers. It is described thus on its website:

The theoretical orientation of the clinical training represents the thinking of the Independent School within the British Psychoanalytic movement and also provides

Freudian and Kleinian thinking, both classical and contemporary. It allows trainees flexibility and scope to find in time their own theoretical position. Additional Jungian theory modules are provided for Jungian analysts on the Jungian pathway. As well as receiving direct teaching on research methodologies and how to evaluate others' research findings, participants in the course will undertake a research project on an area of significance to the child psychotherapy profession. Participants will be helped to develop an approach to research that will be able to make a serious contribution to the future of the child psychotherapy profession. (British Psychotherapy Foundation, n.d.)

The Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust, the Scottish Institute of Human Relations, the Birmingham Trust for Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy, the Northern School of Child and Adolescent Psychotherapy and IPCAPA are now the five accredited training schools for the training of child and adolescent psychotherapists in the UK (Association of Child Psychotherapists, 2014).

Michael Fordham

As alluded to above the advent and finish of the Second World War was a time of great ferment and creativity for the minds and activities of key figures in the growing field of child psychotherapy because of the effects and aftermath on children of their various traumatic experiences. The establishment of a welfare state and a national health service provided a platform for the ensuing therapeutic activities. However, before the war, as we have seen, analysts were already preoccupied by the predicament of children and their psychic life, and working hard to consider how the insights of psychodynamics could shed light on the internal processes involved; and associated with this developing techniques and approaches to working with children.

Michael Fordham (1905- 1995), James Astor argues (1995), was as important a founder of a movement in analysis as Klein, Winnicott and Wilfrid Bion, through his blending of new findings from psychoanalysis with Jung's original ideas, culminating in pioneering a Jungian approach to working analytically with children. As Elizabeth Urban notes his life spanned the first century of psychoanalysis and he spent over sixty years thinking about children (Urban, 1996). James Astor and Elizabeth Urban have

both spent their own professional lives exploring and writing about Michael Fordham and his clinical and theoretical approach. They are truly his heirs in all respects and play a crucial role in the story I tell here. To attempt to convey all that they both have made available for the public in their published work would be foolish so instead I will offer a brief summary of Michael Fordham's life and work in order to offer more context for his role in setting up the SAP and its associated child training.

Michael Fordham was born in London in 1905 into a landowning family from Hertfordshire. After boarding school in Norfolk he went to Cambridge University in 1924 and then to study medicine at St. Bartholomew's Hospital in 1927. He qualified as a doctor in 1931. In 1928 he had married Molly Swabey, who gave birth to a son Max in 1933. This marriage was dissolved in 1940 and his second marriage to Frieda Hoyle lasted until her death in 1987. She was to become, as Frieda Fordham, one of his great clinical collaborators (see, for example, Fordham, 1953).

Fordham entered into general psychiatry in 1932, which was the same year that Melanie Klein had published her first volume, *The Psychoanalysis of Children*. Entering child psychiatry the following year at the London Child Guidance Clinic coincided with him entering his first analysis with H.G. Baynes. Through Baynes he arranged to meet Jung in Zurich in 1934 with whom he had contact until Jung's death in 1961. Fordham began attending the Analytical Psychology Club in London, which had been founded in 1922 by close associates of Jung in order to discuss, explore and disseminate Jung's ideas – it still exists today (C.G. Jung Club, London, 2015)). Indeed the roots of the Society of Analytical Society lie in the Club as it was through it that its eventual founding members met in 1936.

Like Freud, Klein, Winnicott and Lowenfeld, Fordham worked with evacuated children who had been affected traumatically by their experiences of the Second World War, in his case in Nottingham (Fordham, 1993). Returning to London after the war Fordham introduced psychoanalytically minded colleagues to Jung's work through the medium of the British Psychological Society's Medical Section. This was a forum that had been frequented originally by psychiatrists whom had become interested in trauma through their work with soldiers returning from the First World War with 'shell shock' (what we would now call post-traumatic stress disorder). The most famous of these was W.H.R.

Rivers (Slobodin, 1997) who was immortalized in Pat Barker's Regeneration Trilogy: a series of three novels (Barker, 1991, 1993, 1995) focussing on the first world war and its aftermath. These psychiatrists were interested in the developing science of psychoanalysis and used the Society to discuss their innovative approach to working with mental illness (they were therefore influenced by Freudian practice). It was not until after the Second World War that Fordham introduced established members to Jung.

This coincided with Fordham being appointed as a consultant to the Child Guidance Clinic at the West End Hospital for Nervous Diseases in 1946. This was one of the pioneering hospitals in the psychiatric field founded in 1878, opening for child guidance in the 1920s (Chambers, 2008). Michael Fordham was therefore at the centre of the contemporary psychiatric discourse in London – a consultant at a major hospital, an enthusiastic and active participant in the BPS Medical Section, undergoing Jungian analysis and beginning his professional relationship with Jung himself. Out of this ferment of intellectual and personal psychological activity the Society of Analytical Psychology came into being.

Chapter Three: The Society of Analytical Psychology

Originally Michael Fordham had proposed a joint endeavour between the already existing Analytical Psychology Club and a group of interested practicing analysts to form a professional training body for adult Jungian Analysis. After ‘disagreeableness’ (Fordham, 1993, p.92) in the discussions this idea was abandoned in favour of a group of like-minded analysts to found a society. The founding members of the Society of Analytical Psychology (SAP) were Gerhard Adler, Culver Baker, Erna Rosenbaum, Freida Fordham, Michael Fordham, Philip Metman, Lotte Paulson and Robert Moody.

Michael Fordham (1993, pp.93-94) writes:

Margaret Welch [one of the sponsors] lent us part of her house in St. John’s Wood where we could hold meetings and start a clinic. It was a small group and I learnt a lot about how difficult it was for analysts to get along with each other – Adler and Rosenbaum in particular did not seem to see eye to eye on much. At the start, however, they sank their differences, and discussions on clinical material were quite vivid, especially when it came to training. We decided that we wanted to provide cases for the students to analyse under the supervision of a senior analyst. The question of supervision became a central issue and Jung was consulted. He gave, somewhat to my surprise, his qualified approval to our proposals to separate supervision and analysis. My impression had been that he did not like professional societies of analysts at all, nor systematic clinical training. He wanted to base analysis on vocation: a prospective analyst would discover his talent during his analysis, which was therefore the nub of any training given.

In all this I found myself becoming something of a leader. I say ‘found myself’ because I had defects as a Jungian. I was something of a vocational analyst, although ... I did take the training at the Institute of Medical Psychology (now the Tavistock Clinic). I had not studied in Zurich nor did I intend to: my life in London was becoming too rich and I was sufficiently accepted by the Jungians and others in England. It was partly because of this, but also because I held that we were serving science, that I insisted on calling our society the Society of Analytical Psychology and not the C.G Jung Institute.

The aim of the SAP was to formalize the exploration and dissemination of Jung's ideas, and Jung himself was its first president. The SAP was the first to offer a Jungian analytic training in the UK. It set up the *Journal of Analytical Psychology* in 1955 and also the C.G. Jung Clinic in 1946 to enable potential patients to benefit from an analysis. All these activities continue today. (For details of the acquisition of the current building at 1 Daleham Gardens see appended document kindly provided by Hugh Gee: appendix iv).

The story of the SAP and its growing activities are documented at the archive house at the Wellcome Library in Euston. It is regretfully beyond my remit to present here a summary and commentary on the full archive collection, which is comprehensive and almost fully accessible at the Wellcome Library. I heartily recommend any student interested in the history and development of Jungian thought and of depth psychology in general to spend an afternoon glancing through these precious remnants of a bygone age, which include letters written in inky, spidery handwriting signed by Jung, Jolande Jakobi and Michael Fordham amongst others. This was a time when all correspondence was through the medium of surface mail, with the inevitable delays and frustrations that entailed. Instead, I offer what I hope will be an enticement to the individual reader to explore further, and a flavour, in the form of extracted examples, of the material that is available. I present in chronological order some of the seminal moments along the way of the historical unfolding of the society and its activities, and brief nuggets of the material that is there to be found. As previously mentioned, I am appending (see appendix i) a full description of the archive available at the Wellcome Library, from which I have made my extractions and 'found' the particular narrative I present here.

Between the found extracts from the archive I will interweave description of the internal states and the associations that arose in me in response to coming across these remnants from time passed. Indeed, as this project has progressed my associated emotional state has been one of nostalgia for lost things, people and places while knowing full well that the actual nuts and bolts of establishing the SAP and its trainings would have been as fraught and political as anything that is happening currently within psychoanalytic organisations of all persuasions. But nevertheless the odour of people who are no longer here, ideas coming to fruition, locations discussed, collectively smell strongly of a London that also, in some ways, is unrecognisable as a backdrop to the one I

encountered as I walked down Euston Road to the library. Stepping physically into the archive is in itself such a strange, almost subversive act, when compared to the chronic hustle and bustle outside. The insulation and quiet of the room, the solemnity of the personnel and one's fellow researchers lend itself to a genuinely surreal experience in which temporal space and time are suspended such that the world the archive presents becomes reality. It never fails to be a shock to re-emerge and find the London of 2016 waiting outside: a London changed irrevocably by seismic international shifts intruding and interacting in complex ways with the city's demographic and psychological state (Judah, 2016).

We encounter Michael Fordham as a young doctor at the beginning of his lifelong fascination with the psychological lives of children. We see his very early papers, showing quite clearly his interest in children and the aetiology of their distress: for example in 1937 in the *St. Bartholomew's Hospital Journal* there is a paper entitled 'A psychological approach to functional disorders of childhood'; in 1938 the Guild of Pastoral Psychology published his lecture *Analysis of Children*.

This activity continues with Jung writing to Fordham on 29 June 1945 congratulating him on the establishment of 'The Medical Society of Analytical Psychologists' and on inviting the Analytical Psychology Club to collaborate. The aim of this was actually to bring together lay and medics under the same umbrella – it was ultimately not successful but laid the groundwork for the establishment of the SAP.

There is evidence of vigorous correspondence between Jung and Fordham relating to the translation of Jung's work into English, of which Fordham eventually became general editor. A most significant document is dated 3 January 1946 and entitled 'Memorandum and Articles of Association of The Society of Analytical Psychology'. This was the founding document of the SAP with the original seven 'subscribers' named above in the previous section. And at the same time we see Michael Fordham's continued interest in children in a paper entitled 'Analytical Psychology Applied to Children' published in a journal called *The Nervous Child* (volume 5, number 2, April 1946). He also published 'Integration and Disintegration and Early Ego Development' in the same journal a year later (Volume 6, number 3, July 1947). A full list of all his

published papers, including these most early ones, is available in the archive (PP/FOR/B.2).

Trawling through the minutes of endless meetings what is so striking is the similarity and ubiquity of organisational and training concerns: for example the lack of training patients and the clinic patient commitment. 'Clinic patients' refer to the ongoing commitment of members of the SAP to offer an intensive analysis to a patient referred by the CG Jung Clinic and for that fee to be payable to the SAP. The 'clinic patient analysis' was originally a twenty-year post qualification commitment that has been modified in recent times but with financial consequences for the SAP.

In the AGM 17 July 1954 it was reported 'Dr. Fordham stated that he thought there was a feeling amongst senior members that there should be an end to the time in which members were required to take clinic patients. [He] thought this was a reasonable point.' Interestingly, even within the last week of writing this paragraph I have received communication from the SAP circulated to the membership in respect of this issue, which remains unresolved.

In the same year it is reported that there are waiting lists and members needing cases to analyse. Although there is better news as, in his chairman's address, Michael Fordham talks of growth over the last 20 years. In 1935 when he joined the Analytical Psychology Club there were only four other active analysts: Drs Godwin Baynes, Culver Barker, Helen Shaw and the lay analyst Elsie Beckinsale. 'We were, with the exception of Dr. Baynes, without position in medical circles, a supposedly defunct remnant of the Jungian deviation'. The other members of the 'Club' were non-practising lay people with an interest in Jung and his ideas. In 1954 there were 40 members (22 medical and 18 lay) and representatives in 10 hospitals, 3 psychiatric clinics and 4 child guidance clinics. In October of this year he was also given permission by Jung to inaugurate the 'C.G. Jung Clinic'.

Reading about the ubiquitous problem of matching the needs of patients and analysts it is hard not to conclude 'plus ca change, plus c'est la meme chose'. It is extraordinary really that decades on from this the Society's chair is still writing newsletters attempting to rally the troops with good news while telling a story of struggle and difficulty.

In 1956 the first newsletter of the SAP was published to celebrate Jung's eightieth birthday. Happy times it seemed and yet by July 1957 again we find a depressing picture of a society ridden with strife and discord. The chairman offers a 'cri de coeur' entreating members to desist from interpersonal and organisational disputes. One of the personalities name checked at this time is Dr. John Layard, father of the LSE economist Richard Layard, who has become well known for being the 'happiness' tsar and one of the prime movers in the Improving Access to Psychological Therapies initiative begun in 2006.

The SAP had been occupying a lease on a building at 25 Park Crescent, London W1. In 1958 they received news that they must quit and 30 Devonshire Place was bought in March 1959 as a direct result.

I am reminded of struggles with our current building: a higgledy-piggledy, no longer fit for purpose, large residential house in the lower reaches of Hampstead. Its future is currently uncertain, with some wishing to sell and others wishing to retain. This uncertainty occurs against the backdrop of imminent and inevitable changes to this neighbourhood still heavily associated with psychoanalytic thought and practice: the Tavistock Centre will be relocating within the next few years as will the Anna Freud Centre. The buildings themselves are no longer the bulwarks they were: acquired to defend, ferment and develop ideas, those buildings and ideas alike are under threat from the meeting of the desirability of prime land and the exigencies of current financial demands.

On 14 November 1960 there is a more upbeat 'Chairman's News Bulletin' thanking Dr. Robert Hobson for stalwart efforts (whose son Peter is a renowned child psychiatrist and psychoanalyst, particularly interested in researching autism). There is better news to report: it is now Jung's eighty-fifth birthday; there is a 'New Outline of Training'; and papers have been given to the British Psychological Society (Medical Section).

I am struck by the Venn diagrammatic nature of what I find: both concretely in terms of coming across the names of fathers of people whose influence abounds today but also in the familiarity of the issues, conflicts and concerns that emerge from the documents. It

suggests a certain inevitability of discord and disappointment when people join together in organisational settings. The very innovative forces that allow these organisations to be formed in the first place become fuel for intra-group rivalries that put the organisations at risk (Fraher, 2004).

The 'New Model'

With the founding of the SAP, Fordham was free to develop and expand on his emerging ideas about psychological life. It is hard now to imagine, in a world (albeit a privileged section of it) where words such as 'neuroscience' and 'mindfulness' roll off lay people's tongues having entered the vernacular, just how revolutionary it was for Fordham to intrude upon existing Jungian orthodoxy his views of early mental life. Thinking about children, in fact infants, and their individual and autonomous emotional states represented a radical reworking of Jungian psychology providing a structure to enable Jungians to think about early psychic life that had not been previously available.

Shiho Main (2008) has written about the tension between Fordham's reworking of the model (and the labelling of such as 'developmental') and the wider Jungian community. She shows how he was considered the deviant within the Jungian fold, and considers his interest in the child within the framework of the increasing recognition of childhood as a state demanding attention and afforded rights (Main, 2008, pp.103–145). This commitment to integrating fundamental Jungian psychology with psychoanalytic findings was controversial as it led him finally to depart from Jung on a major tenet: describing the infant as an autonomous being, with its own self capable of action and therefore a person with individuality from in utero onwards.

Post-Jungian developmental theory owes a massive debt to Fordham's empirical psychological work with children and his observations of certain activities from which he extrapolated evidence of the workings of the self. The two cases most commonly cited are of two children under the age of two: a little boy who scribbled circles on a wall until discovering the word 'I' at which point the scribbling ceased, and a little girl whose inhibition decreased as she scribbled circles. Fordham understood the circles through his Jungian lens as attempts by the self to cohere the uncontained ego into the whole personality. Fordham therefore located the self at the very beginning of life, and

thus very significantly claimed the self for early childhood.

The emerging theory of primary self and its actions: deintegration and reintegration

Fordham absolutely saw the infant as an individual in its own right, separate from its mother; he was particularly interested to acknowledge that at such an early point in human experience the baby was necessarily completely bound up in its physical experience of itself equally as its embryonic psychological self. Therefore he coined the term ‘primary self’ to include the full psychosomatic dimension of this early human self. This is a self which simultaneously both ‘is’ i.e. exists here and now, but also exists in potentia, as it is from this primary self that all future development will emerge.

In order to explain how this ‘in potentia’ self will develop and emerge into what it will / can become, he posited the processes of deintegration and reintegration. Deintegration is the verb he coined to illustrate a process in which the primary self unfurls from itself in order to interact with the external world: to ‘de-integrate’. It is a reaching out to the world and those who inhabit it in the service of growth and both personal and interpersonal expansion, but it is an experience that feeds back into the primary self, maintaining wholeness and avoiding any fragmentation. This is a whole personality action. In turn re-integration is the process by which these whole personality experiences / actions (which are known as ‘deintegrates’) are absorbed back into the primary self, contributing to its expansive growth and development. Fordham viewed the processes of deintegration and reintegration as archetypal – meaning they are processes that are inherent, integral and essential to human development.

As the primary self is a mind–body integrate i.e. a psychosomatic entity, this de / re integrative cycle is essential for the developing mind and body to separate out and to enable the growing infant to start differentiating between physical and mental experience. This goes hand in hand with ego development, which Fordham claimed was happening from the very earliest days (Fordham 1958).

In 1944 he wrote his first book ‘The Life of Childhood’ which was written before he had consolidated his ideas of early child development. Elizabeth Urban (1996) points out that in the first edition of the book Fordham was still attempting to reconcile a fully

Jungian archetypal understanding of early mental life and she describes how ‘the way he managed the material strikes those of us who trained with him as peculiar’ (p. 154). She argues that the three reprints of the book describe the arc in Fordham’s thinking about. The second 1969 edition was re-titled ‘Children as Individuals’ demonstrating clearly his commitment to putting the child’s experience central to his thinking about developmental processes, freeing himself from the perceived Jungian demand to inextricably link mother and baby’s psyche. In 1994 this process is culminated by the inclusion of his understanding gained from participating in infant observation seminars allowing for ‘the importance of the infant's contribution to early relationships; the conclusion that fusion is not an early stage of development, but, rather, fluctuating projective states; the roles of projective and introjective processes in creating self-representations; the assertion that whole objects precede part objects; and observations about the sources of the depressive position, which he came to understand as the first step in individuation.’ (Urban, 1996, p. 155).

The Foundation of Child Training at the Society of Analytical Psychology

There was thus a physical site (the SAP) and a mental site (Fordham’s developing model) and with this potent combination seen from our contemporary vantage point it seems inevitable that there should be a child training established at the SAP: the combination of the historical and contemporaneous environmental factors documented above and the intent and will of an individual, Michael Fordham, committed to applying and adapting Jungian principles to work with children would suggest an addition to the then existing child psychotherapy trainings was necessary. Through what other fora could Fordham have moved his findings from a mere personal adventure into the mental health of children to a coherent, publicly endorsed model of working shared by colleagues? However, what we know from the archive, and from the tales of individuals involved this ‘inevitability’ involved painstaking work and difficulty.

The most significant document marking the genesis of the child training is entitled ‘Outline of Suggestions for Training Child Analysts Working Party’ dated 17 June 1964. This is a very detailed proposal suggesting that trainees would complete the adult training first, and then continue with a mother-infant observation, plus ‘joint interviews’ with a mother and child, along with gaining experience at ‘child guidance clinics –

hospitals or local authority'. Laurie Hawkey was the chair of the working party and it is from this point that one clearly sees the labour intensive nature of this enterprise.

By October 1964 there is an 'Outline of training seminars' consisting of 125 hours over two years including an introduction to child analysis, mental development in childhood, baby observation, clinical concepts, psychopathology, and weekly group clinical supervision.

A thorough and detailed treatment of the proposal is submitted to SAP council on 12 November 1965 and there then follows a vigorous exchange of letters between Mildred Marshak (an early member of the society who was enthused by the idea of a child training) and the committee. In response to a query regarding application requirements the Committee refer to a document produced by the Association of Child Psychotherapists referring to an explanation of different university degrees and qualifications that are considered suitable for potential applicants e.g. psychology degrees and social work diplomas.

On 18 February 1966 Mildred Marshak writes to the chairman of council expressing a strong desire for the SAP to have a child analytic training but expressing reservations about the current proposals being 'too disconcertingly ambiguous'. She also speaks to the tension between child analysis and child psychotherapy and needing to both satisfy the ACP while remaining in keeping with the depth of a Jungian analytic contribution to the field. The question is posed: 'Is it desirable that we should compromise our long standing aim to train Jungian Child Analysts in order to qualify for membership to the Association of Child Psychotherapists?'

This question – which could be summarised as analysis versus psychotherapy but in reality is a more nuanced debate about persisting with a practice that one considers valuable and yet is not supported by the wider culture – is still relevant, and one that exercises many psychoanalytic organisations today in relation to an increasingly market and outcome driven NHS. It is of course what drives clinicians into private practice seeking new structures within which to offer the treatment they wish to provide. Having said that, there is a place for the application of psychoanalytic thought within clinical settings where the traditional practice model itself is not possible. It also resonates with

a more contemporary event, which happened towards the end of the training when the requirement for child trainees to analyse a mother as an integral part of their clinical requirements for qualification was lifted. There was no requirement from the ACP for this: this was an internal demand placed on child trainees by the SAP, and a demand that was felt increasingly onerous by the remaining trainees struggling to meet the requirements for qualification.

In response to the SAP's decision, an even more detailed submission including the specific curriculum with exposition of different theoretical models was required. In addition a document was circulated entitled 'General Principles Regarding Structure of Proposed Training'. It claimed that there is 'no real conflict over the issue of training child analysts versus psychotherapists'. Nevertheless, on 15 February 1967 Michael Fordham wrote a 'Memo' addressing both a point about family psychopathology and his papers on Infantile Autism and the ongoing concern regarding the 'analysis versus psychotherapy' question. This constellated around concern regarding a possible compromise of the structural (frequency of sessions) and theoretical (is there a 'Jungian' child developmental theory?) model.

There was a response from Marshak on 26 February 1967 and a counter response from Hawkey on 28 February. It seems as though Marshak was mollified by Dorothy Davidson's intervention suggesting there is in general 'more agreement than disagreement' as there are minutes of a sub-committee meeting on 1 March 1967 amplifying on the draft structure. Throughout the course of 1967 there are several re-drafts submitted barely different one from the other.

It seems like there was such a fear of this new training – why? The fear of straying outside what is known perhaps: what could happen by inviting in new ideas and linking with other organisations? Perhaps it was some unconscious fear of attending so closely to the earlier years of life, which as has been noted were neglected in Jungian circles.

In what appears to be an acceptance by the Jungian establishment of the training there is a letter dated September 1968 from Jolande Jacoby (an influential figure within Jung's close circle in Zurich) approving a bibliography of books and papers on child analysis by analytical psychologists.

Finally, after years of negotiation and strife Judith Hubback announced the intention to run a child training to the membership in a letter dated 14 July 1969. On 6 January 1970 investigations were made to advertise in the *Journal of Child Psychotherapy*, *The Journal of Analytical Psychology*, *The British Medical Journal*, *The Lancet*, *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, and *BPS Journal*, although there is evidence of continued negotiation within the SAP. It is not until July 1970 that the ‘Outline of Training in Child Analysis’ is finally written. Dorothy Davidson writes to Michael Fordham with a draft of a letter to write advertising the training to start in October 1970 – a culmination of an unimaginable amount of work and wrangling both internal and external to the Society.

The training starts

A letter dated 5 September 1970 from Vera Cole to Michael Fordham announced the first two meetings of ‘The Children’s Section’ of the SAP with Michael Fordham speaking on Wednesday 14 October on ‘Theory of the Self in Childhood’. The first meeting was very well received leading to suggestions that Donald Meltzer and Frances Tustin should be invited to speak. There ensued a warm and respectful correspondence between Fordham and Meltzer during November 1970 inviting him to talk and him accepting. He spoke at the society on 1 April 1971.

To see Donald Meltzer being invited to the society and the clear mutual admiration between these two men is extraordinary to stumble across in the archive. It is evidence of the influences from outside the Jungian canon that Fordham wanted to explore and invite into both the society and his own mind and practice. It also has a peculiar resonance for me as somebody who trained both at the SAP and the Tavistock. My second analyst had been analysed by Meltzer so I also felt that I was bridging traditions and continuing with an earlier established link between these two men. One that was unbeknown to me at the outset of the analysis.

There are concerns about the prohibitive cost of the training discouraging potential trainees from pursuing it. Correspondence between Michael Fordham and a body called the Wickes Foundation – a grant awarding foundation based in the United States of

America – takes place towards the end of 1970 addressing this issue. It is clearly a problem for the SAP that the child training is so expensive and it seems as though for a period of two years the Wickes Foundation offered a grant in support of the training. There are letters from Dr. Hogle of the Foundation dated October 1970 encouraging the application for funding. However, by 1973 there are letters indicating that owing to financial difficulties of its own the Wickes Foundation withdrew its funding. The C.G. Jung Institute of San Francisco stepped in on 16 October 1973 offering a grant of \$40 000 to the SAP. The Wickes foundation was liquidated and The San Francisco Institute received all the proceeds.

There is more evidence of the difficulties with funding during this period in the form of a personal letter from Michael Fordham to Dr. F. Tait at the Greater London Council Medical Department on 23 December 1971 enumerating the various developments of the child training. This garnered an enthusiastic response on 10 January 1972 welcoming more information and wishing to explore ideas of funding and secondment. In addition there is, on 14 June 1973, a memo to council members explaining the need for funds to run the child training.

As with so much of this archive material I find the story unfolding within it continually resonating with the contemporary picture. Funding is a ubiquitous issue both for individuals wishing to undertake trainings and for organisations trying to secure funding for its trainees.

On 18 June 1973 Shirley Hoxter from the *Journal of Child Psychotherapy* writes to SAP asking whether it would like to submit a description of the training as well as an advert. This seems to me to be an unsolicited acknowledgment that the child training was worthy of inclusion in the *Journal*. Shirley Hoxter is described in correspondence between Norah Moore and Dorothy Davidson as helpful and facilitative. Accordingly, Dorothy Davidson in August 1973 writes a description of the training:

‘To enable successful candidates, both medical and lay, to qualify as members of the Society and to practise as child Analytical Psychologists ... also for membership of the ACP (non medical).’ ‘Minimum length of training is 3 years with minimum requirement of 400 hours of personal analysis’ It concludes ‘The

training is as yet in its early infancy and change and modifications in it are inevitable. The current thinking about it, as it stands today, is that it covers, with the inclusion of baby observation and the analysis of one adult together with the analysis of children, a comprehensive experience of the individuating human psyche’.

In an undated booklet entitled *Careers in Child Psychotherapy* issued by the ACP, registered at Burgh House in Hampstead, the SAP is listed as one of the four training centres (along with Anna Freud’s Hampstead Clinic, the Tavistock Centre and the Institute of Child Psychology)

Finally, Lawrence Brown is admitted as the first trainee. Michael Fordham is director of children’s training. Lawrence Brown did not wish to be interviewed for this project, which clearly needs to be acknowledged and recognised as a gap in the research. He expressed reservations about the validity of the method (i.e. interviewing for memories) and also concerns regarding the notion of consent for participating. I did not pursue him for inclusion, and therefore do not fully understand his reasons for not wishing to be involved. It is hard not to speculate that it is related to the painful legacy of what was to come after such promising and optimistic beginnings.

Defences of the Self

In 1974 Fordham published his paper ‘Defences of the Self’ in the *Journal of Analytical Psychology*: these had been little spoken about previously in the Jungian discourse. He saw these defences as ‘total’ and likened them to a negative therapeutic reaction, which can take hold in intractable ways to protect the patient from violation. These are defences resulting from unbearable trauma where the usual recourse of the analytic endeavour simply fails to reach the patient. The aim of primitive defences is to ensure the individual’s survival, but results in somehow chopping up experience to make trauma tolerable. Fordham described working with these patients as extremely challenging: the patients attack what is good and flood the analytic process with negative affect. Fordham was looking for an alternative version of events from that postulated by Klein, that these patients were overcome by a ‘constitutional excess of envy’ (Fordham, 1974, p.199). He tried to find a teleological, prospective meaning,

seeing these behaviours in terms of a pathological trauma history and the patients', albeit ultimately counter-productive, attempts to protect themselves from unbearable affect provoked by threatened intimacy. Donald Kalsched (1996) has described this as a very prescient thought: the moving on from Kleinian envy and the death instinct and has shown how these have helped form his notion of the 'self-care system'. Indeed more recently Kalsched (2015) has gone further to link Fordham's work on defences of the self with contemporary work in the field of neuroscience, showing these defences true recalcitrance.

Fordham showed how 'Not-self objects then come to be felt as a danger or even a total threat to life and must be attacked, destroyed or their effect neutralised' (Fordham, 1976, p.91). At this point deintegration and reintegration are stopped in their tracks as relationship is banned and learning from experience cannot unfold. Inevitably an impoverished internal world is the result, as the self-integrate exiles itself from the affective world remaining in untouched isolation.

In the same year as the publication of 'Defences of the Self', on 4 October 1974 there is a truly amazing offer from Emily Abercrombie offering to provide a house for the child clinic; or alternatively to sell the property and use the proceeds to buy something more appropriate. The offer is declined on 30 October! It turns out from later correspondence that this woman might have been suffering from mental illness and the Society was well advised to avoid involvement with her.

In minutes from a committee meeting on 24 October 24 1974 at 8.30 pm a list of interested parties is presented including Mara Sidoli (who went on to train at the SAP and publish several papers available in the *Journal of Analytical Psychology*). There is a notice that an interview has been offered to James Astor by Kenneth Lambert (in analysis with Fordham). On 23 May 1974 Barry Proner is 'accepted by a unanimous vote'. Similarly, on 22 May 1975 James Astor is 'unanimously accepted for training'. In November 1975 there is a report from Mary Coghlan indicating that the trainees need training patients.

The familiar cry of the need for training patients is a constant theme throughout all psychoanalytic trainings – both child and adult - and is the most rehearsed refrain of all

trainees. As with so much of this story themes and narratives are familiar, and it recalls memories of my own experience of training: the anxieties about being accepted onto the training; the anxieties around gaining adequate clinical experience; the anxieties around qualification. This is also the time in the archive where the names I am reading about are no longer the names of mere historical figures but the names of those whom I interviewed, which adds a piquant emotion to the experience of trawling through. For me now these are ‘memoried’ documents, the skeletons around which the flesh of the story in the interviews wraps.

This reworking of theory and the introduction of the child training was not without consequences, and rather like the earliest mental states to which Fordham’s attention was turning, the dissent percolated over many years and was aired during a series of fraught discussions in the SAP between the years 1975 and 1977. (See copies of Mrs. Newton’s and Dr. Adler’s statements dated July 1975 appendix v, and kindly provided by Hugh Gee). Gerhard Adler and others had increasingly felt that Fordham was privileging contemporary views of psychoanalysis over a more purely Jungian approach – alluded to above in Fordham’s naming of his ‘defect’. Judith Hubback (2003) understood these differences as largely to do with conflict between those who had studied in Zurich with Jung and those of the next generation (p.199). However, it is also widely acknowledged that some of the difficulty lay in personal tensions between the towering intellects and ambition of two driven men (Gee, personal communication 2013). The outcome of these discussions was that Adler left the society in 1977 to form a splinter organisation, the Association of Jungian Analysts, which still exists today (Association of Jungian Analysts, 2016). It is important to note that we are now arriving at a time in the archive when the SAP was going through the devastating split within its ranks, which resulted in Gerhard Adler leaving the society to form his own independent training and group. There is a letter dated 24 February 1975 from Gerhard Adler to Camilla Bosanquet, who was then chair of the society stating his decision to form a ‘clearly defined and independent group’.

Infant Observation

The important discussions about setting up infant observations for those undertaking the child analytic training begin with potential interested parties inquiring: Barry Proner and

Mara Sidoli amongst them. On 2 October 1975 Michael Fordham presented 'Reflections on the Infant Observation Seminars' for the Child Analytic Training (CAT) Committee and this is where we see the first mention of Gianna Williams (or Mrs. Gianna Henry as she was known as then. For purposes of clarity I will refer to her henceforth as 'Williams'). The proposal mooted in the presentation was agreed by Camilla Bosanquet and the CAT committee. There is a further letter from Michael Fordham in his capacity as Director of Training dated 2 October 1975 to Gianna Williams explaining that the trainees will meet her on Tuesday 14 October at 8 am and these will be: Stewart Britten, James Astor, John Way and Barry Proner. Michael will be there to facilitate introductions. Here we see marked in the archive the beginnings of what proved to be such a significant experience for those involved; it also marks the beginning of Gianna Williams's profound influence and assistance in the child training, more about which will be discussed later.

In a report on the child training prepared by Michael Fordham for the SAP's AGM in November 1975 he is able to report that Lawrence Brown has completed his training and that Gianna Williams has started the infant observation seminars. There is also information pertaining to discussions with the Association of Child Psychotherapists about financial assistance for trainees, as it is recognised that the costs are proving prohibitive.

On 8 September 1976 Gianna Williams writes to Michael Fordham confirming her agreement to a second year of infant observation seminars. In November 1976 Michael Fordham's report as Director of Training tells us there are 6 trainees; and also informs us that Mary Coghlan is 'Children's Department Director of the C.G. Jung Clinic'; the infant observation seminars are proceeding well and Lawrence Brown is applying for membership of the ACP. He would be the first SAP child trained therapist to do so.

Further to the report in 1975 signalling the financial costs of the training there is interesting correspondence dated February 1977 pointing to the idiosyncratic position SAP trainees found themselves in with regard to funded training places (which trainees from the other trainings had more access to) and the demand on them to find gainful employment while training. The original letter exists with signatures from seven trainees including Jane Bunster, James Astor and Mara Sidoli.

This is a fascinating artefact: a letter written directly from the trainees describing precisely the plight of future trainees to come, and one that was never satisfactorily resolved. The ‘funding’ issue was a major factor cited in the decision to close the training, which I will come to in a later section and which of course is the ‘death’ in the title of this project. Money – in its incarnation as ‘funding’; or ‘membership subscriptions’; or ‘pay’; or ‘fees’ – is an over-determined and fraught area in the society’s life. Specifically with regard to the child training it links with the Society of Analytical Psychology’s position as never quite in the mainstream. As I alluded to in the introduction the SAP has suffered from the very things that have also made it attractive as a body providing training: it is small, personal, idiosyncratic; it has forged its own path and rejected homogeneity. However, there is a cost to this independence, and it is a literal one: organisations need money and ultimately unless only trainees with independent means pursue the training, the incumbent financial demand becomes too onerous. Perhaps the model was unsustainable from the off.

However, as yet the implications of this were yet to hit. At the 1977 AGM there are reports from Alan Edwards (chair of the training committee), Mary Coghlan (clinic director) and Michael Fordham (director of training) in their respective roles showing increased activity and a sense of expansion. In March 1977 Miranda Davies, who is by then a potential trainee, wants to offer a property. This is the second time the training has been generously offered a property although this time the matter is pursued a little further than last time. Mary Coghlan is charged with managing this matter, involving solicitors as she rightly concerns herself with Miranda’s financial protection. It is not at all clear from the archive how this issue unfurled but it is clear that the offer was not taken up.

In November 1978 the autumn term seminars are in full swing at 40 Montagu Square with Dorothy Davidson leading. Michael Fordham’s report to the AGM is the most full description of the training to date detailing the pre-training requirements and the four years’ worth of seminars.

In minutes of the CAT dated 19 July 1979 Miranda Davies is mentioned as having been offered a job at the Whittington Hospital as a supply teacher. However, in November

1979 Mary Coghlan tells us that referrals to the C.G. Jung clinic remain ‘surprisingly low’ with six mothers in treatment and fifteen children. James Astor is co-opted onto the Child Analytic Training Committee and there are ongoing negotiations with ACP and requirements: ‘James Astor is co-opted as Course tutor to assist Dr. Fordham with training matters and has now become our representative to the ACP’

There is a report from the CAT committee detailing the process of examination of the training by the ACP for full acceptance: representatives from the Hampstead Child Therapy Course and Tavistock training in child psychotherapy. The application is successful: ‘We were impressed by the high personal quality and experience of the trainees we met, by their enthusiasm for the training and their high morale’ writes the examiners.

This excursion into the archive has taken us from the genesis of Michael Fordham’s interest in children’s psychological and inner lives to the successful application of the Child Analytic Training for full acceptance into the Association of Child Psychotherapists. What follows is the drama that occurred subsequent to that which was something along the lines of blood feuds amongst the second generation. In the archive it is called ‘Rucksions’ (sic). Before launching into that story I will introduce those people whom I interviewed and who played such an important part in the story.

Chapter Four: The People

I want to acknowledge in the main body of this project the incredible generosity shown to me by my interviewees. Each went out of their way to answer my questions and to inform me in different ways. On receiving my initial email inquiring whether or not he would agree to be interviewed James Astor wrote:

Your project sounds very interesting. And there are enough of us alive still to give you our ‘unreliable’ memories. Lawrence Brown was the first trainee. Dorothy Davidson was a key person in the society during the setting up period. I was the first Organising Tutor and the person who made the links to the ACP. Mara Sidoli and Jane Bunster are no longer alive but during their lifetime they contributed a lot. And Ann Brown whose infant observation called ‘Noel’ was used by Michael Fordham is in Australia. For your project a key person and someone who knows Fordham’s work best of all is Elizabeth Urban. She also ran the rump of the training with Miranda Davies and has knowledge in detail of its demise. For some years Barry Proner was involved especially in the period when I removed myself from the training. To help set up the first infant observation seminars Gianna Williams came to Devonshire Place and took seminars with Michael Fordham. Ann presented Noel and we all saw Michael’s model unfolding before our eyes. Extraordinarily exciting times.

I was given permission by those whom I interviewed to use their names and details of the material they provided. I have decided to categorize them in sub groups and think about them in terms of their chronological and functional involvement. The categories I have designated them are descriptive ones, illustrating in a pithy way how I have come to see their roles in the developing history of the SAP child training. These are actors who had particular functions in the unfolding narrative; they also were subjects undergoing intimately personal experiences with each other, with themselves and with this organization that, like all organizations, came into being at a particular time to serve a purpose that was needed. Inevitably these categories are not final, and to some extent are conventions to manage the material. People overlap and inhabit more than one category. There are two major events within this history, ‘The Rupture’ and ‘The Ending’, and I will write about those separately drawing on the interviews and also some archive material. First, I simply introduce the people and tell some of their story –

in the words of James Astor their ‘unreliable memories’. I am letting their words tell their story as they remember it. (Biography of interviewees in appendix ix).

The Pioneers

The pioneers are that group of people who were there even before the beginning and who made possible the very existence of the training. Of course many, in fact most, have died, and these pioneers had different levels of influence and impact. In this ‘pioneer’ group I am not including those who actually trained although of course those first trainees had pioneering spirit – embarking on a new, almost experimental, training. In recognition of that I have categorised them as ‘pioneering consolidators/consolidating pioneers’: those who played out in practice all that the pioneers had planned and worked for. And of course some of those are still playing a role. Equally, one could argue that those ‘holding the mantle’ are pioneers in their own right: attempting to hold a position for which the external structures are no longer present and therefore striking into new territory. It is arguably a more intrepid position than that of these original actors whom I have designated the pioneers because the appetite for depth psychology is on the wane generally in our frenetic and quick fix culture. Nevertheless, it is how I am choosing to define those early creators and supporters.

Michael Fordham is of course the original pioneer, and what I have already documented describes his role as that. Obviously I was unable to interview him, as I was unable to interview others who pre-deceased this project. But I am not the first who has felt the weight of history and time passing, and the associated necessity of catching memories and testament before it is too late. In 1988 James Astor published an interview he had undertaken with Michael Fordham in the *Journal of Child Psychotherapy* (Astor, 1988), in which he covered similar territory to that attempted by me in the interviews I undertook. In this interview we hear in his own words what drew Michael Fordham to work with children. He speaks of realising his own analyst was not sure what to do with his (Michael’s) problematic childhood – his brother and sister were much older than him and his mother died when he was 15 years old - and this realisation coincided with his becoming more interested by what the children whom he was seeing at the London Child Guidance Clinic were doing. Before the Second World War he got his consultant

post in Nottingham where he determined to set up a psycho-dynamically oriented clinic. At this point he felt he had understood Klein's ideas about childhood development, which was in contrast to the prevailing Jungian approach of accessing children through their parents. He said that his Jungian colleagues thought he would soon abandon this interest but, as we know, he persisted and alongside his interest in actual children amplified his views on analysing the child within the adult. He eventually wrote a paper in 1965 titled 'The Importance of Analysing Childhood for the Assimilation of the Shadow' (*Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 10(1), pp.33-47), which he said 'went down quite well' when he read it first in Zurich. However, in this interview he describes what he sees as the Jungian difficulty with the child as a person in its own right, and also with the past actual child still active within the adult personality. He saw Jung as 'turning away from childhood' being more interested in the 'subjective and what he called interpretation of the subjective plane.' Michael Fordham 'felt that the child's inner world grew out of the child's relation to its mother and itself and this was initially bodily and sexual' (Astor, 1988 p.7).

In this interview he talks vividly of his experience with the evacuee and 'difficult' children he encountered at the hostel under his charge during the war: 'They were so alive. They did such extraordinary things. It was their psychotic bits that interested me. Devising ways of trying to get in touch with a proper schizophrenic child we had in one of the hostels I found quite fascinating. (p:9)' He mentions a 'very paranoid adolescent girl, very split' whose physical movements he analysed as well as a rather quiet girl for whom he offered mainly containment. It was in this way he self-taught and developed his clinical skills and theoretical ideas gradually discovering 'that children thought and felt the way Mrs. Klein described', yet also asserting it was his 'Jungian background [that] gave a value and meaning to the psychotic experiences. It is the ongoing dimension of Jung's work that is so important and that I value' (p.11).

Michael Fordham might have been the original pioneer but without the pioneering spirit of his loyal supporters and helpers he would have fallen at the first hurdle.

Dorothy Davidson

It is crucially important to acknowledge here the contribution that Dorothy Davidson made to the child training. As Dorothy Davidson died before my entanglement with the SAP I never met her and obviously I was unable to interview her. However, her name is oft cited both in the interviews and in the archive, and it is clear she is remembered not only fondly but also as a crucial cog in the machine that became and was the child training. She certainly deserves to be placed firmly in the category of ‘pioneer’.

Elizabeth Urban described her as a ‘diffident and shy woman’ but a ‘fine teacher’ who was one of Elizabeth’s training supervisors (Urban, personal communication).

It is no coincidence that it is she who wrote a paper, published in the *Journal of Child Psychotherapy* in 1996, presaging this project, entitled ‘The Jungian Child Analytic Training: An Historical Perspective’. She had already begun to capture the story of the child training in a previous paper published ten years earlier. (Davidson, 1986). One imagines that she too felt compelled to record in writing this movement within child psychotherapy, within which she had been so influential and which clearly commanded so much of her professional and personal life. I had not known of Davidson’s paper before I conceived of this project, so my first reading of these papers was after having decided to embark on it. She in fact offers us an excellent distillation of the social context, the history and the theoretical sweep which informed Michael Fordham and his colleagues in their setting up of both the SAP and its child training – all of which I have endeavoured to expand on in this project. However, what Davidson can offer in the 1996 paper is her own reflections of having been part of the original group in the late 1950s meeting to discuss their work with children and locating that retrospectively as ‘a prelude to what was to follow’ (Davidson, 1996, p.42). She writes about Fordham’s ‘dogged determination’ (p.43) to continue with the idea of creating a child training within the SAP despite internal opposition. Dorothy introduces us to other early pioneers: Laurie Hawkey (already a member of the ACP); Ruth Campbell (a child psychiatrist); Frieda Martin (also a child psychiatrist) and Mildred Marshak (a child psychologist). Dorothy herself worked with Donald Winnicott at Paddington Green Children’s Hospital. Unfortunately, due to illness and emigration Fordham soon lost Campbell, Martin and Hawkey. In the face of these losses he took the pragmatic approach of importing outside help in the form of Jess Guthrie (not a member of the

SAP but an ACP member who had had a Jungian analysis: this perhaps setting the precedent for his much later importing of Gianna Williams). The Children's Section met monthly for clinical discussion and Dorothy surmises that they were preparing themselves for their eventual roles as supervisors and trainers. Dorothy gives a lively account of 1974 onwards when the 'first trainee arrived' and describes the subsequent cohort as 'particularly lively, intelligent, talented and experienced, which made the whole pioneering enterprise very rewarding' (p.45). She mentions Dr. Mary Coghlan (whom I interviewed and will be writing about later), who was at that point Director of the Notre Dame Clinic in Notting Hill, in her capacity as clinic director for the children's section. Dorothy in turn offers her thanks to Gianna for the infant observation seminars and explains from her vantage point the impact these had on Fordham when in his late seventies he joined them.

Dorothy concludes:

Fordham was able to push back the frontiers of our understanding of Jung's original ideas while remaining loyal to him. In this way he greatly enlarged the theory of analytical psychology, giving it a wider dimension and putting it firmly on the international map. He freely acknowledged his debt to the psychoanalysts, especially to Klein, Winnicott, Clifford Scott, Bion and, latterly, to Meltzer and others. Fordham's single-minded work seemed to me to be the product of a burning wish to continue discovering more and more about the roots of identity and the process of individuation. It was, perhaps, as well, a fascination with the dynamic model of the deintegrating, reintegrating rhythm of the self that drove him on (p.47).

She ends by saying that she believes the existence of the child training, established in the face of opposition and difficulty, is a 'living memorial to Michael Fordham's creativity' (p.47). This makes poignant reading in the light of what was to come, that is the closing of the training, and being in the position of knowing that that 'living memorial' ultimately did not survive.

Mary Coghlan

As we have seen from the archive Dr. Mary Coghlan played a significant role in the early days of the child training. Trained as a child psychiatrist as well as a Jungian analyst she had been Michael Fordham's senior registrar in the 1970s. Mary's interview is of quite a different tone to the others, somewhat similar to Hugh Gee (to follow): less reverential; clearly seeing herself more on an equal footing; perhaps a more 'warts and all' approach to Michael Fordham than for example James, Barry and Elizabeth. However, she was another key figure and ally in the development of the child training playing an important role in providing clinical placements for trainees through her position as a child psychiatrist. Similar to Hugh Gee she was one of those adult trained analysts who took a serious interest in the development of the child analytic training in the SAP. Undoubtedly her own training as a child psychiatrist had impressed upon her the importance of infancy and childhood in the development of human personality, and also the importance of offering therapeutic intervention in a timely manner to children suffering from emotional and psychological disturbance.

It was at Paddington Green, where Winnicott had worked, that Mary was Fordham's senior registrar in a split post between there and St. Mary's Hospital's Children's Psychiatric Unit. She described an ambivalent relationship between Michael and her while she was his registrar in the health service, with him apparently 'not interested' in her. She was able to recall him only being 'interested in the patients he kept for himself'. She went on:

We shared a consulting room which was hell because one of Michael's kids was very disturbed and threw paint around like nobody's business and Michael didn't want anything changed as you can imagine I had to use this [the room] with all the other children. At that time as I say, I wasn't in training at all so I don't think that Michael was very interested in me and he wasn't interested in teaching an NHS senior reg. anyhow.

However, he was 'mollified' when she started the adult training and became her second supervisor while she was undertaking her analytic cases. He also became more interested in her when she undertook an infant observation. He was 'totally different

once you were doing what he was interested in'. Fordham then sent Lawrence Brown to Mary for supervision of his adolescent training case. She qualified and became a member of the SAP, and then was approached by Alan Edwards who asked her if she would take on the Directorship of the Children's Clinic. Mary felt suitably qualified and able to do so: she had experience in both adult and child psychiatry including at the Maudsley and Great Ormond Street, and was at that point Consultant Psychiatrist at the Notre Dame Clinic, which was a child and adolescent psychiatric clinic. However, she was extremely busy with her clinical posts and had doubts as to her capacity to manage everything. Nevertheless she took on the role explaining to me 'if you want something done ask someone busy!' She also thought that she would have the necessary contacts, through her NHS experience, to source child patients for the trainees.

Having taken it on she then executed that role for ten years. Her responsibility to the SAP was to find suitable patients for the child analytic trainees and discuss those with Michael Fordham. She described this as 'onerous' – 'one had to find time to try and listen to a patient and then to find time to discuss it with Michael and that was on top of whatever else I was doing'. Mary's expression in the interview was one of impatience with Michael – she used terms such as 'pie in the sky' to describe his vision of a child training with '100 trainees'. She complained that Michael was unrealistic generally; for example he wanted the potential child patients to be from relatively stable homes with parents who were together and married. As Mary said, 'these were not the kinds of children who ended up in Child Guidance Clinics'. She described the professional burden she felt in relation to the role, as she had to maintain medical responsibility for each patient. She said, 'I was jolly glad to be able to hand the job over after ten years'. She described other battles she had. For example, with the 'Director of Kensington and Chelsea' (presumably Director of Children's Services) she fought over a proposal for those children coming into care to be offered the opportunity to become training patients. She thought those children would be 'the perfect source' but neither the local authority nor the SAP agreed. Mary had an air of frustration and impatience when speaking about all of this. This seemed to come from a genuine sense of wasted opportunity and perhaps it was this sort of thing that also added to her relief to give the role up. Mary can remember also the preliminary discussions that were taking place about the trainees being able to see their training patients at their place of work, which is of course what eventually did happen.

Mary's interview was an interesting mixture of acutely remembered people and incidents, and clearly strongly held views about certain occurrences, with surprising vagueness about the development and unfolding of the child training. When she told me that Barry Proner had taken over from her as Clinic Director she refrained from linking this to the profound splits which were occurring at that point. She said, for example, 'I didn't know very much about it' when I questioned her on the question of the 'Rupture':

The committee then was now chaired in fact by my old analyst David Howell and David expressed his sorrow after one of the meetings he chaired, this question of James or Barry came up and for some reason Barry was appointed. I don't understand that at all I do know that David Howell was certainly rather sorry that they somehow or another lost James.

Interestingly the impatience and frustration fell away when we began to discuss Michael and her later relationship. Her tone changed when she stopped speaking of Michael as a colleague and more as a friend: 'we became better friends in the more recent years, well we were never not friends ... but we had this arguing relationship while I tried to find him the right kind of patient for him, and to persuade him that those we were sending him were the right kind of patient.'

As it happened Mary and her husband were with Michael at the end of his life, as they had visited him in the country and, being both doctors, realised he was extremely unwell and called an ambulance. He seemed to be recovering in hospital but died a couple of days later. It was she who rang James Astor to tell him that Michael had fallen ill. To be the person who relayed the message of Michael Fordham's death to James Astor exemplifies the centrality of Mary's position within this narrative. Perhaps more central than she herself took credit for.

One of the most striking things that Mary Coghlan said in this interview in response to my question about how she felt towards the SAP was: 'Well, I feel quite distant now but partly time and age ... I don't think if I was to start now I would have any Jungian analysis – I think I would gone to the psychoanalysts, but when I went in enough of our

people were involved with psychoanalysts for you not to feel that the Jungians were a small, separate group ... **I think a lot of people now would go with the psychoanalysts being the longer term safe bet'** (my emphasis). It is an extraordinary admission, and yet I wonder if not entirely prescient and pertinent.

Hugh Gee

Hugh Gee's presence within the SAP has been of incalculable value and he was described to me by Elizabeth Urban as 'a great friend to the child training' (personal communication). He has performed almost every role within the executive, and his lively, generous presence enthused us as trainees when he taught us seminars. He responded to my request to interview him with characteristic enthusiasm and hospitality, providing me with additional documents and crucial information. He welcomed me into his home from where he was still working, having moved out of London several years earlier. His encyclopaedic knowledge and insight into the mechanics of the SAP machine has been invaluable. Hugh also played to me a recording he has of Michael and Frieda Fordham talking to his training group in 1973, which continued to meet for clinical discussion after they all qualified. He provided me with a transcript of that discussion in which the Fordhams discuss the origins of the SAP. In these small ways Hugh has become responsible for recording the history of the SAP; for example he became aware at some point as members died they were removed from the membership list and eventually all trace of them seemed to disappear. He suggested to the Office that a list should be kept and maintained: 'I am hoping that the office still keeps this going because they certainly started it.' He was full of anecdotes, personalising the history of this organisation in a vivid, deeply memoried way. For example recounting a celebration in honour of Michael Fordham's 70th birthday, which took place at London Zoo, Regents Park where Michael demurred the praise forthcoming from the speeches in his characteristic contrary manner. He surprised me by very soon into the interview explaining how his desire to do the child training had 'completely evaporated' on having his own children. And within seconds of that stating, 'One of the reasons why I think the SAP child training packed up was because we were demanding that the trainees analysed a mother as well as the children.' His purview of the history and context was clear to me: he was on the Child Training Committee and was a trainee on the adult training before the child training had even been started.

Hugh had studied psychology at Oxford from 1960-1963 and subsequently trained as a psychiatric social worker at the London School of Economics in 1964 where he undertook seminars with Donald Winnicott for one year, ‘because that was part of the mental health course that you had to do to become a psychiatric social worker It is amazing, yes those days have gone well and truly.’ Having become interested in analytic thought he attended the meetings of the Medical Section of the British Psychological Society describing them as a forum where both Freudians and Jungians met freely to ‘exchange ideas’. Hugh had worked in therapeutic communities as a psychiatric social worker and found out about the SAP through a colleague with whom he discussed training and his desire to train somewhere where he would be able to read everything, and not be restricted from reading Jung. Hugh believes that the SAP was truly an eclectic training. Hugh’s view is that there is ‘nothing that Klein says that Jung hadn’t already said ... I mean her theory of projective identification was thirty years after Jung had talked about unconscious identity which you know everybody got from participation mystique’¹. Hugh shared the view that Michael’s unique contribution was to apply these concepts to early childhood, and he contended that Jung was grateful to Michael for that.

After completing his training as an adult analyst at the SAP Hugh joined its child analytic committee as a result of his interest in child mental health. After a series of chairs had been appointed and left in rapid succession he received a message on his answer phone from Michael Fordham saying that he had decided that Hugh should be chair:

If you want somebody to join a committee you know you flatter them – you’re the right person, you’ve got all the qualities It’s a way of trying to seduce people and manipulate them into doing what you want and Michael was no exception to doing this ..and this message was Michael seducing me.

1. ‘Participation mystique’ is a term Jung borrowed from the ethnologist Lucien Levy-Bruhl which Levy-Bruhl used to denote a relationship with an object (a thing) in which the subject cannot distinguish himself from this thing. Jung used the term alongside the term ‘unconscious identity’ from 1912 onwards to describe relations between people in which the subject, or a part of him, attains an influence over the other, or vice-versa. The suggestion by Hugh Gee here is that Jung described projective identification, in which a part of the personality is projected into the object, and the object is then experienced as if it were the projected content, decades before Melanie Klein’s first description of it in 1946. For expansion of this see appendix x.

Hugh thought that Michael saw him as somebody ‘amenable, more agreeable’ as he had no ‘conflict with Michael’ and had also successfully navigated the finding, buying and refurbishment of 3 Daleham Gardens. In fact a propos this refurbishment Hugh was responsible for ensuring that one of the consulting rooms was suitably equipped for child psychotherapy to take place in; details such as not only soundproofing but also waterproofing and having a slightly sloping camber, flow control on the taps and a collapsible couch to maximise play space. So Hugh was involved in a very important micro level of organisation, which really I would never have appreciated had I not undertaken this interview.

Hugh’s view of the child training was that there was a ‘very positive attitude towards it’, and he saw it as being ‘probably the best of the trainings because it handled this bit of not being over-identified with the Child’ by expecting the child trainees to analyse a mother as well. Although of course he had also cited that as one of the contributing factors to the training’s eventual demise. In addition Hugh bemoaned the various splits, which occurred both within the SAP but also within other psychoanalytic organisations. He regretted Gerhard Adler leaving the SAP, believing that he had a ‘valid point of view, the only problem was that he put it in oppositional terms’. Hugh’s suggestion is that these splits occur mainly around personality in the guise of theoretical or ideological difference: ‘the preoccupation with the Numinous and the archetypes, why treat them that as being different to the transference? I mean it is nonsense. In child development he [Gerhard] acknowledged the value of it but again it was his personality in relation to Michael I think, and that was the essence of it [the split]’.

Hugh’s position was that the splits were regrettable not only because they eroded structures and diminished resources within the organisation, but because they were unnecessary. He believes that the differing theoretical and clinical positions could have been profitably housed within one society. He is somebody well able to hold the tension of opposing views and integrate different influences within himself and his work. The trajectory of his career took him from Winnicott, to Jung via Michael Fordham, and perhaps because of the internal and external logic this provided for him Hugh saw an equally logical and natural arc from Jung, to Michael Fordham and from Michael Fordham into the child training.

In responding to my questions about the end of the child training, Hugh said that by then he was not involved. He described it as a 'slow death, really certainly a sad one but understandable if you can't get the trainees then you can't run the training.' He described the tension in maintaining a training along with the qualities that have made it original yet in a climate of diminishing interest. At that point he was referring to the principle of the child trainees analyzing a mother as part of their training, which as explained previously was not a requirement of the ACP and which was felt to be an increasingly onerous demand by the trainees. However, he also acknowledged a wider societal shift with the closing of the Anna Freud Centre training shortly after in addition to some strongly felt personal anger:

Well there were just not enough trainees around and it's interesting really as to why – well no it isn't we know bloody well why – adults are happy to spend money on themselves – they're not happy to spend money on their children I mean it's as simple as that – I'm afraid that's the truth of it and children by and large are at the bottom of the pecking order – all the services – this is why Child Guidance packed up – again, children don't vote so they have no political value so that it's one of those sad realities that one has to come round to that children are of course the future but this is a longsighted view and most people are orientated to what's going to happen at the next election so to speak.

It was abundantly clear from the power of this statement, and throughout the interview, that Hugh was and always has been a passionate advocate of both the actual child and also the child in the adult who presents him or herself in the consulting room. This he saw as Michael Fordham's major contribution to the SAP:

I mean in volume 16 when he was talking about psychotherapy I mean it's all absolutely on the ball as far as we are concerned and, as I say, I think his most valuable concept was the unconscious identity which he recognises as not being his originally, but it was he that saw the relevance of it and of course the great value of it was that, unlike Klein, he didn't treat it as pathology and I think that unconscious identity is what's going on between mother and baby – the so-called bonding attachment is based on unconscious identity i.e. where there is a difficulty in saying who is who – there needs to be that degree of being enmeshed and similarly, if I have a supervisee and I can see is in a state of unconscious identity, I immediately

say that this is such an asset it means that you are capable of getting involved with this person so that – and yes you are needing to differentiate out of it but I'm glad you got into it and that's the nature of the business that we are in so that I think that that is probably one of Jung's most important concepts and I've been going on about that for years.

Labels are inherently problematic and inevitably arbitrary but these preceding figures, whom I have designated 'Pioneers' for differing reasons perhaps, are drawn together by dint of sheer history and chronology. Michael Fordham's position as a pioneer in this context is, in my opinion, not problematic as I am arguing throughout not only for the originality of his thinking but a trailblazing ambition, which had actual and structural results. Dorothy accompanied him on this journey in a manner redolent of her commitment to the analytic project in general and characterised by her integrity. Hugh and Mary played critical roles in supporting and enabling the clinical infrastructure of the endeavour.

The Consolidating Pioneers / Pioneering Consolidators

This group of 'Consolidators' are pioneering in their own right, which is clear by their stories. These are the first group of trainees who took their chances with this new and untried endeavour. They were de facto consolidators by being the first trainees to read the syllabus, see the patients, receive the supervision and become qualified through this untested, innovative training. The original consolidator, the first trainee Lawrence Brown, did not wish to be interviewed for the project but I was lucky to speak to both Barry Proner and James Astor, whom were in the second and third cohorts respectively.

Barry Proner

Barry Proner, having originally trained as a psychiatrist in America, described how in the library at Maclean Hospital around 1970 he came across the *Journal of Analytical Psychology* advertising a 'Combined Adult and Child Analytic Training at The Society of Analytical Psychology, London, England' under the auspices of Dr. Michael Fordham. As his then girlfriend intended to train at the Tavistock they both decided to travel together to London to investigate the feasibility of pursuing these endeavours.

Barry, as so many others did, went to meet Michael Fordham at St. Catherine's Precinct overlooking Regents Park who informed him he had an analyst in mind for him, Kenneth Lambert. Meanwhile Barry's girlfriend was having meetings with Frances Tustin at the Tavistock to discuss her training at the Tavistock. A plan was formed to return to London in the summer of 1972 to begin the process of arduous training. Barry started his analysis at the beginning of 1973 and the actual training at the end of 1974. He explained how he was in the second cohort behind Lawrence Brown, and one cohort in front of James Astor. It consisted mainly of tutorials with Michael Fordham: 'it was very, very interesting – he was sometimes hard to follow because he was a bit verbose or circumlocutious, and for me, a yank who had just come over here, it was almost a different language and I had to sort of learn to go with the flow and finally understand what people were saying.'

Barry was clearly encountering a culture difference in the way concepts – both theoretical and clinical – were discussed but he described witnessing Michael Fordham developing his own ideas 'very well integrated with the psychoanalytic theory – there wasn't any sense of a separation or division'. He described him as being 'fluent' in the different languages of psychoanalysis. Barry did not experience an especially distinct Jungian 'vernacular' to Fordham's teaching although he felt it was implicit in his work on integrating the self and archetypes into the psychoanalytic discourse. Barry, similar to so many others, hails the infant observation seminars with Gianna Williams as a key learning experience in the training. This was where Fordham would describe in detail his ideas about de-integration and re-integration and distinguishing these from projective identification; the self and actions of the self; and applying his theories directly to what was observed in these infants.

In spite of Fordham being heavily influenced by Kleinian theory it is testament to a certain mischievousness in him that, according to an anecdote Barry related, when invited to the Institute of Psychoanalysis to give a lecture in the early 1970s he chose to 'give clinical material from a very Jungian point of view ... you know, he always liked to stoke up a little bit of controversy!' Similarly Barry suggested that Fordham 'drummed up' a further controversy by going into 'battle with certain analysts particularly Kate Newton and Joe Redfearn over the issue of mother/infant fusion as he called it, which he said was a myth – there was no such thing – it did not exist.' Barry

developed this by saying that he was not sure that anybody had ever suggested that it really did exist but that this was a facet of Fordham's personality: to stoke up controversy in a rather perverse fashion. Although Fordham did have a genuine argument with Neumann's ideas of a fusion between mother and baby, a sympathy with which he attributed to Kate Newton and Joe Redfearn not necessarily entirely accurately. Barry used this anecdote to illustrate the ferocity with which Fordham would counter critics who did not adhere to what he considered the empirical findings of infant observation work. This is also a good example of Fordham's attempts to distance himself from what he would have viewed as the more nebulous and unhelpful Jungian notions of 'fusion' and 'oneness'; but in this conviction he could at times be insensitive and careless with others' personal feelings. Barry suggested that Kate Newton was 'very, very hurt by Michael taking such a position against her and she felt misunderstood because she worshipped Fordham.'

Barry himself worked at an NHS clinic at Charing Cross Hospital where he was allowed to see his training patients whom had been assessed at the C.G. Jung Clinic. He was supervised by Fordham and Jess Guthrie: 'who was not an SAP analyst, he simply wanted her to be one of the supervisors so he declared her to be one of the supervisors!' Barry was also in supervision for his adult training patients with Frieda Fordham and Fred Plaut. During our interview we discussed how he would identify himself as Jungian and distinguish himself from psychoanalysis. Barry suggested that at heart it is related inextricably to the concept of the Self as being an 'overriding governing system that somehow guides development'. He also considers the work of Wilfrid Bion as a bridge between the Kleinian and Jungian traditions, as 'he allowed for the unknown and ... the capacity for growth and development'. However, Barry understood Fordham to be concerned by what he considered a too facilitating approach at the SAP, which neglected more destructive elements in a patient, and what Fordham 'might have called fostering the positive transference'. Barry spoke of his wish that there could be more open discussion of difference at the SAP, rather like the controversial discussions of the Institute. However, what Barry holds on to is his original motivation for coming to train at the SAP which was the advert promising 'integration of Jung's ideas and psychoanalytic ideas and I thought that could be very interesting'.

Barry described a relatively small world of trainees in London from all the trainings meeting each other at the ACP conferences, and of course he was in the interesting position of being married to somebody undertaking the training at the Tavistock simultaneously.

Barry was obviously involved with the ‘rupture’ that occurred when Fordham chose to retire as director of the training and there was a massive disruption with regards to the heritage and lineage (this is a substantial part of the history of the training covered herein on page 97). He chose not to speak about that on the record while of course others have. So, that story will need to be told without his contribution. Nevertheless, in terms of the ultimate disruption, the actual ending of the training Barry expressed huge regret. He felt that Michael Fordham created the training despite envious attacks and resistance from the adult analysts within the SAP. And he speculated that as well as all the practical and external challenges there might not have been enough commitment from the wider SAP to save it. His view is that the child training is not alive in any form at the SAP and to some extent he appeared to feel that this is exemplified in the fact that infant observation is not obligatory for adult analytic trainees. This is something he repeatedly pushed for but it has never been taken up, it remains voluntary which he considers anomalous.

James Astor

As I have already said James Astor is a key person in this story, making an immeasurable contribution to the SAP and in disseminating Michael Fordham’s work. His urbane yet compassionate presence made a huge impression on me during my training, along with his total command of theory and its clinical application. Along with Elizabeth Urban he has been key in locating Michael Fordham’s clinical understanding in the wider psychoanalytic canon. He also maintained a close, personal relationship with Fordham until his death. When I went to his magnificent consulting room in Ladbrooke Grove, lined with books, the intellectual endeavour leaking from every corner, James first played me an interview which he had recently recorded with Warren Colman, a supervising analyst and former chair of the SAP. This was part of a project undertaken by the British Library to record the experiences of influential child psychotherapists a full list of which I have appended (appendix ii). After listening to

that I then was able to ask him more specific questions about his involvement in the child training.

James described a troubled adolescence that led him to seek psychological help. He was referred to Ruth Campbell and ended up having ‘12 years of analysis of which 7 were 5 times a week analysis until she died in 1974’. This experience had a profound impact on him: ‘As my analysis deepened it became .. I became aware that the most meaningful thing for me was to pursue this and to train as an analyst, and that’s what I did’. At the time he was working in television as a reporter for a programme called *Man Alive* which was a programme interested in social issues, and this added to his compelling sense of wanting to pursue analytic training. After gaining experience at Great Ormond Street Hospital and doing a number of courses at the Tavistock Centre, James joined the third cohort of trainees, after Lawrence Brown and Barry Proner’s cohort.

‘My reflection was that I had done the child analytical training because I thought it was the best training available at that time and that I needed to understand actual children before I could understand the child inside the adult.’ James became a member of the SAP in 1978, a professional member in 1982 and a training analyst in 1988, rising through the hierarchy of the Society denoting his seniority and experience. He trained both as a child and an adult analyst through the SAP, applying for the adult training part way through the child training.

As soon as he finished the child training in 1978 he became course tutor while Michael was the director. James was specifically charged with liaising with the Association of Child Psychotherapists, with whom it was recognised it was key to have a good relationship in order for the SAP training be ‘recognised as a proper training so that people would be able to work in the National Health Service, so I immediately got involved in that ... from 1979 to 1985 and that was when Michael Fordham retired.’

He reminisced about the infant observation seminars run by Gianna Williams:

[It was] thrilling and Gianna Williams had had a Jungian background before she became a Kleinian and she was very familiar with our world, which helped but it

also helped that you got somebody operating from a different theory ... who is also part of that process of discovery.

We really did feel as if we were watching something unfold and that was what made it so exciting and so interesting. Fordham was thrilled by it.

James also spoke about the link with Donald Meltzer. James joined an ACP seminar in the late 1970s run by Alberto Hahn (a prominent exponent of Meltzer's ideas, who was still teaching when I undertook the child training at the Tavistock 2009 – 2013). Subsequently he joined a seminar run by Meltzer at his house in Highgate, where he 'was revising in public his books to us particularly *Sexual States of Mind*'. James had extraordinary recollections of Meltzer – of going to visit him in Oxford for many years of supervision: 'I learned a great deal about how to manage the very powerful early embodied affective life of patients as they presented in analysis and I learned a lot about really what he wrote about in the *Psychoanalytical Process*'. This was a further link to Meltzer, which I spoke to James about – my having had my second analysis with a training analyst analysed by Meltzer himself.

James spoke about something he noticed about the individuals who trained early on at the SAP, that they either died untimely deaths or did not really establish themselves fully as child psychotherapists within the NHS. He was unable to offer any amplification or explanation although he cited Elizabeth and Miranda as exceptions. He noted, 'It was a disappointing feature of our training'. He also spoke about the issue of cost and the 'ambivalent relationship that the Society had to the trainees led to its eventual demise'. It was also clear that James did not want to speak much about that.

James spoke very powerfully of his experience of being caught up in the split, which occurred within the child training and which, as I have explained above, I will speak about in more depth later on in the section 'Rupture'.

By coining the term 'pioneering consolidators' I am attempting to emphasise the sheer adventurousness of these first trainees in throwing their lot in with such an untried and untested training. What is also illustrated by the term is how by taking that risk they further cemented the training into its structure and into its position as a viable child

psychotherapy training recognised externally as valid and respectable. These consolidators were essential in building the momentum for consolidation to take place.

The Outside Supporter

With such sparse numbers of suitably qualified and able people available within the society Michael Fordham rightfully recognised the need for outside help. His own analytic life had been characterised by drawing on different traditions and people at different times when either his external world (his clinical work) or his internal world (his psychological state) demanded. He had no qualms about seeking out new experiences embodied by innovative and brilliant clinicians.

Gianna Williams

Gianna Williams has been, and continues to be, a key figure in the theory and practice of British child and adolescent psychoanalytic psychotherapy. Her breathtaking virtuosity is exemplified in her work on eating disorders where she identified a particular defence system she recognised as a ‘no-entry’ system (Williams, 1997). Gianna Williams holds a really fascinating position within the child training as somebody who was there at the beginning and at the end. As has been described Michael Fordham sought help from the Tavistock Clinic in order to institute infant observation seminars for the SAP child trainees. Infant Observation was a central, critical plank of child psychotherapy training and remains so today: the regular, weekly, repeated observation of a newly born infant during the first two years of its life and the ensuing relationship between infant and mother (Miller et al, 1989).

Gianna spans an incredible time span as she first went to Zurich in 1959, when Jung was still alive. She then started with the ‘Rome Course’ led by Isca Wittenburg in 1976. She came to the UK in 1961 and ‘fell in love with [her] first husband. Gianna’s interest was caught by the idea of the transference which she did not feel was sufficiently taken into account by classical Jungians at that time. She started with the training at the Institute of Child Psychology but it ‘did not meet [her] expectations’ so she moved to the Tavistock. She had already started an analysis with Donald Meltzer. As she had become increasingly involved with the Tavistock, when Michael Fordham asked Martha

Harris for an infant observation seminar leader Martha suggested Gianna. She did this from 1975 until the mid-1980s and therefore saw many cohorts through their training. The very first cohort had already been taking seminars at the Tavistock so there was a strong link between these two organisations.

Gianna can remember Michael's ideas coming to the fore during these observation sessions, which he joined: 'He was so pleased to see these very early states being talked about and being observed. He had not actually done an infant observation.' Gianna can remember very clearly the babies that were discussed: Miranda's baby was hospitalized; James's baby 'Daniel' aroused much anxiety in everybody as the mother was literally not holding her carefully enough: she would have him lying unsupported on her lap while leaning over him to type at a type-writer.

Gianna also acted as a further link between Donald Meltzer and the SAP as, as I have mentioned above, she was analysed by him. Both Michael and James Astor consulted with Meltzer for many years about their clinical work.

Gianna was aware of the ruction that occurred when Barry Proner defied Michael's wishes that James Astor take over as director of training after Michael's resignation. 'I know that Michael was very hurt by what happened, very. Fortunately he did not see the end of the training. It was very much his child, and his heart was so much in it'.

Gianna stopped leading the infant observation seminar in 1981, but after a hiatus of nineteen years she returned in 2000. She was invited by Elizabeth Urban and Miranda Davies to help them navigate the training of the last four trainees who were at the very early stage of their trainings when Jane Bunster died. Gianna explained that she did not in any way adopt a different language when leading these SAP seminars: 'it was all part of my journey, an extension'.

Elizabeth Urban and Miranda Davies have always acknowledged the central importance of Gianna to their experience of the training, both as students and then latterly as collaborators. Testament to this, and perhaps heralding her return to the training, is a paper that was published in the ACP in 1996 by Miranda and Elizabeth the main body of which is an interview between them and Gianna, which took place in 1995, precisely

asking her to reminisce about her time leading that first set of seminars (Davies and Urban, 1996). The paper explains in more detail the structure of these seminars, which changed somewhat after Michael joined them as a 'guest observer'. As the first observational seminar inspired theoretical discussions emerging out of the data a second seminar was set up to protect the purely observational focus of the first. These two seminars became known as the 'marathon'. 'In the marathons Fordham discussed with seminar members ideas that were linked to his interests and to his growing model of development. Because the seminar was led by a Kleinian, there were also fruitful discussions comparing and contrasting Jungian and psychoanalytic concepts. Overall, the seminars were a productive workshop out of which ideas and thought still develop' (p.50).

In this interview, which is also a shared recollection and discussion about past times, Miranda and Elizabeth speak openly about their ambivalence when Michael Fordham began to attend the seminars. There was an anxiety that an already established group 'work group' (Bion, 1961, p.173) would be interrupted and disrupted in some way by his 'charismatic presence'. This did not seem to last and in fact Michael Fordham comes across remembered as somebody willing and able to learn, and these seminars appear to have been a ferment of developing theoretical activity. Gianna is quoted:

A comparatively short time after Michael joined the seminar, we began to discuss the difference in the phenomenology between splitting and deintegration. I think it became clear, as we were going along, that the concept of deintegration formulated by Michael is very different from that of splitting, and it is a very useful concept. It refers to a much gentler process where feelers remain attached and there is no severance. I think there is a difference between this and splitting, because splitting does involve a severance. Deintegration doesn't. What we discussed, though, was whether splitting, as Michael felt, always means damaging, and I could not agree with it (Davies and Urban, 1996, p.55).

The Absent Presence

Jane Bunster:

In all stories there are ghosts and shadows. Their presence far from occluded by time can be inextricable to the story and in their absence they loom large. It has been difficult to know how to handle the presence/absence of Jane Bunster. She spanned many years of the training and would have occupied different categories had she lived. As it is she falls into the category nobody would wish to inhabit, that category unwittingly identified by James Astor as the ones who have died, the ones that did not survive which he saw as something uncannily characteristic of the SAP child training. I can remember starting the adult training with that final group of child trainees themselves in shock from what was clearly her unexpected and untimely death. I have the faintest of memories of her and yet she exists so firmly in this story – rather like the ghostly figure in a negative of a photo: there but not. In retrospect it is clear that her death was the harbinger of the death of the training, although at the time that was not apparent. It nevertheless catapulted the endeavour into an entirely new ontological space, from which it did not recover. The trainees felt stranded, without either anchor or harbour, in a way to which as trainees on the adult stream we could not relate. In fact, I can remember starkly my utter ignorance of the child training: what it involved, even really that it existed at all. This is in itself so telling: how the child training had become more and more peripheral within the SAP, but also how the whole notion of NHS training was neither widely known about nor understood in the society. This indicates the society's increasing retreat, at that time, into a somewhat myopic, internal state at a time when the need for the child trainees was a turning out to public provision and the wider discourse.

Jane died in June 1999 and her funeral was held on 25 June. Two obituaries appeared in the subsequent edition of the *Journal of Analytical Psychology* (44(4), October 1999), one by Barry Proner and the other by Miranda Davies. I am drawing on these to understand something of Jane's impact and influence on the training.

Barry speaks of the universal shock on learning of her death: 'Our shock and disbelief were really on account of how, in her unassuming way, Jane features so largely in many

of our lives and we were really not prepared to be without her' (Proner, 1999, p: 573). He goes on to describe her as the 'mainstay' of the Jungian Child Analytic Training, and how over the final 15 years of her life (so presumably from 1984 until 1999) she had devoted 'endless hours' to the teaching and managing of the child training. This chimes with a distinct memory of one of the trainees telling me at the time that having done her infant observation with Jane she felt like 'her baby' (personal communication), that Jane had brought her to the point of being able to start the training, and now she was without her mother and felt completely lost and abandoned. It is understandable how her death brought about the crisis it did: in her 'unassuming' way she was not just the 'mainstay' of the training but rather the training itself. This in spite of her being experienced as shy, humble, intensely private yet apparently brimming with passions for music, for travel and most of all for the child training.

Miranda describes meeting her first at the infant observation seminars led by Gianna Williams in 1977. She was struck by the commitment Jane showed to concentrating on the internal world of the child over external circumstances. They worked together at Notre Dame Clinic where Mary Coghlan was consultant, and Dorothy Davidson was her supervisor. Dorothy was struck by the depth of Jane's capacity to work with truly disturbed patients, but felt that Jane 'paid the price in loneliness' (Davidson, 1999, p.576). Both Barry and Miranda cite Jane's prodigious hard work on behalf of the child training, bearing increasing responsibilities for its smooth running.

We thought of her as a mother hen with her small brood, in that she took great trouble over their personal welfare, did much of the teaching, visited the clinics where they training posts, and was largely responsible for making Child Analytic Training Fund bursaries available. ... For some years she served as chair of the Child Analytical Training Committee and continued after her term to represent the training at many other committee meetings of the SAP, as well as attending the relevant sub-committee meetings of the ACP. (p.577).

It is hardly surprising that the training and those involved were reeling in the aftermath of her death, which Miranda concludes was 'an inexpressible loss for her family and friends, as well as for the SAP training in child analysis' (p. 577).

Those near the beginning/Those near the end

Where and how to place and categorise Miranda Davies and Elizabeth Urban has exercised me greatly: they transcend categorisation in a way that determinedly illustrates both their enduring importance within this story and the instrumental roles they have played. Very much individuals they inevitably are coupled in the narrative because of their key joint role during the end of the training. From being early trainees they both maintained key positions within the SAP culminating in their specific roles as joint co-consultants to the child training for the cohort which eventually became the final one; finding themselves therefore in the unanticipated position of overseeing the close of the training. A legacy that neither would have foreseen, nor desired, for themselves.

Miranda Davies

I interviewed Miranda at her home in the Gloucestershire countryside where she appeared both utterly engaged in the telling of the history and her experience with the child training, while at the same time clearly distanced and removed from it now. Miranda was a dedicated and fulsome member of the SAP while active but in retirement chose to make a clear boundary between herself and her involvement with the society.

Miranda undertook the training from 1979–1984, although she had taken part in the infant observation with Gianna Williams from 1977. However, as she explained to me, she had encountered Michael Fordham earlier due to her offer to help purchase a building for the SAP. She said that marked the beginning of her ‘curious relationship with Michael’. Miranda had come across Jung when her father, the Canadian writer Robertson Davies, had given her a book introducing Jungian ideas when she was seventeen years old and when she arrived in England in 1968 she pursued the idea of undertaking an analysis. It was through her analysis that she found out about the infant observation seminars. During her training Miranda did her clinical work at a child guidance clinic in Newham, East London and was supervised by Dorothy Davidson. However, she was in effect alone throughout her training with no fellow trainees alongside her. Miranda did have an initial cohort of adult analytic trainees for her first year but because of the ‘siphoning off into a different field’ she then found herself

alone. She would meet with Michael weekly and he taught her theory. But in typical idiosyncratic fashion he set her essays that he would mark and return to her: 'I spent the entire weekend writing these papers – it was really gruelling and the thing that I found most difficult was that I had no peers so I had no idea how you talked to the children.' Miranda was supervised by Michael Fordham, Dorothy Davidson and James Astor. She also attended James's and Barry's consulting rooms for individual seminars. This siphoning off, as she described it, seemed to be very much a live issue, with the child training itself 'the instigation of the divide' between the archetypal school and those more interested in early infant development. As noted earlier Michael Fordham was staking a claim for the infantile through the child training.

Miranda talked of her 'curious' relationship with Fordham and it was clear from the emotionality expressed during the interview that this was a complicated and fraught relationship, the meaning and impact of which she had not fully resolved. She found him 'enigmatic; detached; awkward; inhibited; difficult to reach'. However, she was nevertheless profoundly influenced by his work such that she became one of the ambassadors for his approach both to the wider Jungian world but also to the wider child psychotherapy world through her writings and teachings. Miranda described a much warmer and collegial relationship with other child psychotherapists from the ACP than with the international Jungian analysts who were working with children along a more archetypal Jungian approach. In fact, it seemed rather that the Jungian world was puzzled by Michael Fordham's approach, which was of course, as I have shown, inextricably linked to what we might label the British developmental school. Miranda described attending an international congress of Jungian organisations and being 'appalled by the Jungian failure to take on deep work in the transference let alone studying infants and the infantile transference – this was a split within the SAP'. And linked to this Miranda was particularly influenced by Donald Meltzer attending seminars at his house along with Barry Proner, James Astor and other child psychotherapists trained at the Tavistock; this sort of activity no doubt inspiring Fred Plaut to coin the term 'Klungians' to describe them.

However Miranda told me, 'I never felt I was a Kleinian or anything like that, it was in the context basically of Jung and his concept of the psyche as a far greater identity than Freud's conscious/unconscious.' She drew on Allan Schore, Margaret Wilkinson and

Jean Knox identifying herself more with ‘the neuro-science stream’ explaining her penchant for that: ‘I am [a] much more practical person – how does this little machine work?’

After the training post at Newham, Miranda moved to Notre Dame where Mary Coghlan was consultant child psychiatrist where she was able to consolidate her experience of multi-disciplinary team-work and worked hard to integrate herself into this way of working.

After the death of Jane Bunster, Miranda and Elizabeth were co-opted to ‘keep control’ of the training. There was an advert placed for the paid post of director of training but Elizabeth and Miranda applied for it as a job share, demonstrating how they could ‘split the responsibility... it would have been a killer job for anyone on their own.’ She told me their ‘temperaments and skills [were] so very different’. So, Elizabeth was charged with drawing up and delivering a syllabus; while Miranda worked on liaising with the ACP training committee and the consortium within the NHS from which the training posts were administered. This involved liaising with the service supervisors within the NHS child and adolescent mental health teams in which trainees were undertaking their training posts, and also being the SAP representative within the wider child psychotherapy profession. Therefore Elizabeth and Miranda worked on discrete tasks but they could ‘come together on all kinds of issues particularly how to relate to the Child Analytic Training Committee, and how to negotiate with them and get changes and ideas approved and so forth.’ Miranda explained to me that Elizabeth and she were not directors of the child training, that the term ‘consultant’ was deliberate as this made it clear that their role was consulting to the training committee, which set up a fraught and complex relationship: the tension between them as paid staff in a position of deference to the committee which was staffed by unpaid volunteers. Interestingly Elizabeth and Miranda being paid for their time, skills and experience was a harbinger of massive structural change that the whole of the SAP undertook subsequently, with a recognition that the era of clinicians being able to contribute time and energy for no monetary reward was coming to an end. However, they were the unwitting frontrunners of this and at that time this inevitably led to discomfort. Another discomfort and tension was in trying to convey to the committee the reality of the National Health Service and the demands placed on child psychotherapy trainees, and the inevitable incompatibility

with some of the demands coming from the SAP. The most contentious of this, as highlighted previously, was the demand that child trainees analysed a mother in addition to all the other arduous requirements set by the ACP. Miranda described to me straddling a very difficult interface between the SAP and the ACP, with her and Elizabeth finding themselves in the invidious position of translating two different cultures to each other: the pragmatic and clinical demands of the NHS as mediated through the ACP and the analytic tradition of the SAP. Eventually practicality won and the demand to analyse a mother was abandoned for that last cohort.

Miranda was on various committees within the SAP including the journal committee and the child analytic training committee, and as mentioned above her specific role was co-consultant in negotiating the relationship of the SAP child training with the rest of the profession, as well as supervising and assisting the trainees. However, it was also under Elizabeth and Miranda's watch that the decision to close the training was taken. She described how they had 'discussed it endlessly with the trainees ... and finally we got an outside consultant from the Tavi[stock], who was very, very good to discuss the group dynamics of the whole question of the continuation of the training.' 'This was the final touch because an outside arbitrator could see the logic.. so finally it was concluded that there was absolutely no practical way [for it to continue]'.

Elizabeth Urban

Elizabeth is an American and came to England in 1968 with her then husband. Feeling very isolated, she managed to get a teaching job at the American School where she stayed for seven years. Through a woman she met at the school she became interested in Jung and eventually took a Master's degree in social work, went into analysis and started infant observation with Gianna Williams in 1978: 'That's where I met Miranda ... and I just really threw myself into it'. Like others Elizabeth described to me in vivid detail her recollection of the 'marathon seminars' when Michael Fordham joined, with James and Barry in attendance: 'It was a treat ... one felt like being part of some sort of history – something new and important was happening.' Elizabeth finished her infant observation in 1980 and applied for the child training but was turned down with her rheumatoid arthritis being the cited reason. This had not crossed her mind and was 'a crushing blow, it really threw myself back on myself'. Forcing Elizabeth to re-examine

herself and her ambitions the rejection had a powerful effect: ‘the analysis had touched in me something that was bringing me back to life’. Her desire to work with children never left her and by 1983 she had decided to reapply. This time she was accepted and Michael Fordham was her supervisor throughout both her child and adult trainings. James Astor was tutor of the child training at that time whom Elizabeth found, ‘competent and very efficient, and very conscientious and informed’. It was during Elizabeth’s training that issues of succession within the child training came to the fore, and this will be covered in a proceeding section as it led to the rupture within the training.

Elizabeth can remember feeling quite intimidated by Fordham during her first encounters with him and described him very much in the role of ‘director’ of the training. She was aware that in the past he had been experienced by some as ruthless in pursuit of his ambitions, but Elizabeth described him as softer by the time she met him, although still absolutely resolute in what he wanted for the SAP. When Elizabeth undertook the child training seminars were held in people’s houses, and her training cases were seen both at the SAP and also at Parkside Clinic. She felt part of the wider ACP training community and was friendly with trainees from other bodies, and also benefitted from teaching from member of other institutions. Elizabeth cited Frances Tuston as a particular influence, and one with whom Michael shared an interest in autism. Elizabeth qualified as a child analyst in 1988 and as an adult analyst in 1989. She represents a time when the SAP child training was within the mainstream, when ideas and work were shared, and she describes a feeling of being both independent - a member of a discrete training body with its own tradition approach - and inter-dependent – being part of a wider profession with shared interests and a common goal: that children should be helped and thought about through the application of psychoanalytic based treatment. This is certainly something she identified as not enduring largely down to sheer mathematics: the child section failed to grow adequately and was unable to nurture its existing members and provide adequately for interested potential trainees. This inherent and pervasive problem sowed seeds right at the outset for the eventual demise.

As written about in the previous section Elizabeth and Miranda were very concerned after Jane Bunster’s death about the fate of the then-current cohort of trainees, which is

what led to their decision to jointly care take the situation. Elizabeth believes that Miranda saw that the writing was on the wall before she did, but that she came round to the view, ‘we just didn’t have the body mass within the SAP – that there were too many requirements from the NHS, there too few training posts .. and it was getting to be prohibitively expensive’. Similarly to others Elizabeth described the tension between the ‘conservative arm’ of the SAP and the demands of the NHS. An additional pressure for them and one that was a key factor in the timing of making the final decision to close the training was that there were potential trainees waiting in the wings ready to submit applications, needing to know whether or not there would be a training for which to apply. Once it was clear the training would end, those few trainees who would have chosen to come to the SAP were absorbed into other trainings, whom Elizabeth described as being ‘very respectful of [our] situation and of those who really wanted to train at the SAP’ and there was some accommodation made for them to have some of their supervision from SAP members, and to keep their analysis with their SAP analysts. Interestingly, there was a number, albeit a vanishingly small number, of hybrid trainees who had begun their training journeys intent on training at the SAP but finally undertook trainings at the Tavistock or the Anna Freud Centre: a final trickling away from the SAP child training.

Elizabeth considers herself ‘a student of Fordham’ and she has worked hard herself on preserving his legacy, and to understand how she has absorbed his work in relation to her own clinical career. ‘Fordham did not teach Fordham’ so she feels it was mainly through her conversations with him that she most fully came to understand his ideas. She has also always maintained a lively interest in, and openness to, new areas of research to inform her understanding. A particular influence on Elizabeth more latterly was Colwyn Trevarthen, a research psychologist based at Edinburgh University who has concerned himself with the relationship between mothers and their infants. She said this work amplified and added to her own position, that it became absorbed into her existing model and that she never found it in conflict with Fordham’s model, which she says was always left open.

Miranda and Elizabeth: perhaps not there at the very beginning but most certainly at the end and, beyond that, all the way through. These two women’s lives and work have to some extent become synonymous with the child training at the SAP. Their

determination to see through the last training cohort at considerable emotional and physical cost to themselves was both a gift of great generosity and a display of fortitude.

Those gone – a solution

Oliver Foster

I interviewed Oliver in the NHS clinic in Devon where he works as the consultant child psychotherapist. Strangely, but aptly given the overlapping nature of my own clinical life, a fellow trainee with whom I studied at the Tavistock also works there, and Oliver had been her placement supervisor for the latter part of her training. Oliver represents a group of SAP child psychotherapists who qualified through the Society but then chose to resign their membership – he is one of many who have so done and this haemorrhage of talented, committed clinicians has been a major factor in the gradual erosion of the child section and the concomitant knock on effect on the viability of the training.

Oliver also brings us closer to contemporary events, in the sense of intersecting with the training during the 1990s in its mid-life rather than so early on, and ending not until 2003, so very near the end. He explained to me how through working in nurseries and counselling projects he realised he wanted to be a therapist. He knew nothing of the analytic world so was investigating his options from a neutral position. He felt the SAP offered something ‘optimistic’ and ‘development’ which chimed with the way he was thinking about his work. He also appreciated the smaller scale ‘something more personal more individual that I liked’ compared to the Tavistock, which was where he had also considered. Oliver explained that an ‘ad hoc’ programme was ‘pulled together’ for him starting with infant observation. He was able to profit from successfully applying for an NHS training post in High Wycombe. Oliver also represents a time of much more flexibility in the NHS around training posts, when they were not ‘fixed term’ and he was able to train from 1996 to 2003. Oliver described Michael Fordham being talked about by Jane Bunster and Elizabeth Urban, but conspicuous in his absence from the SAP. Oliver had had direct contact with him before his death in 1995 during the introductory year he had completed at the SAP before embarking on the child training and also had been to Michael’s house ‘Jordans’ for seminars: ‘It was terrific actually, it was very, very good and I am very glad to have had that opportunity’.

Oliver was in fact one of the last trainees to have direct contact with Michael Fordham in that way, and he expressed gratitude for the experience:

... someone who had such a kind of sparkling intelligence that was very engaging – the way in which he was so steeped in what he was teaching you. And also being impressed by someone who was a real part of the history of the training that you were on. Sort of living connections with historical figures, with Jung himself.

However Oliver also spoke of being aware of Michael Fordham's age and how that brought about its own vulnerability and 'a sense of frailty'. In his interview one can see how the frailty and vulnerability of Michael Fordham had actually seeped into the minds of those charged with running the trainings and become more concrete fears: Michael Fordham's longevity was linked to anxieties about the sustainability of the training: 'The anxiety was starting ... how is the training going to hold its own when he dies. I think there was quite a concern about it.'

Oliver was still being supervised by Jane Bunster when she died, so was also profoundly affected by her death: 'It had a major impact. We felt generally a loss of centrality ... she was the one who was your point of contact over the training and the main organising person, and I think we all in our different ways were greatly drawn towards her.'

Oliver was particularly able to speak to the idiosyncrasy of being an SAP trainee at a time when it was clear something was in decline. Although he described Jane Bunster as being very Kleinian in her approach she was also 'very much a Jungian'. He talked of having a 'mixed identity': that the clinical implementation was just the everyday busyness of NHS child mental health (in that sense on the face of it indecipherable from what his peers on other trainings would have been doing), but that Fordham's model was internalised: 'in ways that weren't sort of clear – a different sort of spirit in my approach – and to some degree a greater felt individual freedom.'

Oliver saw that Jane's death brought into focus the fact that she had largely taken on the running of the training herself, and that this in itself was a crisis – the recognition that

this had occurred at all seemed to be deeply troubling. There was a further death of a child psychotherapist, Michael Green, who had been one of Oliver's peers and this had an impact on Oliver's relationship to the SAP: 'I suppose my way of managing it at the time was to be a bit more distant, it was complicated you know.' Oliver finally resigned in 2010. He described wanting very much to remain part of the SAP for a period of time, and 'to give back to the training'.

However, in the aftermath of the demise of the training he described a more ambivalent relationship. On being told of the 'fait accompli' that the training would close 'it was shocking and distressing'. He spoke of the contradiction of on the other hand being at the beginning of one's career as a child psychotherapist and need to forge one's path at the same time as one's 'parent body' was dying. Additionally in the light of the 'enormous' annual membership subscription he needed to work out whether it was an organisation that still felt worth being part of. It was a process of defection that occurred over a two- to three-year period.

Oliver raised interesting issues about the way the child training was positioned within the SAP, and both how it was seen and saw itself in terms of this position. It felt 'different being part of the child analytic set up There was a sense the child analysts were much more Kleinian and the broader group within the SAP was more Winnicottian and I think some of those sorts of tensions were quite difficult to manage, this was my kind of experience'. He felt that once the adult and child trainees split after the first year of shared training, that the 'interconnectedness' was lost.

Interestingly in spite of no longer being a member of the SAP Oliver spoke about the importance in his view of speaking about Michael Fordham when he teaches and ensuring people realise 'that there are different perspectives'. He expressed his concern that something will inevitably be lost without new trainees coming through and this was painful to him, yet equally he claimed to feel no nostalgia and seemed remarkably sanguine about his position in spite of telling me that the decision to leave the SAP was fraught and difficult.

If one describes belonging to what is arguably a dying tradition as a 'problem' then I posit that Oliver represents a particular solution to that problem, which is to leave. To

leave home, not in order to seek a different and new home, but to forge an individual identity determined not by membership of a particular body but by one's personal journey through training, through analysis and through work. It is in fact a solution that several have opted for as I indicated above.

Those Holding the Mantle

Alessandra Cavalli

Alessandra is unique within the SAP. She is the only one of the final cohort of trainees who remains a member, and a very active one at that. It is undoubtedly significant that she went on to complete the adult analytic training, which has given her dual membership, which all the remaining child analysts who are members also have, apart from Miranda Davies. It seems as though to have survived the ending it was easier to have formed an alliance with the dominant *raison d'être* of the society.

I have called the category 'Those Holding the Mantle' – those who are left: left to think, to teach, to carry the flame. However, Alessandra was also there at the end, and others are also holding the mantle. The truth is that with such diminished numbers people inhabit multiple functions and find themselves existing across categories. It is testament to Alessandra's independent spirit that she found herself at the SAP at all. There exists an established axis between Italy and the Tavistock Centre and, as an Italian, it would have made sense to train there. However, having moved to Munich to do her undergraduate and post graduate degrees, and then to Belgium, it might be that in some way the presence of so many Italians was in itself a reason not to be there. She had attended a course at the Tavistock run by Gianna Williams about working with adolescents, and had found it 'so big ... there were a lot of Italians anyhow'. She explained her decision to train at the SAP as seeking somewhere 'small'. She was also attracted to Jane Bunster's 'impartial' and 'neutral' stance, in that Alessandra felt there was no agenda – there was an offer of training but no push to come. This appealed to her and so she moved to London in 1998 to begin analysis in order to start the training the following year. She started her infant observation with Jane Bunster just before her death, and then moved on to Annette Mendelson (a child trained analyst who resigned before her death in 2009). She did her young child observation with Elizabeth Urban

who also supervised both her under-five and latency cases. Miranda Davies supervised her adolescent case, and Ian Williamson her once weekly cases. Another way in which Alessandra holds a unique place in the history of the training is that she managed to complete all the requirements without a funded training place. This was unheard of at that time, when training in child psychotherapy had become inextricably linked, as it still is, with funded posts. It is an extraordinary achievement that she managed to qualify at all in such trying circumstances, and testament to a certain tenacity and independent spirit which also might go some way to explaining her determination to stay within the SAP: in that sense her ‘solution’ was to stay.

Interestingly the experience of not having a funded training place, while putting Alessandra under a lot of pressure, resulted in her seeking patients and experience in a variety of locations including the Tavistock, which I would argue was key in consolidating her position amongst the wider child psychotherapy community. She also sought out supervisory experiences from outside the fold, including from Irma Pick, a highly regarded Kleinian psychoanalyst.

Alessandra began the training in the aftermath of Jane Bunster’s death and remembered clearly the sense of crisis: ‘we knew that there was a crisis. ... I discussed it with Ian [Williamson] who was saying that it was a process of democratisation so that not only one person but three people who were also paid and organising together – on the whole Miranda and Elizabeth were able to hold us together with Ian in the background.’ It is instructive to note that the intention of removing authority from one person onto a committee was precisely what those leading the original palace coup declared to be their objective. And yet somehow, through slippage or through design, the reality was that Jane Bunster had been de facto director of training in all but name.

Alessandra spoke of finding out in her third year of training that the training would close. ‘It was a blow, and that happened while one of our colleagues, our co-trainee, decided to change training and go to the Tavistock and that was very puzzling in some way because we felt she was betraying something about this group that had to hold itself together’.

This trainee found her own ‘solution’ to the problem – this time leaving but leaving even before qualifying, a defection to another training, which seemed to feel like jumping as the ship was sinking to those left behind. Alessandra identified a painful truth, that having survived the loss of one of their peers, they then had to survive the news that the training would end, and they:

.... began to become aware of so many losses that were never acknowledged – like all the trained analysts – child trained analysts who had left the SAP –there was no trace of them, nobody mentioned them even so the only people who stayed were those who were involved with the training or had done the adult training but all the others had one after the next disappeared.

And as I put to Alessandra history repeated itself with her group, with all three of her peers leaving, and a trainee who had qualified only two years before dying very suddenly while her cohort were still in training. Alessandra said that her group became aware of conflict both within the Child Analytic Group, and also between the Child Analysts and the wider SAP. However, Alessandra herself felt that if anything the wider SAP were ‘admiring maybe even jealous at times of our capacity to work with the children’. She herself became interested in trying to understand the history in order to process the legacy. Alessandra spoke about the ‘rupture’ as a schism between two families: the one of James Astor and the one of Barry Proner. She was caught absolutely within this schism owing to being in analysis with Barry Proner, yet supervised and trained by Miranda Davies and Elizabeth Urban who would firmly situate themselves within the James Astor line. It was hard to disentangle the origins of this – whether these were ‘actually personal conflicts between two schools of thought or two people that then got all enacted in the clinical work ... it felt that James Astor had taken over Michael Fordham with Elizabeth and Miranda, and Barry Proner had had taken over the more Kleinian way of thinking.’ She described a ‘disconcerting’ confusion between, and conflation of, personality and theory, which made it essential but difficult for her to find her own way of working. Alessandra’s view is less that the ending of the training was inevitable, but that insufficient effort was made to keep it alive and that there was almost a squandering of the talent and competence that had been trained through it in such a thorough and highly regarded way. Alessandra perhaps feels her strenuous effort to keep even the children’s section alive was met with little interest.

There is some suggestion of a strain within the SAP of strong men with rivalrous personalities, which rather than being worked through results in ruptures: firstly between Michael Fordham and Gerhard Adler, followed by James Astor and Barry Proner. This added to the sense of the struggle, in fact, inability to process events rather than act into and out of them. This seemed to have been continually enacted in the resignations, even as far as those two final colleagues of Alessandra's. She has come to understand this as a 'transmission of trauma' from generation to generation: 'you can see a lot of undigested bits that were re-enacted again and again'. Alessandra co-edited a book with colleagues (Cavalli et al., 2013) in order to platform the legacy of SAP thinking and Fordham's contribution. Rather than being an opportunity to repair schisms and rifts within the SAP it served instead to illustrate that the fissure remains sore and open. Those whom one would associate most strongly with Michael Fordham were reluctant to participate, and those whom did participate were anxious for the book not to be too strongly identified with Fordham. It is hard to understand the dynamics at play in this, and of course I am hampered in my understanding by only seeing through Alessandra's lens however it speaks to the tenacity of transmitted trauma within an organisation; the fear induced when faced with handing over knowledge in the form of the written word to another: profound lack of trust that has become tinged with paranoia.

Alessandra re-encountered Gianna Williams at the reincarnated infant observation / marathon sessions which were organised for this last training cohort. Having met Gianna previously when considering undertaking training at the Tavistock this was a 'shock' but she came to appreciate deeply these sessions and Gianna has become a friend and close professional colleague, which Alessandra suspected would not have happened should she have trained at the Tavistock.

Even these reincarnated 'marathon' sessions perpetuated a schism as senior Child members did not attend, perhaps still playing out rivalry and friction, and Alessandra's subjective experience was of 'slowly, slowly, the marathon faded away'. She described repeatedly in the interview the experience of 'constant loss' and this propelling her to seek supervision outside the perimeter of the SAP membership. I suggested to her that she had, unwittingly, repeated a familial pattern of ultimately the SAP not being able to

provide what is necessary to its, in this case, child members: the parent-analysts eventually proving inadequate with the children seeking nurture and growth elsewhere. We have seen it with both Fordham and Astor consulting Meltzer; we have seen Gianna Williams being imported across generations of trainees; we witnessed Oliver Foster seeking psychoanalysis with a clinician trained at a different Institution; and Alessandra seeking supervision with Irma Brenman. In each of these instances there are perfectly understandable and legitimate reasons, and obviously practitioners seek input and learning from many sources throughout their professional lives. However, it is somewhat ubiquitous in the SAP and points to scarce and ever diminishing resources.

Alessandra does represent a synthesis of many traditions, and many languages: just as she literally practises psychotherapy in multiple languages, so has she found a way of integrating the multiple psychoanalytic languages into a coherent, working, clinical model. She spoke of being a member of the SAP as ‘hard work’ in that it has demanded putting up a fight on behalf of the infant within the SAP, but also on behalf of the SAP within the wider child psychotherapy world.

Those at the Sides – the Extractors

There are a small group of SAP adult-trained analysts whose professional lives, in spite of not having undertaken the child training either at the SAP or elsewhere, have been involved in either child and adolescent mental health or infant development. In some cases this is through their previous core profession: for example those trained as child and adolescent psychiatrists, social workers, or family therapists working in NHS child and adolescent mental health teams. In other cases it is through the vagaries of professional lives and clinical journeys. This is an interesting category because unwittingly they have played their role in the history of the child tradition but in an idiosyncratic way, not through the formal route of training but of having applied skills, knowledge and competencies hard won from the potent combination of existing roles along with the long haul of adult analytic training. They have ‘extracted’ from the adult training those things they have learnt which can be applied to their work with adolescents, children and infants and they have contributed through acquired experience back into the SAP.

Marica Rytovaara

Marica is another of those analysts who occupy a uniquely forged position as a result of their professional background, their emerging interests and the trajectory of their professional life. Marica trained at the SAP as an adult analyst but has held the post of consultant adolescent psychotherapist within a specialist NHS in-patient unit, Simmonds House, North London, for young people suffering from mental illness and whose safety cannot be guaranteed in out-patient provision. I met Marica in her office of this unit in order to carry out the interview, and I was lucky enough also to sit in on a ward round and tour the very impressive premises. We spoke about her early life and education in Finland, and how she came over to the UK and pursued a Masters in Psychiatric Social Work at Brunel University (1971), which at the time had a particularly psychoanalytic bent with guest lecturers from the Tavistock coming to teach. From early on Marica was therefore being taught about early child development and her interest in autistic children was encouraged by these seminars. She was learning from major figures from the Tavistock including Margaret Rustin, Frances Tustin and Anne Alvarez and had imagined she might do the child training – in fact all indicators seemed to be pointing that way. However, having just had a baby herself she finished the social work training and took a job at the very unit where she was still working: ‘I never worked anywhere else. I’ve changed the job completely, so it was a psychiatric social work job, then it became a family therapist job, then it became a child psychotherapy job.’

Over the years Marica attended seminars at the Tavistock and then the Anna Freud Centre, when Anna Freud herself was still alive and in attendance. The consultant psychiatrist, Dr. Geoff Brown, at Simmonds House was training in adult analysis at the SAP so Marica became aware of it as an institution. Originally she had decided to complete a PhD in psychology but was discouraged from doing so by her supervisor at Simmonds House at the time who was a psychoanalyst trained at the Institute of Psychoanalysis. The combination of feeling prohibited from continuing her doctoral studies and by an increasing interest in what she observed Geoff Brown doing encouraged her to explore training at the SAP. She explained her decision to train there, rather than for example the Institute of Psychoanalysis as her work supervisor was urging her to do, because it was ‘an open church ... you didn’t have to be a card

carrying Jungian, I could have my Winnicott and Bion'. She went on to explain her difficulty with the, at that time, very Kleinian approach of the Tavistock but also the 'archetypes and metaphors of the American Jungians', so the SAP provided a third way for her.

During her adult training Marica was supervised by Joseph Redfearn and Katherine Newton, both of whom offered robust support to her during her training. Marica carried on seeing Joseph Redfearn for supervision for over twenty years; his psychiatric background provided the framework she needed for working with the complex and disturbed patients she ended up seeing. She described how knowing Joe was there in the background holding her clinical work imbued her with confidence to take risks in working with this level of difficulty. Geoff Brown also contributed to this with his pragmatic yet 'laid back' approach to the young people resident at Simmonds House. Marica became increasingly experienced with the most unwell adolescents as this was the patient group with whom she was developing expertise. This left her in an ambiguous position with regard to the Association of Child Psychotherapists, as she was an adult trained analyst yet one working and developing skills with young people – an age group which the ACP would feel it had primacy over. Not without complicated negotiations and much support from the NHS manager Ricky Emmanuel (a very well respected and long qualified consultant child psychotherapist) Marica was rather grudgingly accepted as a sort of honorary member of the ACP and therefore able to manage trainee child psychotherapists who have their posts at Simmonds House.

Marica became aware of the SAP as a possible place to train by about 1989 and eventually began the training in 1993 having started analysis in 1991. She was aware of the child training as Oliver Foster and Michael Green had started theirs at that time. Marica can remember that her training group 'loved' the child trainees and were 'aggrieved' when they branched off to follow their own syllabus and training journey. She had 'lost the links' with the Tavistock by then although she found it again eventually through Ricky Emmanuel being her manager. However, she had always maintained an interest in child development through being an early adopter of the neuroscience paradigm that has more recently become a familiar part of the lexicon of child psychotherapy. Marica is particularly interested in the so called Boston School, a group of psychoanalytic practitioners who are particularly interested in the relational

aspects of psychotherapy and how these link to neuroscience and child development (Boston Change Process Study Group, 2016).

During the interview it became clear that Marica draws on theoretical and clinical ideas that are meaningful and speak to her, with no regard for any tribal loyalty. This seems to free her up to genuine independent thought and allows her to approach Jung not as a fierce loyalist but simply as an important contributor to clinical work. She does however position herself within the SAP tradition although admitted that at times her position within the SAP has felt strained at times, with her interest in attachment theory and child development research. She has held various administrative positions including being on council; being part of the liaison group between the University of Essex and the SAP; being a member of the SAP's child analytic training committee and also being on the *Journal of Analytical Psychology* editorial board. What is notable is that while Marica trained as an adult analyst her professional identity has been bound up with an NHS in-patient unit serving adolescents. This has linked her back to the Tavistock from where trainees come to do placement at Simmonds House, and also has positioned her in a relationship to the ACP as a service supervisor for those trainees in paid training posts at the unit. This is another example of an SAP member in a thoroughly idiosyncratic situation, straddling different role and different traditions across organisations in an unconventional way. She summed up for me saying:

I can see why Fordham seemed so revolutionary because if you come from a Jungian adult tradition he added the developmental spectrum whilst for me, as I originally came from a developmental clinical psychology orientation, post-Kleinians and Fordham added more metaphysical frills. Winnicott of course provides a link to attachment theory and culture and anthropology as well as Bion, so I suppose I see Fordham as an excellent synthesizer and 'translator' as well as a sound clinician, but not as an original thinker and therefore I doubt he will continue to be quoted as the field has moved on and some people inevitably remain within their own Zeitgeist. Jung is of course enormously flawed, but within this there are things that are surprisingly modern so it is not a question of breathing life in a mummy or hanging on to your teddy.

Judith Woodhead

Judith trained as an adult analyst at the SAP and was also one of those members who held various posts within the organisation including being chair of council. She had a varied and diverse career working with children in therapeutic settings before her adult training, and is of interest to us here because of the role she played in the development of parent-infant psychotherapy as an emerging and developing discipline. She held the post of consultant parent-infant psychotherapist at the Anna Freud Centre, where she contributed hugely to its clinical work and training, and additionally completed a doctoral thesis on the subject of parent-infant work. She is therefore also unique both in her position at the SAP (as an adult trained analyst working with infants) and also at the Anna Freud Centre (as an SAP adult analyst in a senior role). As with Marica before her there are certain quirks of history that contributed to Judith's idiosyncratic trajectory to the straddle the two organisations of the SAP and the Anna Freud Centre, and combining adult work with a clinical interest in the very youngest of infants. In this way she closely followed a path forged by Michael Fordham and his followers.

From an early professional life in working with children with emotional and educational difficulties, Judith had read Jung and Winnicott and begun to get a sense of wanting to train analytically. After a foundation course at the London Centre for Psychotherapy (now part of the British Psychotherapy Foundation) and an infant observation with Catherine Crowther, an SAP member, she attended a consultation interview with Jane Knight (a now deceased training analyst at the SAP) who suggested she gain more clinical experience by approaching the Parkside Clinic. Parkside Clinic was a well-known, long established NHS service offering child and family psychotherapeutic treatment. Judith was at Parkside at the same as Jane Bunster was working there, so there was a certain synchronicity gathering pace, which Judith described as 'kind of unconscious influences or emergent moments'. She described Jane as being very 'kind if you bumped into her at Parkside.' There were also two other honorary psychotherapists who were applying for the adult training at the SAP so it was very much in the ether as a possibility. However, Judith also had a consultation with a staff member at the Anna Freud Centre as, consistent with her background in working with emotionally and behaviourally disturbed children, she was seriously considering whether she should apply for a child analytic training. Interestingly, the conclusion from

these consultations was that she should consider applying for an adult training – to broaden her scope and experience - with a view possibly to undertaking a child training subsequently. Additionally on reflection with young children of her own Judith felt she could not take on the commitment demanded by the child training with the added complication of living out of London. During the adult training Judith synthesized her immersion in the psychoanalytic approach with her earlier work in early child development by becoming a consultant to two residential therapeutic communities, as well as to Pen Green in Corby:

My main work was looking at how to transmute psychoanalytic ideas into understanding their work with infants. I was very influential in developing this work – bringing psychoanalysis into understandable ways of thinking and looking at the dynamics of the group and also the staff group.

During the interview Judith noted the ‘common thread’ between her developing work with infants and the adult training, all the research and reading she was doing, and how this evolved organically into her applying for the role as a parent-infant psychotherapist at the Anna Freud Centre. However, she did not see Michael Fordham as a particular influence. This is noteworthy because it demonstrates that by the time Judith undertook the adult training (late 1990s) Michael Fordham did not have such a prominent position within the adult clinical discourse and was a more distant, historical figure for those trainees. This supports Marica’s assertion above that Michael Fordham eventually will no longer be ‘quoted within the field’.

Judith came to her adult training with an already established understanding and appreciation of attachment theory (John Bowlby) and also, again similar to Marica, the work of Daniel Stern and the Boston Group. The roots of attachment and the primacy of relationships within infancy became central to her way of thinking, which only deepened once she began her work as a parent-infant psychotherapist at the Anna Freud Centre. She eventually synthesised all these influences into her doctoral thesis entitled *The Emergence of the Infant Self in Parent-Infant Psychotherapy*. What was striking in talking to Judith in fact was the absence of both any Kleinian influence in her thinking and also Michael Fordham. She described him as ‘not igniting her interest’ although ‘his ideas to do with de-integration and re-integration spoke to me’: ‘I feel that I have

seen that process in babies – experiences sort of sinking in, and I would point that out to a mother, offering a kind of explanatory commentary about what I am observing...’ Judith seemed to be aware that she might have been considered as an ‘anomaly’ to child trained colleagues at the SAP with her involvement in infant-parent work while not being child trained. And of course by not having undertaken the child training at the SAP her relationship to Michael Fordham and his proponents within the Society did not have such a presence in her training and this is no doubt reflected in the extent to which his ideas impacted on her clinically. The work of doing her doctorate helped her assimilate all the various influences she encountered in her professional life and also more firmly clarified her position as a ‘Jungian’. She spoke of conceptualising the infant as a ‘little individuator’ continuing to say, ‘probably from within the womb, probably from conception in a sense – the business of the emergent self’. Judith retired from the Anna Freud Centre concluding, ‘I deeply value all I did with the mothers and babies but I have rounded that off.’

These ‘extractors’ have been ambassadors of the work and the tradition, and have contributed significantly to the reputation and profile of the SAP training. Their approach has been very much in the tradition of Michael Fordham: drawing on different theories and clinical approaches appropriate to the task in hand; free from sectarian divisiveness which was one of the hallmarks of Fordham’s project.

The People: Beyond the SAP

These people have spoken to me about their lives as lived in relation to the SAP. In the psychoanalytic world one’s training organisation is a source of support, comfort, succour, intellectual and clinical nurturing. However, it can also be a source of pain, discomfort, broken friendships and shattered professional partnerships. It is the vessel within and through which one becomes the psychotherapist one is: one can move from infant to retiree within this same vessel - rubbing alongside one’s peers as the years go by. However, as we have seen, there are other options open: adolescent rebellion; early abandonment; ambivalent attachment and even premature death. Similar to any mother-(ship) the training organisation is an object of projection, and as in any sibling group there are emerging difficult dynamics. The interviewees spoke to me with candour and integrity, honestly and frankly, at times about difficult events about which inevitably

there are different views and divergent memories. This is a story of both great creativity and associated destruction, and I have told it in the spirit of invested neutrality. That is to say a position of impossibility: of care and concern for my subjects with some attempt to interrogate contested narratives.

Chapter 5: Rupture, repair, remains

It is instructive that the first time I interviewed Elizabeth Urban we entirely failed to speak about the ‘rupture’ to which I refer in this sub-title: this most significant period in the training when irrevocable changes came about through personal conflict and organisational stress. Neither of us was able to be conclusive as to why this happened. I returned to interview her for a second time specifically to cover this topic and inevitably we speculated that we had both avoided a very painful and difficult subject. As Elizabeth said this was ‘a critical period in the history and it had to do with differences’ and was ‘deeply emotive and affected those of us who did it’. It is a good example of how emotionality can penetrate the process of interviewing apparently without any conscious intent on the part of either interviewer or interviewee. And actually this would have had a significant impact on the telling of the story had we not been able to acknowledge this had happened and agree to meet a second time.

The ‘Rupture’ as I have called it is referred to as ‘Rucksions’ (sic) in the archive. It refers to a period of time in the child training when issues of lineage and heritage came to the fore in an explosive and ultimately destructive way. So destructive that the damage has never been repaired and undoubtedly introduced poison into not only the atmosphere but perhaps the very structure of the training. A poison whose toxicity spread insidiously festering in cracks which finally fissured open to create insuperable and fatal damage.

It is always challenging to establish truth in these matters, matters which are mostly alive in the memories of those who were present at the time and of course unwittingly massaged by the passage of time, associated discussion, and what unfolds in the aftermath. There is of course the essential story, which is one of lineage and an associated ‘palace coup’ (personal communication James Astor). The rupture came

about in the light of discussions regarding succession, and how this creation of Michael Fordham's, the child training, would continue to be kept alive after his retirement. Fordham turned 80 years old in 1985 and it is clear from the minutes of the committee meetings that there were discussions about how to manage matters on his retirement. He had been very ill, and in fact nearly died, so would have been acutely aware of the pressing need to consider this. He had already moved out of London to live full time at Severalls in Buckinghamshire. His wife, Frieda, was frail so there had been a general withdrawal from activity at the society. From the minutes of the CAT meetings it is evident that there were proposals made about having tenures of office for both the director and tutor of the training. There is also a clear recommendation that 'it would be desirable for the tutor to continue on to the post of director of training.' This meant that at the time of Fordham's retirement James Astor would have stepped into the post of director of training. Those few months were an important time for the training as a letter dated 10 July 1985 from James shows, reminding the society that the ACP had plans to inspect and review the training given the imminent changes.

James Astor described the proposed 'succession' system:

...He [Fordham] retired in 1985 (as director of training). There had been put in place a succession procedure in that the course tutor would then become the director of training when the director of training retired and would bring on a new course tutor, so Fordham had set up a succession model which was designed to produce continuity but it was also based on the idea that there would be a leader and that there would be a director of training. Just before he stepped down a group on the committee decided they didn't want that.

He went on to say '...when the Dauphin steps up and says he is going to be the next king the knives go flooding into his back'.

The period between June and September 1985 was when it 'blew apart' according to Elizabeth. She can remember receiving a phone call late at night from James Astor explaining that he would no longer be the course tutor. There seemed to be a small group of people, seemingly strongly influenced by Barry Proner and Mara Sidoli, who felt the succession system was not appropriate and that the training should be run by a

committee. Michael Fordham's position was that this was not a viable way to run a training; a view gathered from his many years of experience of running things and setting things up. He also felt that with such a small training which nevertheless generated a number of tasks (curriculum, trainees, ACP liaison) he wanted to hand over in an orderly fashion and this had been 'blown away'. This caused a huge crisis with endless meeting between James, Michael and Dorothy. However, James did not want to 'fight this', and although he was invited to be part of the committee because he did not agree with such a structure he felt unable to participate.

James in fact called all the trainees to keep them abreast of these developments whereas Elizabeth experienced Barry Proner's attitude towards it as 'this is between the grown ups'. Elizabeth visited Michael to discuss it with him, and he was very open with her about it, expressing his disappointment that his proposal for succession had not been taken up. Dorothy Davidson was also 'very angry .. it was rare for her to get worked up about things and she clearly felt very strongly'.

In the archive there is a hand written letter dated 20 September 1985 from James Astor to Michael Fordham resigning from his post. It is a very moving and emotional letter expressing his regret but assuring Michael that he (Michael) remains alive in him (James). Dated the same day, 20 September, Dorothy Davidson writes to Michael Fordham saying she is 'sickened' by what has happened and that she is 'unable to see a way ahead'. There is, in addition, an amazing hand written document dated 28 September 1985 written by Agnes Wilkinson, in her role as Public Relations Officer for the SAP. It is entitled 'Thoughts on Forthrightness, Arrogance and Schism'. She is reduced to a state of 'paralysed silence' at the 'awfulness of the situation'. This document runs for many pages, the script becoming increasingly erratic presumably as her emotions become more heightened during the writing of it. We are left in no doubt about the impact this has had.

Dorothy Davidson wrote to David Howell 2 October 1985 resigning from her post. This is an extraordinary letter to read after trawling through the archive as I did, having a sense almost first hand of the enormity of the tasks she took on, her quiet but dogged commitment to the project. That her decades long involvement should end like that is painful to see.

On 19 November 1985 David writes a truly heartfelt letter to Michael Fordham thanking him, Dorothy and James for 'invaluable work over the years in regard to the training'. His appreciation is 'real and deep'. On 25 November 1985 there is a short sad reply from Michael, typed, but with a shaky handwritten postscript. The shakiness was symbolic of the then shaky state of affairs and of shaky times to come.

Elizabeth spoke very frankly to me about the effects of this on her. As she explained the training had only been going for under 10 years when this all took place, and the key players were recently qualified themselves. For example Barry Proner and James Astor were still training when she was doing her infant observation. She coped by taking advantage of Michael Fordham and Dorothy Davidson's age and experience as a means of continuity and stability, helping her navigate what became choppy seas around. Eventually by the October 1985 meeting a proposal that the three main tasks be carried out by four different people: Jane Bunster to undertake liaison with students; Barry Proner to liaise with the supervisors and seminar leaders; Mara Sidoli to liaise with potential applicants and convene curriculum meetings; and John Way to liaise with the ACP. Elizabeth suggested that it was hard not to see his proposal as an attack 'on a single authority'.

What is clear is that this schism within the training caused an organisational collapse that was never properly mended until after Jane Bunster's death. The attack on the 'single authority', which arguably was to prevent power and privilege being invested in one person to detrimental affect, simply left a still young training vulnerable to no authority. Elizabeth Urban's experience was of there no longer being the 'orderliness and organisation' and 'sense of containment' there had been previously. It is ironic that although Barry Proner became head of the clinic the rest of the work was done by Jane Bunster, so in fact exactly the structure that the coup was intended to prevent. Jane Bunster effectively ran the training single handedly. James explained:

She would come and see me quite regularly and ask me if I would please come back because she felt I was outside it, which is true, I was outside it. And I said no, I wouldn't come back but I would always be there. I mean in the way as a presence for the teaching of the curriculum and the students and everything but I wouldn't

come back as part of the administration. I didn't share her confidence in this committee within a committee arrangement.

The Ending – 'death'

In the August 2004 *Newsletter of the Society of Analytical Psychology* the first entry is an article entitled 'SAP CHILD ANALYTIC TRAINING: The Decision to Close the Child Analytic Training' written by Miranda Davies and Elizabeth Urban (appendix vi). They write:

Last year the Child Analytic Training Committee informed Council of its decision to wind down the training and to close it after all the present trainees had applied for membership. The reasons for this were specified in the CAT Annual Report last November, but given the gravity of the decision, it seems important to explain how this came about.

This was the announcement to the wider SAP membership of what constituted the end of an era. And yet the relatively modest forum within which it took place speaks to the minority interest the child analytic training had become within the SAP by then. The article itself gave a whistle stop account of the recent history of the training and it is likely that for many members of the SAP this was the first time they had heard about the ins and outs of what had been unfolding. It offered a succinct but chastening account of the heroic efforts made by Miranda and Elizabeth to re-invigorate the training after Jane Bunster's death in June 1999. They enumerated the difficulties they confronted attempting to run a fit for purpose training with the scanty resources available to them: both in terms of 'low morale as well as low numbers' (p.2). In addition to the practical obstacles of running a training without sufficient personnel from within the organisation and therefore needing to bring in external staff (for example Gianna Williams as we have seen above) they also discussed the exigencies of increased demand from the ACP in response to NHS requirements for evidence-based practice which was beginning to impact on child psychotherapy training. There was therefore a cascade of demand both from on top and bottom up, which ultimately proved too onerous for the SAP to carry. Interestingly the two key problems identified: lack of personnel and lack of money (which are of course linked because increasingly people were reluctant to work on a

voluntary basis to provide training seminars and supervision; and in addition trainees were simply unable to meet the prohibitive expense of being a self-funded child psychotherapy trainee) are those very difficulties we saw rearing their head even at the beginning of the training. Elizabeth and Miranda explained how the need to bring in more outside staff increased the cost the burden of which was inevitably borne by the trainees. Hence a toxic cycle of increased need and diminishing resources led to exhaustion all round – financial, emotional and motivational. They referenced in this short article Fordham’s independent spirit, which had led him to hope to keep the SAP child training independent. However, as we know it was understood to be both expedient and important to seek accreditation from the ACP and this had unforeseen advantages at the later stages of the training. Trainees were able to apply for NHS funded training posts where available and also the SAP was able to draw on support from the wider profession as well as contribute to it.

Nevertheless, notwithstanding support from the ACP and interested external colleagues Elizabeth and Miranda realised it was simply not sustainable and a ‘general meeting was held with interested SAP members, who expressed concern and regret. This group made efforts to consider how the training might continue but they could not adequately address the interrelated complexity of the difficulties’ (p.4). They also noted the prescience of Dorothy Davidson’s description of the initial difficulties encountered and how these were never fully alleviated. They conclude by reminding the membership that since taking over as Co-Consultants three new child analysts qualified and they were committed to seeing through the remaining trainee. This person unwittingly became the final child analyst to be qualified through the SAP child analytic training.

In her interview with me Elizabeth described meeting what turned out to be that last cohort of child trainees at Jane Bunster’s funeral. She and Miranda felt, ‘out of loyalty’ to Jane that this group needed to be looked after. The CAT Committee proposed a ‘Consultant’ role to see the trainees through and Elizabeth felt able to apply for it on the basis of a job share with Miranda. Elizabeth believed that:

Miranda foresaw before I did that the training couldn’t continue ... but there did reach a time when I was clear we just didn’t have the body mass within the SAP – that there were too many requirements from the NHS there were too few

training posts to ensure that our trainees would have access to the financial support for training and it was getting to be prohibitively expensive.

Although Elizabeth claimed ‘It was clear to me that it was nobody’s fault and it was nobody’s failing’ she did point to a ‘conservative’ wing in the SAP who were very committed to retaining the requirement that the child trainees analyse a mother as part of their training. This was incompatible with the structures of the NHS training posts so while Elizabeth absolutely understood the value of having carried out such an analysis in her own training she also felt well placed as a child psychotherapist working within the contemporary NHS to speak out on the necessity to lose that requirement.

Elizabeth described increasing pressure to make a final decision one way or another as potential applicants were writing enquiring about training, and a small number were waiting in the wings having completed an infant observation with the Society and in analysis with an SAP member. This was a painful decision because even at the time they were acutely conscious of ‘cutting off a chapter of history’. She described her own attempt as a ‘student of Fordham’ to keep the tradition alive in talks and conferences, and discussion groups. However, she also described feeling that there was a ‘disregard’ of Fordham in the adult section of the SAP, at the time of the ending of the child training. In the text what emanates is a sense of abandonment by the SAP of the child training and perhaps then more broadly the ‘child’ and Fordham.

It is clear what a watershed Jane Bunster’s death was. From the time of the rupture Jane had taken on increasing levels of responsibility, slowly and gradually, which meant in the event of her death an unforeseen crisis occurred. A crisis largely unseen by the main body of the SAP because of the minority interest the child training had become. It is likely that this increasing marginalisation of the child training had its roots in its very founding and also in the rupture. Fordham used the child training as a conduit for bringing in new ideas from psychoanalysis in the guise of exploring childhood and infant development. It was where his interest lay and what he wanted to explore clinically, but perhaps the child training was a way of introducing the ideas by stealth, under the guise of the training but then allowing them to filter into the Society. In which case, once ideas of earlier mental life had been assimilated into the mainstream of SAP thinking, did the child training in some way lose its *raison d’être*, its ‘function’ within

the society? Perhaps it is extremely significant that the SAP adult training still does not demand that its trainees do an infant observation – thus speaking to ambivalence remaining re early psychic life and relational/attachment thinking. It was after all Fordham’s penchant for psychoanalytic theory and technique that was a factor in the split with Gerhard Adler.

So, the training, which had been so inextricably linked with the personality of Michael Fordham, which then suffered a crisis after his retirement causing more friction and loss eventuating in its activities becoming more and more sidelined within the Society such that one person was responsible for almost all its activities, simply was unable to withstand the contemporary demands. The unacknowledged losses that were not properly metabolised and mourned, like pathogens circulating in the blood stream of the training were never absorbed rather remaining poisonous and spreading leading to a ‘final solution’, the solution to end all solutions and which put an end to the damage once and for all.

The Current Picture – ‘Beyond’

In what way can a tradition be said to exist if it is not being attended to? This is one of the key questions I set out to contemplate at the outset of this project. This question, central for the SAP child analytic tradition, is being asked at a time of pervasive increasing pressure on analytic approaches.

As I write the picture for all psychoanalytic provision – adult, child, couple – within the NHS looks grim. The British Psychoanalytic Council is engaged in a vigorous agenda of refuting the unhelpful and inaccurate prevailing narrative of the ineffectiveness of psychoanalytically derived treatment for mental health conditions such as depression. This refutation has been given some weight by the publication of the *Tavistock Adult Depression Study* (Fonagy et al, 2015; see also: Leichsenring and Rabung, 2008,; Leichsenring and Rabung, 2011; and Shedler, 2010). The Association of Child Psychotherapists is recognising the need to raise its media profile by organising a ‘media day’ aimed at training its registrants to feel confident in speaking to the press in its various guises. All this has an effect on the health of adult psychoanalytic training bodies each of whom, bar the Institute of Psychoanalysis, are struggling to recruit

trainees. The exception of the Institute to this trend is, in part, owed to its unique relationship to the Tavistock Centre, which is both an NHS funded treatment provider and a training body with an international reputation. It is beyond the scope of this project to discuss the massive changes underfoot at the Tavistock but suffice to say that what perhaps is viewed from the outside as a sacrosanct organisation with a legacy necessarily needing protection is not immune to the systematic changes rampant within publicly funded psychological services. What is interesting is that at the very time that NHS mental health services are being eroded and dismantled applications to the Institute of Psychoanalysis are numerous. Clinicians of a particular bent and temperament desire the opportunity to work closely and in depth with their patients. In addition they desire the concomitant experience of their own personal analysis. Owing to a history of power and privilege the Institute has maintained its pole position and is where young, bright clinicians will inevitably seek to train.

Child psychotherapy training organisations, while still having much interest from people wishing to train are continuing to battle with NHS commissioners regarding the number of fully funded training posts remaining available for trainees. At the time of writing there has been a flurry of worried emails from the ACP officers to its members (an example is appended: appendix vii) about proposed changes to the funding of NHS allied professionals and how this might impact on child psychotherapy training. A response from the Department of Health (Ben Gummer, MP, parliamentary under-secretary of state) was received:

In the November 2015 Spending Review, the Government announced changes to how healthcare student places will be funded. The policy intention of the reforms is to change the funding system for pre-registration undergraduate and postgraduate courses in nursing, midwifery and allied health subjects. From 1 August 2017, these courses will be funded through the standard student loans system; and will not receive Health Education England funding for tuition and students or a National Health Service bursary. The changes will apply to new students only. Child Psychotherapists courses are not included in the policy intention for these reforms as they do not attract funding through the NHS Bursary Scheme.

However, the ACP Officers were not sufficiently reassured and wrote a further email to

its membership on 16 March 2016:

Our assessment of this response is that it does not answer our fears, as child psychotherapy was not included in the announcement made in the Autumn Statement about training of nurses, etc, and this response does not exclude any future announcements. We have therefore engaged a government relations company called PAC to help us to find out what and who is driving this possible change and to try to ensure that it doesn't happen. On Monday we succeeded in getting a question asked in the House of Lords by Lord Patel of Bradford.

Lord Patel asked: "Given that 1 in 10 6-15 year olds suffer from a diagnosable mental health condition but only 25-35% access support, can the Minister give assurances that there are no plans to change the funding for the training of child psychotherapists who do valuable work in providing children's mental health services in the NHS?"

Lord Prior, the Health Minister responsible for Commissioning and CCG funding responded: "I can give him the assurance that he wants – there are no plans to change the way that the funding of training for psychotherapists is done at the moment."

It is our view that the addition of 'at the moment' still doesn't give us the assurances needed, although it does mean that any announcement in the budget would have been potentially awkward for Ministers.

Today with the help of PAC we have been examining the budget statement and it does not seem to include any statement that directly affects training budgets for mental health. We are now planning our next steps, and will keep you informed of developments.

Therefore the context in which one thinks about the status of the child analytic tradition of the Society of Analytical Psychology is one of diminished opportunity across the board for the training of child psychotherapists. It is also one of slippage of the SAP in its influence in relation to the wider psychoanalytic world in the UK. The link between the Tavistock and the SAP, once so fertile, is now barely existent. I unwittingly stepped into a relationship dynamic that had, for a period of time, been accepted and understood

as meaningful and productive: from the time of James Astor attending pre-training seminars to Gianna Williams' two stints of involvement with the SAP. However, the combination of the retirement of key figures from the Tavistock's own older generation of senior psychotherapists and the absence of any new SAP trained child psychotherapists that link is attenuated to the point of extinction. It is ironic that concretely the SAP is quite literally within the shadow of the Tavistock, while metaphorically being so too. Located in a residential building only metres away from the looming 1960s concrete monolith it is telling that few clinicians based at the Tavistock are even aware of the SAP's existence, so near yet so far. And yet this small patch of North West London richly redolent of the history of psychoanalysis, containing as it does the Anna Freud Centre, the Tavistock and the SAP (along with the Institute of Group Analysis housed downstairs), is under threat from irrevocable change. At the time of writing there is a staff consultation taking place at the Tavistock about a proposed potential move and the specifications for any new building. But in a depressing harbinger of what might be to come one of the questions is whether it would be a good idea to have a Costa for the patients! This speaks powerfully about the mercantile nature of the NHS and the lens through which services are viewed as a potential commodity to make money. Inevitably prime real estate in Hampstead is a soft target for an increasingly cash strapped NHS. However, the emotional and historical freight carried in the building cannot be quantified in financial terms. The management of the SAP is paying close attention to the fate of the Tavistock as the Society weighs up its own precarious financial situation with thoughts of cashing in and moving elsewhere. The Anna Freud Centre, one of the most financially successful of the original psychoanalytic organisations, is in the throes of building a new state of the art building in Kings Cross, and the fate of the Maresfield Gardens site is not clear. The threat of a wholesale hollowing out of psychoanalysis from this area of London is very real.

How then would we weigh up the significance of Fordham in this new world? In a child psychotherapy world concerned with its very survival as a profession, the secondary survival of a theoretical tradition no longer taught in any of the training bodies does not bode well for the continuing impact of Michael Fordham. My own view is that he was a radical who fulfilled a particular function at a particular time. As that function was time

specific the ontological status of Fordham's model is imperilled, and it seems to me that the inevitable status will be as an artefact.

The SAP has always positioned itself in a very particular way in relation to both the wider psychoanalytic world and also the wider Jungian world: arguably neither fully 'Jungian' nor 'psychoanalytic'. The feeling of the SAP as having a very individual voice, located in a very particular place has been a strength but might also be a weakness. The idiosyncratic nature means it exists in an intellectual space not easily defined: some members would fully embrace the term 'Jungian analyst, others would feel it does not adequately or accurately describe what and who they are and how they work.

Miranda and Elizabeth expressed the hope in their article in the newsletter that 'something of the Child Analytic Training will survive in more than memory' (Davies and Urban, 2004, p.5 – see appendix vi). I see those still thinking and working in the tradition as little islands slowly diminishing in a huge ocean of change, the tide working against them. So, in spite of courageous efforts by Alessandra Cavalli and Elizabeth Urban, two people are not enough, and neither is good will without good action. It has not survived in more than memory.

As things have unfolded out of those final four trainees one defected to the Tavistock to complete her training and in fact now no longer works as a child psychotherapist, two others resigned from the SAP feeling that it offered nothing to them as child psychotherapists, other than onerous demands and expensive membership fees. Since embarking on this project Ian Williamson resigned, who was instrumental in helping the training keep alive for as long as it did, and supervised these last trainees. It is a depressing picture of decline.

The only formal substantial activity taking place under the auspices of the SAP redolent of child work are the infant observation seminars run by Elizabeth and Alessandra. A question I considered is why somebody would come to an infant observation with an SAP member rather than apply to the Tavistock or the Anna Freud Centre. In fact the attendees at those seminars are by and large potential Jungian adult trainees; they are

seeking something specifically within a Jungian paradigm to aid their development as adult analysts, not as a move towards becoming child psychotherapists.

Alessandra Cavalli is quite clear in her view that we can no longer say there is an SAP child analytic tradition. Currently it continues to exist in some form in the way those practising have internalised it, but gradually it will become extinct. Its legacy will continue to be felt in ways not even realised by those experiencing it perhaps as the ultimate legacy was to bring the infant and the child into the SAP.

Final thoughts

As I draw to the end of this project I have to ask myself whether or not I met my aims, and what have been the strengths and weaknesses of the project. First and foremost I wanted to record, literally, memories and reflections of the main players, still alive, in this story. This aim has been met and the undertaking of the interviews themselves was undoubtedly the most personally rewarding part of the endeavour. I have used and fashioned them for the purposes of a research thesis but they exist within their own rights and on re-listening they reveal themselves over and over as testaments to extraordinary lives lived. The interviewees' words reveal both their stories in relation to the SAP but also are time-bound and will come in the future to represent a moment of time in an unfolding narrative. Interviews might well be about the past, but they inevitably tell us much about the particular present in which they are recorded. Also, they reveal to us not just lives in relation to an organisation but lives in relation to a profession that is particularly involving and perhaps solemn in its significance, which means the separation between personal and professional lives becomes less easy to discern.

Immersing myself in the broad church of narrative analysis revealed to me both the flexibility and rigour needed when approaching data emerging out of told, 'memoried' stories. The approach needed towards conducting the interviews themselves and subsequently to the narratives they produced demanded a care and a sensibility that also sat well with my training in psychoanalysis. The bringing together of narrative analysis and a psychoanalytic sensibility seemed fitting to the task in hand. My departure from formal data analysis emerged as a solution to my developing intention for the thesis

over the course of writing. The resultant piece of work is the product of the triangulation of the found story in the archive, the oral history interview and my own reconstruction of events from both of these sources. Dividing the interviews into categories was a device that had the added advantage of signalling how I located each individual into the story.

So there remains for me a question about how to preserve the interviews and to what end. They were recorded on the understanding that they were only to be used for the purposes of this project, which inevitably has been in distilled and excerpted forms. I am aware that my own relationship to the material changes over time, and will continue to alter as the unfolding present inevitably adds new layers to historical narrative. Therefore I am considering discussing this issue with each of the interviewees to see how they feel about future storage and the potential for wider dissemination. It would be made completely clear that this is without obligation and that nothing would happen without their explicit agreement. But I should want to convey to them the profound effect their stories had on me, and that it is with this in mind that I am engaging in the conversation with them.

The historical legacy of both the interviews and the project is also temporally bound. Although the child training ended and that story is over in one way, I nevertheless will watch with interest how the engagement of the SAP with its lost child within continues to unfold. A weakness inherent in any telling of a story to do with an organisation and the players within is that no sooner is it told it becomes out of date. The child psychotherapy profession continues to grapple and negotiate with external exigencies although as a profession there has been an organised and energetic response to these. Child psychotherapy, perhaps with innovation and responsiveness in its DNA, has found applied ways of offering its insights and treatments in both non-traditional modes of delivery (short term psychotherapy, see Catty 2016) and in non-traditional venues such as schools and third sector settings. Sadly these are innovations that the SAP was unable either to contribute to or profit from. Unfortunately the buildings of the Tavistock, the Anna Freud Centre and the Society of Analytical Psychology – the concrete and emotional infrastructure of the organisations – are under new and more imminent threat of change.

One weakness of the project was not being able to interview Lawrence Brown, the first trainee. In terms of the exterior narrative I was able to mitigate this lack as others filled the gap and he was spoken of often and freely. However, not having direct access to his words is of regret, not only for the purposes of my project but also in relation to having his spoken testament for posterity. This is of course precisely what he did not want, and we can infer that it was the retention of words for posterity that concerned him. As I have attested above the future of the recordings and transcripts is currently unclear. As things stand the transcripts are locked in my cabinet and the recordings exist in encrypted digital form and negotiations about these have yet to occur.

This thesis has involved looking at the history of child psychotherapy in the UK and the various organisations involved in this both historically and currently. I have shown how the Second World War played a significant role in this both by delivering the Freuds to London and in presenting to interested clinicians the effects of traumatic experiences – witnessing death and injury, loss, displacement, bereavement – on children. I have shown how theory and practice developed for Melanie Klein, for Anna Freud and for Michael Fordham, all of whom developed their own child analytic traditions moulded according to their theoretical positions. The intention of the thesis has been to narrate and illustrate the particular history of the child analytic tradition of the Society of Analytical Psychology as envisaged and developed by Michael Fordham and his associates. I have described Michael Fordham's original theoretical contributions to the child analytic discourse and how he brought the infant alive for Jungian culture. Using both the existing archive and the personal narratives of the interviewees I have been able to present a more coherent story of the development of the SAP child training than was previously available; in addition I have been able to texture this with affect and description from the mouths of those who were there at various points in the history. I have argued that ultimately, in spite of the best efforts of those involved, the training was unable to become sufficiently embedded in the mainstream of the child psychotherapy world to continue to function. As I have stated previously I have therefore concluded that however upsetting this might be to those who trained at the SAP, Fordham's theoretical and clinical work in the child psychotherapy world will eventually dwindle to that of an artefact. It is with regret that I assert this, but I can see no way that a tradition can continue to live and flourish with no new trainees qualifying

to keep it alive. It is like a family with no more heirs; dying out as the last generation fades away.

The aim was modest: to record words, to meet with people, and to weave together a story with as much truth as is possible. I have drawn strength from the words of Sir Leslie Stephen: ‘great as is the difference between a good and a bad work of the kind, even a defective performance is superior to none at all’ (Stephen, 1898, p.36). This has been done and therein lies the strength of the project: simply that it has been done. I have asserted that there was a story waiting to be told, and the enthusiastic and unguarded response I received from those who chose to participate vindicates that point of view. There was an urgency to speak about a time and a tradition whose time, I think it is fair to conclude, is over. This conclusion is sad and dispiriting but I think the valid one. Nevertheless, the journey was anything but sad and dispiriting: it took me to people’s houses, into people’s lives and pasts, into the wondrous adventure of the archive and into relationship with a story which I needed to make sense of and which I believe needed to be told.

References

- Anderson, R. and Braud, W., 2011. *Transforming Self and Others Through Research: Transpersonal Research Methods and Skills for the Human Science and Humanities*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Andrews, M., 2014. *Narrative Imagination and Everyday Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aronson, J., 1994. A pragmatic view of thematic analysis. *The Qualitative Report*, 2(1). [online] Available at: <www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/BackIssues/QR2-1/aronson.html>
- Association of Child Psychotherapists, 2014. *Training*. Available at: <<http://www.childpsychotherapy.org.uk/training>> [Accessed 17 October 2016]
- Association of Jungian Analysts, 2016. *Welcome to the Association of Jungian Analysts*. [online] Available at <www.jungiananalysts.org.uk> [Accessed 18 October 2016].
- Astor, J., 1988. A conversation with Dr Michael Fordham. *Journal of Child Psychotherapy*, 14(1), pp.3-11.
- Astor, J., 1995. *Michael Fordham. Innovations in Analytical Psychology*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Attride-Stirling, J., 2001. Thematic networks: an analytic tool for qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, 1(3), pp.385–405.
- Barker, P., 1991. *Regeneration*. London and New York: Viking.
- Barker, P., 1993. *The Eye in the Door*. London and New York: Viking.
- Barker, P., 1995. *The Ghost Road*. London and New York: Viking.
- Bertaux, D. and Bertaux-Wiame, I., 1981. Artisanal bakery in France. How it lives and why it survives.. In: F. Bechhofer and B. Elliott, eds., *The Petite Bourgeoisie. Comparative Studies of the Uneasy Stratum*. London: Macmillan. pp. 155–181.
- Beyers, L., 2006. Review: Jane Elliot (2005). Using Narrative in Social Research, Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, [e-journal] 7(2), Art. 19, <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0602192>.
- Bion, W.R., 1961. *Experiences in Groups and Other Papers*. Reprint 2001. London: Brunner-Routledge.
- Boston Change Process Study Group, 2016. *Boston Change Process Study Group* [online] Available at: <www.changeprocess.org> [Accessed 19 October 2016].

Boyatzis, R.E., 1998. *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks,: Sage.

Braud, W. and Anderson, R., 1998. *Transpersonal Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V., 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), pp.77–101.

British Library, 2016. *National Life Stories*. [online] Available at: <<http://www.bl.uk/projects/national-life-stories>> [Accessed 17 October 2016].

British Psychotherapy Foundation, n.d, *Child and Adolescent. The Independent Psychoanalytic Child and Adolescent Psychotherapy Association (IPCAPA)*. [online] Available at: <<http://www.britishpsychotherapyfoundation.org.uk/Pages/Trainings/Child-and-Adolescent>> [Accessed 17 October 2016].

Bruner, J., 1986. *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J., 1990. *Meaning Making Stories. Law, Literature, Life* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

C. G. Jung Club London, 2015. *C.G. Jung Club London*. [online] Available at <www.jungclub-london.org> [Accessed 17 October 2016].

Catty, J., ed., 2016. *Short-term Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy for Adolescents with Depression: A Treatment Manual*. London: Karnac.

Cavalli, A., Hawkins, L., and Stevns, M., eds., 2013. *Transformation: Jung's Legacy and Clinical Work Today*. London: Karnac.

Chambers, V., 2008. Lost Hospitals of London. West End Hospital for Neurology and Neurosurgery. [website] Available at: <<http://www.ezitis.myzen.co.uk/westend.html>> [Accessed 18 October 2016].

Charmaz, K., 2006. *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. London: Sage.

Crace, J., 2007. Jerome Bruner: The lesson of the story. *The Guardian* [online] 27 March. Available at: <<https://www.theguardian.com/education/2007/mar/27/academicexperts.highereducationprofile>> [Accessed 16 October 2016].

Creswell, J., 1998. *Qualitative inquiry and research design. Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Creswell, J., 2008. *The Selection of Research Design* available: <http://documents.mx/documents/the-selection-of-research-design.html>

- Creswell, J.W., 2009. *Research Design. Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Davidson, D., 1996. The Jungian child analytic training: an historical perspective. *Journal of Child Psychotherapy*, 22(1), pp.38-48.
- Davidson, D., 1986. The child analytic training, 1960-1985: the first quarter century. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 31(3), pp.213-222.
- Davies, M. and Urban, E., 1996. Fordham and the Society of Analytical Psychology infant observations: an interview with Gianna Williams. *Journal of Child Psychotherapy*, 22(1), pp.49-63.
- Davis, M., 1991. Play and symbolism in Lowenfeld and Winnicott. *Free Associations*, 2(3), pp 395-421.
- Edmunson, M., 2007. *The Death of Sigmund Freud. Fascism, Psychoanalysis and the Rise of Fundamentalism*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Elliot, J., 2005. *Using Narrative in Social Research. Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. London: Sage.
- Emerson, P. and Frosh, S., 2004. *Critical Narrative Analysis in Psychology: A Guide to Practice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fonagy, P., Rost, F. Carlyle, J. McPherson, S., Thomas, R., Fearon, P., Goldberg, D, and Taylor, D., 2015. Pragmatic randomized controlled trial of long-term psychoanalytic psychotherapy for treatment-resistant depression: the Tavistock Adult Depression Study (TADS) *World Psychiatry* 14(3), pp.312–321.
- Fordham, M., 1946. Analytical psychology applied to children. *The Nervous Child* 5(2)
- Fordham, M., 1947. Integration and disintegration and early ego development. *The Nervous Child* 6(3)
- Fordham, F., 1953. *An Introduction to Jung's Psychology*. London: Penguin.
- Fordham, M., 1958. Individuation and Ego Development. *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 3, pp.115-130
- Fordham, M., 1974. Defences of the self. *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 19(2), pp.192-199.
- Fordham, M., Gordon, R., Hubback, J. and Lambert, K., 1976. *The Self and Autism*. London: William Heinemann Medical Books.
- Fordham, M., 1993. *The Making of an Analyst*. London: Free Association Books.
- Fraher, A. L., 2004. *A history of group study and psychodynamic organizations*.

London: Free Association Books.

Frisch, M., 1990. *A Shared Authority: Essays on the Craft and Meaning of Oral and Public History*. New York: SUNY Press.

Gee, H., (1996). Developing insight through supervision: Relating, then defining. *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 41: 529-552

Gee, J. P., 1999. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. London and New York: Routledge.

Giorgi, A., ed., 1985. *Phenomenology and Psychological Research*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.

Glaser, B. and Strauss, A., (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine.

Grele, R., 1998. Movement without aim: methodological and theoretical problems in oral history. In: R. Perks and A. Thomson, eds., 1998 *The Oral History Reader*. London: Routledge. pp.38-52.

Grix, J., 2001. *Demystifying Postgraduate Research: From MA to PhD*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press.

Harrison, A., 1989. Oral history: the pathway to a people's cultural memory. *Oral History in New Zealand*, 2, pp.1-4.

Hubback, J., 2003. *From Dawn to Dusk*. Wilmette, IL: Chiron Publications.

Joffe, H. and Yardley, L., 2004. Content and thematic analysis. In: D.F. Marks and L. Yardley, eds., 2004. *Research methods for clinical and health psychology* London: Sage. pp.56-68.

Judah, B., 2016. *This is London*. London: Picador.

Jung, C.G., 1970; *Collected Works*, Volume 10 p: 317; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Jung, C.G., 1933. *Modern Man in Search of a Soul* Translated from German by W.S. Dell and C.F. Baines. Reprint 2001. London: Routledge.

Kalsched, D.E., 2015. Revisioning Fordham's 'Defences of the Self' in light of modern relational theory and contemporary neuroscience. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 60(4), pp.477-496.

Kalsched, D.E., 1996. *The Inner World of Trauma: Archetypal Defences of The Personal Spirit*. London and New York: Routledge.

Kerr, J., 1993. *A Most Dangerous Method: The Story of Jung, Freud, and Sabina Spielrein*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf

King, P. & Steiner, R. (eds), 1990. *The Freud-Klein Controversies 1941-45*. London: Routledge.

Klein, M., 1955. The Psychoanalytic Play Technique. *American Orthopsychiatric Association* Volume 25, Issue 2 April 1955 Pages 223–237. Republished in *Envy and Gratitude* 1997 Vintage Books

Labov, W., 2010. *Oral Narratives of Personal Experience* [pdf] Available at: <http://www.ling.upenn.edu/~wlabov/Papers/FebOralNarPE.pdf>. Also published in Cambridge Encyclopedia of the Language Sciences: Labov, W., 2011. Narratives of personal experience. In: Hogan, P.C., ed. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the Language Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp 546-548.

Labov, W. and Waletzky, J. (1967) Oral versions of personal experience. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 7(1-4), pp.3-38.

Lawler, S., 2002. Narrative in social research. In: May, T., ed., 2002. *Qualitative Research in Action* London: Sage.pp.242-258.

Leichsenring, F., and Rabung, S., 2011. Long-term psychodynamic psychotherapy in complex mental disorders: Update of a meta-analysis. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 199(1), pp.15-22.

Leichsenring, F., and Rabung, S., 2008. Effectiveness of long-term psychodynamic psychotherapy. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 300(13), pp.1551-1565.

Lieberman, A., 1984. Introduction. In: Propp, V., *Theory and History of Folklore*. Ed. Anatoly Lieberman. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984. pp.ix-lxxxii.

Lowenfeld, M., 1936. *Play in childhood* . Reprint 1991. London and New York: Mac Keith Press.

Main, S., 2008. *Childhood Re-imagined: Images and Narratives of Development in Analytical Psychology*. Hove and New York: Routledge.

McLeod, J., 1997 *Narrative and Psychotherapy* . London: Sage

McWhinnie, T., 1997. Missing the point: oral history and historians. *Oral History in New Zealand*. 8/9, pp.8-10.

Merton, R.K., 1975. Thematic analysis in science: Notes on Holton's concept. *Science*, 188(4186), pp.335–338.

Midgley, N., 2007. Anna Freud: the Hampstead War Nurseries and the role of the direct observation of children for psychoanalysis. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 88(4), pp.939-959.

Miller, L. Rustin, M., Rustin, M. and Shuttleworth, J., eds., 1989. *Closely Observed Infants*. London: Duckworth.

Moyer, J., 1999. *Step-by-Step Guide to Oral History* [online] Available at: <http://dohistory.org/on_your_own/toolkit/oralHistory.html> [Accessed 24 October 2016].

Moore, N. Salter, A. Stanley, L. and Tamboukou, M., (in press). *The Archive Project: Archival Research in the Social Sciences*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Oxford Centre for Life-Writing, n.d. *What is Life-Writing?* [online] Available at: <www.oxlifewriting.wordpress.com/about/what-is-life-writing/> [Accessed 16 October 2016].

Passerini, L., 2003. Memories between silence and forgetting, In K. Hodgkin and S. Radstone, eds., *Contested Pasts: the Politics of Memory* London: Routledge,

Perks, R. and Thomson, A., eds., 2006. *The Oral History Reader*. Second edition. London: Routledge.

Personal Narratives Group, ed., 1989. *Interpreting Women's Lives: Feminist Theory and Personal Narratives*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Phillips, A., 1988. *Winnicott*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pigeon, N. and Henwood, K., 1996. Grounded theory: theoretical background. In: Richardson, T.E., ed., *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods for Psychology and the Social Sciences*. Leicester: British Psychological Society. pp 75-85.

Portelli, A., 2003. *The Order Has Been Carried Out: History, Memory and Meaning of a Nazi Massacre in Rome*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pretorius, I., 2010. From the Hampstead War Nurseries to the Anna Freud Centre. In: Malberg, N.T. and Raphael-Leff, J., eds., 2010. *The Anna Freud Tradition: Lines of Development—Evolution of Theory and Practice over the Decades*. London: Karnac. pp.30-37.

Prior, L., 2003. *Using Documents in Social Research*. London: Sage.

Proner, B. and Davidson, M., 1999. Obituaries. Jane Bunster. *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 44(4), pp.573-578.

Propp, V., 1968. *The Morphology of the Folktale*. Translated by L. Scott. Revised and edited by L.A. Wagner. Reprint 1990. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Riessman, C.K., 2005. Narrative analysis. In: Kelly, N., Horrocks, C., Milnes, K., Roberts, B. and Robinson, D., *Narrative, Memory and Everyday Life*. [e-book] Huddersfield, University of Huddersfield., pp. 1-7. Available at: <<http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/4920/>> [Accessed: 24 October 2016].

Reissman, C.K., 2008. *Narrative Methods for the Human Sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage.

- Ricoeur, P., 1984, 1985, 1988. *Time and Narrative* Translated from French by Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer. 3 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rustin, M., 2001. *Reason and Unreason*. London and New York: Continuum.
- Rustin, M., 2003. Research in the consulting room. *Journal of Child Psychotherapy*, 29(2), pp.137-145.
- Rustin, M., 2014. Research on the couch: single-case studies, subjectivity and scientific knowledge. *Journal of Child Psychotherapy*, 40(1), pp.118-126.
- Scott, J., 1990. *A Matter of Record*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Shedler, J., 2010. The efficacy of psychodynamic psychotherapy. *American Psychologist* 65(2), pp.98-109.
- Slobodin, R., 1997. *W. H. R. Rivers: Pioneer Anthropologist, Psychiatrist of The Ghost Road* 2nd edition. Stroud: Sutton Publishing.
- Smith, G., 2008. *The Making of Oral History: Sections 1-2* [online] Available at: <http://www.history.ac.uk/makinghistory/resources/articles/oral_history.html> [Accessed 24 October 2016].
- Stephen, L., 1898. *Studies of a Biographer*. [e-book] London: Duckworth. Available at: <<https://archive.org/details/studiesofabiogra01stepiala>> [Accessed 24 October 2016].
- Stewart, J., 2009. The scientific claims of British child guidance, 1918-45. *British Journal for the History of Science*, 42(3), pp.407-432.
- Strauss, A. and Corbin, J., 1990. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tamboukou, M., 2011. Archive pleasures or whose time is it? *Frum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research* [e-journal] 12(3), Article 1. Available at: <<http://roar.uel.ac.uk/1319/1/Tamboukou.pdf>> [Accessed 24 October 2016].
- Tamboukou, M., 2016. Feeling narrative in the archive: the question of serendipity *Qualitative Research* 16(2), pp.151-166.
- Thompson, P. 1988. *The Voice of the Past*, second edition. Oxford University Press
- Tuckett, A.G., 2005. Applying thematic analysis theory to practice: A researcher's experience. *Contemporary Nurse*, 19(1-2), pp.75-87.
- Turnbull, A., 2000. Collaboration and censorship in the oral history interview. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 3(1), pp.15-34.

Urban, E., 1996. Michael Fordham, Children as Individuals, London: Free Association Books, 1994. *Journal of Child Psychotherapy*, 22(1), pp.153-156.

Urwin, C., 2004. Lowenfeld, Margaret Frances Jane (1890–1973), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* [online] Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available at: < [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/60993> [Accessed 24 October 2016].

Urwin, C. and Hood-Williams, J., eds., 1988. *Child Psychotherapy, War and the Normal Child: Selected Papers of Margaret Lowenfeld*. London: Free Association Books.

Winnicott, D., 1953. Transitional objects and transitional phenomena, *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 34, pp. 89-97

William, G., 1997. *Internal Landscapes and Foreign Bodies: Eating Disorders and Other Pathologies*. London: Karnac.

www.search.wellcomelibrary.org/iii/encore/record/C__Rb1970021__Smichael%20fordham%20society%20of%20analytical%20psychology__Orightresult__U__X1?lang=eng&suite=cobalt

www.freud.org.uk/education/topic/40053/anna-freud/

Appendices

Appendix i:

Description from the Wellcome Library website of the Michael Fordham archive available at the Wellcome Library:

Imprint: 1905-1997

Physical description: 21 boxes, 5 o/s folders

Arrangement:

- A. Personal and biographical material
- B. Published and unpublished writing
- C. C. G. Jung
 - C.1 Correspondence of MF and FF with C. G. and Emma Jung
 - C.2 Editing the Collected Works
 - C.3 'Jungiana'
- D. Society of Analytical Psychology
 - D.1 SAP general
 - D.2 Child Analysis Training
- E. Organisations, institutions, journals
- F. Correspondence with colleagues
 - F.1 Individuals
 - F.2 Grouped correspondence
- G. Infant Observation
- H. Reference materials by others
- J. Materials relating to Michael Fordham from friends and colleagues

Some apparent anomalies and inconsistencies of filing were corrected.

Collection record level. This archive record describes a grouping of orderable items: to order any of them for consultation, order copies or view them if they have been digitised, navigate down the archive hierarchy to Item level.

Reference: PPFOR

Note: Wellcome Library; GB.

Credits: Fordham, Michael. Fordham, Frieda (nee Hoyle)

Summary

Papers of noted Jungian analyst Michael Fordham., with some papers of his second wife, Frieda Fordham, formerly Hoyle, also an analytical psychotherapist. They include his correspondence with C. G. Jung over a period of several decades and files relating to his work as co-editor of Jung's published Collected Works, material on the Society of

Analytical Psychology (of which Michael Fordham was one of the founders), correspondence with colleagues, and files relating to the infant observation courses at the Tavistock Clinic with which Michael Fordham became involved in later life. There is also a good deal on the evolution of Michael Fordham's ideas, both in his own published and unpublished writings, and in the annotated research material. There is much less surviving material relating to Frieda Fordham's life and career, apart from a substantial amount of correspondence from the years immediately preceding their marriage (PP/FOR/A.3/2), and a few published and unpublished papers (PP/FOR/B.9).

Language: In English, French and German.

Provenance: These papers were formerly in the possession of Michael Fordham's son, Max Fordham

Note: These papers were given to the Wellcome Library in July 2002 and April 2004 by Max Fordham and James Astor, MF's executors 1068 1233
Some duplicate items, and some routine personal administration items, were weeded

Access :

Early unpublished drafts of MF's autobiography may only be consulted with permission of his Literary Executors. The following files are restricted: F.1/13 until 1 Jan 2081, all the files in G.2 for 100 years, G.3/1, 3. and 4 for 100 years. These may be made available following completion of an application to consult restricted materials. The following files are closed: D.2/9 until 1 Jan 2083, F.1/19/1 until 1 Jan 2074, F.2/4 until 1 Jan 2074, G.3/2 until 1 Jan 2075 Certain restrictions apply.

Reproduction conditions

Images are supplied for private research only at the Archivist's discretion. Please note that material may be unsuitable for copying on conservation grounds. Researchers who wish to publish material must seek copyright permission from the copyright owner.

Copyright: Executors of Michael Fordham

For the purposes of my research I used documents housed in sections numbered PP/FOR/D1; PP/FOR/D2; PP/FOR/E; PP/FOR/F; PP/FOR/G.

Appendix ii

As requested, those interviewed for the project were:-

1. James Astor
2. Maria Berger
3. Mary Boston
4. Pauline Cohen
5. Beta Copley
6. Dilys Daws
7. Juliet Hopkins
8. Shirley Hoxter
9. Anne Hurry
10. Margaret Hurst
11. Hansi Kennedy
12. Dolly Lush
13. Donald Meltzer
14. Nicky Model
15. Eileen Orford
16. Edna O'Shaugnessy
17. Pat Radford
18. Anne-Marie Sandler
19. Anne Syz
20. Lydia Tischler
21. Isca Wittenberg
22. Margarita Wood

If you have any further questions, then do not hesitate to contact me.

Emily Hewitt
Oral History & National Life Stories
The British Library
96 Euston Road
London
020 7412 7404
emily.hewitt@bl.uk
www.bl.uk/oralhistory

Appendix iii:

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

The child analytic tradition of the Society of Analytical Psychology – birth, death and beyond.

Doctoral thesis being carried out by Melissa Midgen as part of Professional Doctorate in Child and Adolescent Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy

Name:

Position:

Contact details:

I, _____, confirm that I have received a participant information sheet and understand the aims, scope and nature of this project.

I have agreed voluntarily to participate in the project, to be interviewed by Melissa Midgen and for that interview to be audio-recorded. I am aware that I can withdraw from this study at any time of my choosing.

I confirm that I do not give my permission for this recording, in part or whole, to be broadcast, placed on the internet or made use of for anything other than the specific research of Melissa Midgen and her Doctoral thesis.

I confirm that the transcript of this interview, in part or whole, may only be used by Melissa Midgen for her research and thesis and may not be published or made use of without my express consent.

I am aware that I can opt for anonymity or I can choose to be identified.

Signed:

Dated:

Participant Information Sheet

The child analytic tradition of the Society of Analytical Psychology – birth, death and beyond

The aim of this project is to record a history of the creation, development and continuing practice of the child analytic training of the Society of Analytical Psychology.

My interest in so doing is to ensure for posterity this history and to reflect in writing the memories, thoughts and reflections of those people involved. I will collate those memories into a coherent narrative to reflect both the factual background and the subjective experience of those involved in this undertaking.

There is no such comprehensive history currently written and it is important to document this history while those senior practitioners and chief actors in the organisation are still available for interview and reflection. This history and analysis of the factors leading to the creation and eventual demise of the training has implications for thinking about training and organisational issues in general. I hope to track the development of the training within the SAP alongside the theoretical innovations Michael Fordham introduced and the interplay between these two things.

It would, in addition, be a contribution to the existing literature examining and locating Jungian and post-Jungian and the theoretical ideas of Michael Fordham thought into the wider psychoanalytic discourse as it pertains to work with children. This will include an assessment of Michael Fordham's and the SAP's contribution to the development of child psychotherapy in general.

This project has been approved as appropriate research for a doctoral thesis by the University of East London and the Tavistock and Portman NHS Trust. The thesis forms part of the Professional Doctorate in Child and Adolescent Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy being carried out under the auspices of those two institutions.

In order to research this project I will be accessing archival material, undertaking literature research and also interviewing key people involved in the creation and development of the child training at the SAP.

Your participation would involve an audio-recorded interview at a time and location convenient to you. You would bear no expense. You would have the opportunity to withdraw at any time. You will also have the opportunity to view the transcript and make retractions at that time.

The data gathered will be stored in accordance with university guidelines and if you have any concerns regarding any aspect of this project then you can contact the University at researchethics@uel.ac.uk

Thank you for considering participating in this project.

Melissa Midgen (mail@mjmidgen.co.uk)

Appendix iv:

THE SOCIETY OF ANALYTICAL PSYCHOLOGY

1 Daleham Gardens, London, NW3 5BY.

The buying of 1 Daleham Gardens, London, N.W.3.

A Working Party of the S.A.P., under the chairmanship of Jane Knight, had been looking for suitable property for some time. The main problem being to find a property in which the local authority would allow us to see patients. We had looked at a few properties but they were mostly unsuitable. The Institute of Group Analysis had tried to buy 1 Daleham Gardens on their own, but in January 1981 the Jewish Welfare Board, the then owners, rejected the I.G.A.'s offer of £150,000. In January 1982 Adele Mitwoch, of the I.G.A., approached Alison Lyons, of the Society of Analytical Psychology, with the idea of the two organisations buying the house. The cost at that time was reckoned to be about £260,000 and that repairs would cost about £150,000. Also at that time, it was proposed that the I.G.A would pay/own 33% and the S.A.P. pay/own 66%. (Finally the percentages were I.G.A = 55% and S.A.P. = 45%. See letter of agreement dated 12th October 1982.)

In February 1982 Alison Lyons set up an S.A.P. Working Party to help with the work and to try to clarify the I.G.A.'s position as presented by Adele Mitwoch. The first meeting of the S.A.P. House Working Party met on 20th February 1982. The Working Party consisted of Alison Lyons, Ann Cannon, Jane Knight, Derek Linker, Mara Sidoli, and myself, Hugh Gee. I was elected chairman.

Soon after February 1982 our joint offer of £220,000 was accepted and the surveyor started to survey the house.

On 14th March 1982 the two Working Parties met: five from the S.A.P. and three from the I.G.A. Adele Mitwoch gave a verbal report of the surveyor's findings which were, at that time, incomplete. We also discussed whether to form a Trust or Company (see minutes), Industrial Development Loan (see minutes), and the division of the house. Originally we said that we would have the room on the ground floor, first left as you come into the front door, but the I.G.A. decided that they could afford to pay a greater percentage which would enable them to have all of the ground floor. It was agreed that we would have use of the main meeting room on the ground floor. - Following this meeting we exchanged letters agreeing to the percentages and the division of space.

Background history of the House:

The House was built in the 1880's. It was used as a private residence until 1954 when permission was granted for its use as a residential home. In 1970 approval was granted for the flat roof extension for use as a kitchen and dining room. In March 1981 conditional permission was obtained for the use of the property for group therapy and in September 1982 this was

extended to cover individual psychotherapy. In early 1988 the street was included in the Fitzjohn's Netherhall Conservation Area.

Cost of 1 Daleham Gardens NW3 5BY

Purchase Price:	£220,000
less payment by I.G.A.	£121,000

Payment by S.A.P. for house:	£99,000
Improvements:	£ 3,849
	£71,969

Total cost of house to S.A.P.:	£174,818
--------------------------------	----------

Dilapidations on 30 Devonshire Place:	£22,500
Removal costs:	£ 1,780
Security expenses	£ 1,176

Total cost of moving:	£25,456
-----------------------	---------

Total expenses:	£174,818
	£ 25,456
	<u>£200,274</u>

Thus: S.A.P. paid £99,000 (45% of total price) and the
I.G.A. paid £121,000 (55% of total price)

Maintenance of 1 Daleham Gardens NW3 5BY

“4. (d) The cost of all structural repairs (except those referred to in Sub-clause (b) above) and the service charges specified in the two said leases (except those referred to in Sub-clause (c) above) shall be contributed by the parties hereto in the following proportions *videlicet*: SAP 48%: IGA 52%.” (See item 4 (d) of the ‘Letter of Agreement’ between the S.A.P. and the I.G.A. dated 12th October 1982)

Hugh Gee

Appendix v:

Mrs. Newton's Statement

July 5th 1975

Our purpose today is to gain as much mutual understanding as we can on the issues raised by the possibility of a separate training. As we are all speaking for ourselves, rather than as representatives of a group, I should make my position clear. I feel that two Jungian trainings in London, would have many destructive aspects, and I am hoping that we can use the time today, to see if such a split is essential, or if it would not be possible to have an umbrella such as the Institute of Psychoanalysis, and have a central body with different sections. Gerhard has been telling us of the differences he sees between his own group and the S.A.P. and of course there is a difference in emphasis. My own hope is, that we find there is sufficient common ground to be able to communicate usefully about differences. If we are to do this it would seem important to make sure that we fully understand what the true differences are. I feel that these have become overlaid, and to some extent distorted, by misunderstandings, and misperceived differences.

I don't want to go into the historical background of the present situation, except to say that as far as I understand it, personality clashes, as well as theoretical differences were involved. It seems important to acknowledge this, in order to make certain that past personality clashes don't blur present issues. This brings me to the theme of some of the destructive aspects of forming two separate training groups. Mutual shadow projections of each group on to the other, is one difficulty. If we were under one roof we would be in a better position to work these through. If we are split, the inevitable division between "us" and "them" and the block generalisations which occur from both sides about "them" are unlikely to shift. Block generalisations almost always involve some elements of misconception. I have already experienced this and I expect members of Gerhard's group will have done so too. One feels misperceived and landed with misleading labels, which one hears about second hand, and therefore cannot confute. To give an example, I feel totally misunderstood and misperceived when I find that I have been referred to as a "Kleinian" Jungian. My understanding of Klein is that she leaves out a dimension of experience which I would think of as stemming from the self; her conceptualisation of development in terms of part object relations omits the images and experience of "wholeness", the dynamic of the self. I find this theme a crucial framework, and can only use Klein's concepts on primitive ego defences, and the depressive position in this context. Other block generalisations which I have heard around are - The S.A.P. don't regard archetypes as central; they don't use dreams; they are too reductive; Gerhard's group are the only "true" Jungians. This has the implication that the S.A.P. do not regard Jung as the central mainspring of their work. As I have already said, as far as I am concerned this is not true, and I think all these generalisations are arguable themes, with a very large element of misconception. This sort of labelling might not matter much amongst ourselves, however, mis-perceived, if we are in touch and can argue it out within a personal exchange. If, however, there are two Jungian trainings, and candidates, who know little about the complexities, are having to chose between them, it becomes a much more serious matter.

This brings me to the broad perspective I would like to put forward as a framework to discussing Joe's paper. I take it that we would all agree that a central theme to us, as Jungians, is that of the individuation process and the quality of ego-self dialogue. I will postulate two polarities on this theme. On the one hand the pattern of conscious/unconscious dialogue, explored by Jung in his pioneer work on the individuation process in the second half of life. Here Jung specifically states the need for a mature ego position. At the other end of the spectrum is the self functioning in the service of ego formation, prior to the situation in which there can be a dialogue between two equal partners. Michael started work at this end of the spectrum and has constructed his theoretical schema of the self and the archetypes functioning to promote ego growth. This was an area Jung did little about after his break with Freud. He left us with a division. An implicit and at times explicit supposition that conflicts in our adult patients, belonging to infancy and development, are related to the personal unconscious and a reductive approach. Broadly speaking Jung's position, was, that it was only when infantile problems were dealt with that the archetypal reservoir in the unconscious could come fully in to play to enrich our individuality. It is this division which all Jungians have to deal with in their clinical work, and to which I imagine we are all struggling to find a synthesis. It would seem important to respect work starting from either end of the spectrum of the ego-self dialogue as a genuine attempt to further Jung's concepts. We are confronted with opposites in term of personal and collective or on another plane, between spirit and instinct. The individual balance and synthesis which we achieve will inevitably be on a wide spectrum, this will also apply to our patients who will need to be met on many levels. In so far as the integration of theory and practice is an ongoing process, our individual positions will change on the spectrum. At times we may well be in a state of considerable imbalance. In concentrating on the way in which the self and archetypes function in ego development and the transference, the S.A.P. laid themselves open to being misunderstood by other groups in terms of past patterns about this area. Not only this, some people feel that we have lost or ignored the values in Jung's work as it is demonstrated in the classical individuation process in the second half of life. I think there is something in the accusation that we have neglected some areas in Jung's work, although I do not feel that this means we have been neglecting fundamentals, and I do feel that we have achieved some new synthesis. Joe's paper illustrates this very vividly and I hope it will clear up some misconceptions and enable us to discuss true differences. In this paper, Joe integrates opposites in several spheres. I won't list out all my responses as these will come up in the discussion, but I would like to say two things now. Joe's account elucidates the central place of the self in developing experience, it is the self functioning in a "non-classical" sense. The synthesis between the spiritual theme in "wholeness" and the developmental themes of omnipotence and narcissism was very meaningful to me, as was the need for a synthetic and reductive understanding to be closely linked. This is a very individual account of Joe's attempts to synthesise his experience, and I found it very valuable. One may differ on some things, but to me it is a valid attempt to further Jung's basic thought in experience. To return to neglected areas of Jung's work, I think there is a trend in the Society at present to try and put this to rights.

In my own experience the 1971 Congress was particularly challenging and stimulating in this respect, and demonstrated the cross fertilisation that could occur between different approaches. I thought this happened mainly in the afternoon discussions, when, because there were smaller groups, people could really say what they felt and follow it up in a personal exchange. I hope today's group is not going to be too big for this.

The positive aspect of Gerhard's suggestion of a separate training is that it has been a challenge, which has galvanised new energy to understand and relate to each other. I know that various individuals have made attempts to do this ever since the rift, but perhaps a more concerted effort can achieve better results. I think that the Freud-Jung letters have a very important message for us in our present conflicts. These letters make it very clear that it is emotional loaded questions of identity, rather than theoretical issues, which cause rifts. Those struggles in which identity is at risk, may have short term gains in deepening knowledge, however, if they are not resolved they lead to hardening defensive attitudes which narrow growth. It may be that owing to past hurts, wrongs and misunderstandings, leading protagonists in our present situation, who have values which they have evolved in different areas of experience, may feel that they can no longer usefully communicate, but does this mean that we all have to split on the same issues? In my opinion separate trainings would make it very difficult not to do so. Are there not many individuals amongst us who do not want to identify with polarities, or become identified in a fixed area of the spectrum. If we agree that we respect each other as Jungians, I see many advantages of one training body with separate sections. If it were possible to go ahead on these lines, I think it would emerge that there are three groups. A middle group would seem to have a vital role to play. Separate trainings would seem to me a retrograde step and a set back to the integrative endeavour I have been discussing, not only for the present but for some time to come in terms of the future of trainees.

DR. ADLER'S STATEMENT

July 1975

In Dr. Bosanquet's letter of May 6th in which she suggested a meeting between the SAP and "my" group, she also asked for a statement of the plans for this group. She suggested three points around which the discussion of this meeting should centre.

I would like to concentrate on point 3: "...to consider the areas in which the main differences between our group and that of the SAP occur". This point seems to cover the crucial problem on which the answer to the first two depends.

The main difference is not one of technical subtleties but of basic ideological approach. I tried to formulate this in my paper to the 1968 Congress where I said that "We have something more than differences in method and interpretation . . . we have a basic problem . . . of fundamental divergences of approach, an epistemological problem resting on metapsychological premises. This is not merely a question of technique but the much more decisive problem of first principles."

We put the archetypal and prospective character of the unconscious into the centre of our clinical and theoretical work. Here I would like to quote what Jung wrote in a letter of 1945 (to P.W.Martin, 20.8.45): "... You are quite right, the main interest of my work is not concerned with the treatment of neuroses but rather with the approach to the numinous. But the fact is that the approach to the numinous is the real therapy and inasmuch as you attain to the numinous experiences you are released from the curse of pathology."

In a clinical and practical sense this means that we put the main emphasis on symbolic transformation. Child development is an aspect of the unfolding of the archetypes and not vice-versa. We realize that in the field of child therapy and its significance for adult life we can learn a great deal from the work of the SAP. But we also maintain that in adult analysis the experience of archetypes may take precedence over personal historical material. In our view it is in many cases possible and desirable to achieve a resolution of infantile fixations and complexes by an analysis focusing on the genuine experience of the symbolic contents of dreams.

From this it follows that we regard dream analysis as the absolutely essential and indispensable therapeutic procedure. We are, of course, fully awake to the problem of transference, but its analysis takes second place by a long distance and in its interpretation we particularly note its archetypal aspects. (I have dealt with this at some length in my book "The Living Symbol", in the chapter on the "Archetypal Aspects of Transference").

Dreams to us are the manifestation of the objective psyche, and as such full of archetypal contents. In our view one cannot expect to learn about dreams, archetypes and the living reality of the psyche through seminars, reading or any other theoretical approach. Their truth can only be discovered through experience.

Our approach differs also on the technical side which, however, is more than technical - it is symptomatic. I refer here to the problem of frequency of interviews and of couch versus

chair. We trust in the creative working of the unconscious between interviews, and believe that it is essential to allow the patient to experience the unconscious independently and outside the analytical hour, expressing the rhythm of systole and diastole. Thus we generally regard three weekly interviews as fully adequate. Regarding the couch/chair quandary we do not believe that a true dialectical process, based on the common experience of the creative unconscious and its archetypal images can take place in the couch situation. The two different situations seem to us to express two basically different attitudes to the human situation between two people.

Jung's view of the nature of the psyche covers a wide spectrum including in particular the concept of the opposites, as does his view of the nature of man formulated especially in his ideas about the Anthropos image. The individual is unique, and his life process and symbolical material are never wholly reducible in theoretical terms.

Having said all this I am aware of the difficulty of conveying the real differences in our approaches. They are only too often imponderables, expressing basic human reactions to Jung's work. They belong in the area of metapsychology, of the attitude to the numinosity of the unconscious, of the religious - in its widest sense - character of therapy, of the acceptance or rejection of the "occult" areas of Jung's work, such as synchronicity, alchemy, ESP phenomena.

Jung's concept of the reality of the psyche stands in the centre of our work and thought. We accept Jung's work in its entirety, not looking for "what is essential and what is parenthetical to his main thesis."

Perhaps it is relevant here to mention the different attitudes to the split between Freud and Jung. Whereas the general reaction of the SAP to the split is that it was a tragedy which has to be repaired, to us it appears as inevitable, necessary and creative, since these two men represented two diametrically opposed ideologies, (a view incidentally shared by Ellenberger). Here I want to quote from the editorial introduction to "AP A Modern Science", where it is stated that "... a wide variety of patients seeking aid seem to need the kind of approach that has been linked with psychoanalysis and with methods described by Jung and considered in his earlier writings to be appropriate to such cases." This seems to us simply to go back to Jung's psychoanalytical period which became quite peripheral to his later and independent concepts. Not only do we feel that this "approach that has been linked with psychoanalysis" has taken preference in the work of the SAP over Jung's truly revolutionary discoveries, but we feel that many "patients seeking aid" are much better served with the latter.

We are convinced that Jung's work is full of still unrealized potentialities for the future of therapy, and that much of what the SAP regard as progressive and ongoing is in fact a regression to pre-Jungian concepts which have to a large extent been made redundant by Jung's discoveries. Although we find much value in the work of other schools we put Jung's work absolutely and fully in the centre of our practice and theory.

To sum up, I may be allowed to quote from my presidential address to the 1974 Congress. There I talked of "the truth of the archetypal images, the dominant influence which they exert on the fate of mankind, the reality of an inner Olympus with its gods and goddesses ... the religious dignity and the relevance of the individual as the receiver and carrier of the numinous

revelation. In the centre all Jung's research we can put the search for the numinosum. All the other areas of Analytical Psychology have to be looked at from this angle.

It is only within this context that the clinical aspects of Analytical Psychology make any sense.

I hope that this necessarily brief and highly condensed statement of our approach to analytical psychology may serve as the basis for our discussion today.

Appendix vi:



CONTENTS

<i>Miranda Davies, Elizabeth Wilson</i>	1	SAP CHILD ANALYTIC TRAINING The Decision to Close the Child Analytic Training
<i>Penny Pickles</i>	5	OUTREACH Early Impressions of Moscow
<i>Jean Knox</i>	7	A Weekend with the Czech Developing Group
<i>Catherine Crowther, Jan Wiener</i>	8	Latest Treatment of the Russian Story
<i>Elizabeth Gee</i>	11	CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT Peer Supervision Groups
<i>Miriam Alcock</i>	12	Neuroscience Reading Group
<i>Jean Knox</i>	13	Workshop THE VICTIM, THE RESCUED AND RESCUER PHANTASIES
<i>Jean Knox</i>	14	JOURNAL OF ANALYTICAL PSYCHOLOGY Request for 'Readers'
<i>Miriam Alcock</i>	15	BCP The Council of Institutions of BCP
<i>Jean Steier</i>	15	LIBRARY News from the Library
	16	BOOKS Who Owns Psychoanalysis?
	17	Additions to the Library
	18	JOURNAL OF ANALYTICAL PSYCHOLOGY 50th Anniversary International Conference
	20	Booking form
	21	OBITUARY Michael Green
	22	CONTRIBUTIONS
	23	OFFICE ORGANISATION
<i>Miriam Alcock</i>		EDITORIAL POLICY & ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Disclaimer
The articles and reviews published in the Newsletter are intended for the professional use of the members of the Association and are not intended to be used for any other purpose. The Association is not responsible for any loss or damage arising from the use of the Newsletter.

SAP CHILD ANALYTIC TRAINING

The Decision to Close the Child Analytic Training

Last year the Child Analytic Training Committee informed Council of its decision to wind down the training and to close it after all the present trainees had applied for membership. The reasons for this were specified in the CAT Annual Report last November, but, given the gravity of the decision, it seems important to explain how this came about.

The post of Consultant to the CAT was created by Council following Jane Bunster's death in June 1999. The decision marked a new experiment in professionalising the training, whereby the post holder/s would work to an annual contract and be paid according to the NHS psychotherapy scale (minus benefits). Following a formal interview and appointment, we began our job-share in the spring of 2000, when four child analytic trainees were coming to the end of their first year of training with the adult analytic trainees. Neither of us had applied wanting to carry on with the role indefinitely and within our second year we had decided that we would not continue beyond seeing through the current group of trainees.

Although throughout we worked closely together, we roughly divided the tasks of the post into intramural responsibilities, carried out by Elizabeth, and extramural, handled by Miranda. Elizabeth's first task was to draw up a curriculum and find seminar leaders, while Miranda's was to link with the Training Committee of the Association of Child Psychotherapists, who set the standards and requirements for the child trainings in the UK. During the 1990s the ACP had successfully argued with the government to fund child psychotherapy training, until then the only NHS profession for which the government did not pay training costs. By 2000 funding was carried out via a limited number of paid training posts, which also provided generous allowances for private supervision and analysis, as well as training costs to the training institutions (all of which are private). As several of our trainees became post holders, Miranda costed our training, worked out a budget and saw to the details of charging the NHS consortium responsible for the all the London regional trainings.

As Elizabeth worked out a curriculum that knit together the tradition of the SAP Child Analytic Training and ACP requirements, finding willing and able seminar leaders became a matter of concern. We lacked both numbers and experience. Gianna Williams

had early on offered to help us and we were deeply grateful to have her experience for the clinical seminars that trainees attended for three years. Only two of our qualified Child Analysts worked in the NHS and we needed to offer theoretical seminars on certain aspects of clinical work, such as those on abuse, eating disorders, and borderline and psychotic disorders. These areas of work with children had developed since most of us trained and were best taught by those currently working in the NHS and experienced in those areas. Besides, it was considered a benefit to our trainees to have them introduced to various senior child psychotherapists. NHS funding allowed us to do this, as well as contribute toward the fees of the Co-Consultants and Gianna Williams.

Our dependence on non-SAP teachers was augmented by low morale as well as low numbers. Throughout the Society members felt a growing reluctance to take on organizational responsibilities and a growing resentment of doing so without pay so that these tasks fell on fewer and fewer shoulders. Nowhere was this more evident than in the Children's Section, where the teaching was basically done by three analysts. We decided it was important to expand the pool of teachers; however there were limits to what could be asked of individuals. In the three years of child analytic seminars,

child analysts led only just over a third of the ninety seminars. Altogether there were thirty-eight teachers; of these eight were child analysts, five were SAP adult analysts, two were Jungians from other institutes, and the remaining twenty-three were non-Jungians (including amongst other professionals a solicitor to teach Child Protection law). In the end, most seminar leaders taught too few seminars for them and the trainees to get to know one another.

Not only were we very dependent on external teachers but also we were dependent on our trainees having training posts so that we could fund the outside teaching. Some of the NHS clinics offering training posts had arrangements with various trainings to reserve positions for their trainees. Apart from this, in London there were about half as many posts as there were trainees applying for them and in the future the SAP training could not rely on the income we had been able to draw. Furthermore, we could not charge the NHS one sum for a post-holding trainee and another sum for non-post holders because this would have amounted to getting the Consortium to support non-post-holders. As our costs had increased because of using non-members to teach and those costs were divided between only a few trainees, any non-post holding trainee faced paying prohibitively

expensive fees of around £3,000 per year, excluding analytic and supervision fees.

As with the adult analytic trainees, non-post holders require a source of referrals in order to meet the clinical requirements of the training. Child analysts in our training have been required to analyse a mother, a pre-latency child, a latency child and an adolescent, plus six less intensive, that is, once weekly psychotherapy cases (for which group, family, parent-child therapy or other typical clinical treatment could be substituted). The C. G. Jung Child Clinic has been moribund for several years and honorary placements, which in the past have provided a source of clinical experience, are more difficult to arrange because of the time clinics now give over to trainees in training posts. Referrals for analysable mothers proved so difficult that, after a prolonged and heated discussion within the Committee, the requirement was dropped. What this means is that we are not able to provide trainees with enough clinical work unless they hold NHS training posts.

At the same time other small private trainings were having similar struggles.

This, in turn, has been in the context of anxieties experienced by the child psychotherapy profession. These have arisen in consequence

of NHS demands for evidence based practice, the trend toward short-term work, and the rapid development of other professions, especially child psychology, which profess to be able to meet these demands. In consequence, the ACP has been increasing its requirements and adding more seminars. This would necessitate our 'buying in' yet more teachers. More importantly, the rapid and comprehensive changes that now mark the NHS could not be accommodated by an organization dependent on the waning enthusiasm of members volunteering to run it. Equally important, that organization is predominated by professional concerns about work that is carried out primarily in private practice and with adults.

Scepticism has been raised about our running an NHS training, the consequence of which has been to undermine our autonomy. Forham had initially preferred to remain independent, although others involved in shaping the training saw that it was essential to become accredited by the ACP in order for members to find work because making a living from private work with children was unsustainable. A consequence of this has been that the ACP has linked us with the larger professional community and has provided a source of support and stimulation. We feel it is a privilege to be able to contribute to

the NHS mental health service, and have been gratified that we have consistently met the Association's high standards of the accreditations that have been carried out.

In our second year as Co-Consultants we pressed the Committee to consider seriously the future of the training. The child analysts met for a series of meetings with a consultant, when it became evident that we could not sustain the training. A general meeting was held with interested SAP members, who expressed concern and regret. This group made efforts to consider how the training might continue but they could not adequately address the interrelated complexity of the difficulties. More positive thinking arose from considering how aspects of the training might be held onto, such as the legacy of Fordham's model of development, the use of child analysts in the adult training, contributing to other child trainings and offering infant observations.

The training took over twenty years to establish and has lasted for thirty years. It is painful to contrast the enthusiastic hard work and drive that stimulated child analysts over that initial quarter of a century with the ambivalence and sense of defeat that have come to predominate. Having said this, Dorothy Davidson described early anxieties that centred on

'manpower, money, libido and protocol.... Those of us working with children, myself included, became increasingly doubtful about our respective capacities' (Davidson 1986, p. 215). Her reference to 'protocol' referred to the difficulties the Children's Section faced on occasions when coming up against the 'red tape', as Davidson called it, of the Society. Several matters still remain to be worked out in the process of drawing the training to a close and it will necessarily involve the Society's 'red tape'. A central concern is the position and identity of the Child Analysts within the Society. They have been expected to do Clinic work following qualification and there are complex reasons why this has not happened. This has resulted in disagreement between the Child Analysts and the Society. Some have already resigned from the Society and, should this requirement and the pressure put on individuals to meet it be kept up, then it is hard to see how others will remain.

Since becoming Co-Consultants the CAT has qualified three new child analysts and will see through the remaining trainee until she applies for membership in just over a year. SAP child analysts are teaching in a number of other trainings and MSc. programmes, including a new ten-seminar series on Fordham in the first year of the Adult Analytic Training. We look forward to events marking Fordham's

centenary and hope that something of the Child Analytic Training will survive in more than memory.

Reference

Davidson, D. (1986). 'The Child Analytic Training, 1960-1985: the first quarter century'. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 'Michael Fordham Reviewed', 31, 3, 213-22.

Miranda Davies and Elizabeth Urban
Co-Consultants to the Training

OUTREACH

Early Impressions of Moscow

The programme in Moscow is now well underway. We have 16 'routers' following the individual membership path for IAAP membership. Our candidates have a good grounding in psychoanalytic and Jungian theory. As well as the supervision weekends, some of them will need analysis with an IAAP member from outside Russia, a problem in Moscow, particularly for those who do not speak English (there is currently an English speaking IAAP analyst living there, but she cannot see everyone in the group). So continuing fund raising is essential.

By the time this is circulated, all the supervisors (Penny Pickles and Joy Schaverien, Alex Esterhuysen and Martin Schmidt, Moira Duckworth and Martin Stone) will have had two weekends in Moscow. Our last visit in May felt

very different from the winter weekends. We leave London early on a Friday morning and arrive in Moscow around 4.30 pm. The drive in from the airport has been very different on each trip; in November it was wet and dark, in February bright and snowy. In May it seemed transformed with leaves on the trees at last; there are miles of silver birch tree forests on the outskirts and once we got into town, all the little squares seemed to have large beds of scarlet tulips. On the way back out on Sunday afternoon, we could see people digging their allotment plots by their dachas. It really seemed as if Moscow had woken up from the winter. One of the members of the programme has a comfortable car and we are really pleased to see her at the airport. The alternative is taking a taxi. This is called 'taking a Lada'. Last time we were nearly asleep from the petrol fumes by the time we reached the area of Moscow where we work. Perhaps we should tell you more about what 'taking a Lada' entails. In town, the person who is accompanying us goes to the edge of the road (most of the main roads in Moscow are very wide with about four lanes of traffic going very fast in each direction) and stands at the edge of the road sticking an arm out. Very soon, what seems to be the most dilapidated car in sight screeches to a halt and negotiations begin. If the driver feels like making a detour, he (invariably), and often a

Appendix vii:

Email received on Wednesday 30th March 2016 from the ACP to its membership:

ACP News

Possible cuts to funding for child psychotherapy training

Many of you will have seen the emails sent out recently about this and outlining questions that have been asked in the House of Commons and the House of Lords, on behalf of the ACP.

To give some background, in the Autumn Statement and Spending Review 2015 the government announced that nurses, midwives and allied health professions would have to take out student loans for their training, instead of getting a bursary as in the past. In November 2015 the Chair of the ACP wrote to Health Education England (HEE) and received assurance that there were no plans to change the funding for child psychotherapy training. However, in early March, commissioners from HEE informed some of the ACP-accredited training schools to expect changes to the arrangements for the funding of child psychotherapists. This could affect the bursary for fees, the salary support, or both.

Our colleagues in Clinical Psychology had also been told that changes might be introduced affecting the post-graduate Clinical Psychology training, IAPT, and training for Clinical Scientists. We have established that it is likely to be the Department of Health (DoH) driving the possible changes and the idea appears to be tied in with the move to cut government spending. It is also in line with moves to remove costs from the NHS and contract out to 'any willing provider'. We think we can make a strong case against these possible proposals on the basis that:

- The government has only in the last year prioritized improving mental health services with the aim of putting them on a par with physical health services
- Key elements of this plan focus on improving services for children and young people, particularly those with the most complex and severe needs, as well as services for women in the peri-natal period

- These proposals if announced would have a major impact on the delivery of the mental health strategy, without a supply of skilled professionals to deliver it
- We are in a different position to nurses because our training is post-graduate and trainees come into our trainings with undergraduate debt.
- Those who do manage to take out debt or fund themselves to train will be those in a financial position to do so. The workforce will then not reflect the wide patient population that mental health services serve
- A key element of our training is the experience trainees get from being embedded in a multi-disciplinary public service environment, there is also 'service return' from funding training (trainees contribute hugely to service delivery)
- The trainings have to meet certain standards and can't be farmed out to 'alternative providers' to save money (in this regard it may help that we are now regulated by the PSA)

A briefing has been drawn up making these arguments. This has been used as the basis for our approaches to MPs, members of the House of Lords and officials in HEE and the DoH. We have had helpful responses from a number of those approached. We are very aware that our argument is much stronger if we join forces with the Clinical Psychologists and IAPT, and we have been liaising with the BPS, Clinical Psychology colleagues at UCL and those in the IAPT world on a joint strategy to make these arguments to those in government with influence over these matters.

To help us with our work we have engaged a government communications company called Public Affairs Company (PAC), recommended by colleagues at the training school in Leeds, NSCAP. With their help and through established links with some politicians, we have had two questions tabled in parliament. These have both received evasive replies but we hope they will have drawn attention to the importance of child psychotherapy and the funding for its training and ultimately the delivery of effective child mental health services. PAC are now developing a more extended case in support of child psychotherapy for us, drawing on a range of documents we assembled for them. This will be used to produce effective materials for a more public campaign if an announcement is made. Many people have collaborated on this, the ACP's working group (Chair, Chair of Training Council, Media and Comms lead and Treasurer), people in the training schools (especially Bidy Youell, Kate Robertson and Nick Waggett),

members of Training Council (especially Lydia Hartland-Rowe, Barbara Lund and Andrew Briggs), the Heads of Training and others.

We would like to thank members who have responded to our emails with suggestions and actions. We greatly appreciate any help offered and will continue to keep you informed of developments as they unfold. Any queries or further offers of help, please continue to email the team via Alison at:

editor@childpsychotherapy.org.uk

Appendix viii:

Timeline: Child Analytic Training Key Dates

1943: Michael Fordham invited to help form a professional society for Jungian analysis.

1946: Michael Fordham publishes 'Life of Childhood' and is working at Paddington Day Hospital

Late 1950s: A group of analysts begin to meet to discuss their work with children. From there an idea to set up a training is formed.

1960s: Michael Fordham is made chairman of 'Children's Section' within the SAP

1964: 'Outline of Suggestions for Training Child Analysts Working Party' published

1970: 'Outline of Training in Child Analysis' finally written

1973: Description of the training appears in the Journal of Child Psychotherapy

1973: 1st trainee: Lawrence Brown

1974: Barry Proner joins the training (with two others)

1970s: Mary Coghlan is Michael Fordham's registrar

1975: Gianna Williams begins the infant observation seminars with James Astor, Mara Sidoli, Stuart Britten, Barry Proner, John Way and Sheila Powell. Jane Bunster joins soon after. The seminars continued for 6 years.

1975: James Astor starts training

1975: Gerhard Adler leaves the SAP to form his own group

1975: Lawrence Brown completes his training

1976: There are 6 child analytic trainees

1977: Miranda Davies joins infant observation seminar: Jane Bunster and Elizabeth Urban are already participating.

1977: Jane Bunster begins training

1978: James Astor becomes a member of the SAP

1979: Michael Fordham joins the infant observation seminars ('Marathons')

1979: training granted accreditation with the Association of Child Psychotherapists

1979 – 1984: Miranda Davies trains

1979 – 1985: James Astor course tutor

1982: Miranda joins Jane Bunster at the Notre Dame clinic (both are supervised by Dorothy Davidson)

1983: Elizabeth Urban begins training (she joins 10 adult analytic trainees for her first year, then two other child analytic trainees for subsequent years)

October 1985 ('palace coup')– Michael Fordham resigns as director of training; James Astor resigns as course tutor; Dorothy Davidson resigns from child analytic training committee

1988: Elizabeth Urban qualifies as a child analyst

1989: Elizabeth Urban qualifies as an adult analyst

1991: Marica Rytovaara begins adult analytic training

14th April 1995: Death of Michael Fordham

1996- 2003: Oliver Foster trains (with three others)

16th June 1999 Jane Bunster dies

1999: Final cohort of 4 trainees start including Alessandra Cavalli (one of these four leaves to continue training with the Tavistock)

1999 to 2012: Marica Rytovaara on CAT committee

2000: Elizabeth Urban and Miranda Davies appointed as co-consultants

2000: Gianna Williams comes back to teach on the child analytic training

2004: Closing of training is announced

2004 – 2006: Final cohort qualify. Two subsequently resign their membership

2010: Oliver Foster resigns.

2012: James Astor retires from clinical work

Appendix ix

Biographies of Interviewees

James Astor is a retired training analyst of the Society of Analytical Psychology (SAP), where he was trained in both adult and child analysis. Originally a television producer he became interested in Jungian analysis in the 1960s firstly by undergoing his own personal analysis and then beginning formal training at the SAP in the 1970s. He began a long, personal and professional association with Michael Fordham becoming one of the foremost proponents of his theoretical and clinical work. James was key in the development of the child analytic training at the SAP.

Dr. Alessandra Cavalli trained as a child and an adult analyst at the Society of Analytical Psychology between 1999 and 2006. Originally from Italy she moved to the UK in 1998 to undertake these trainings. With an academic background in child pedagogy Alessandra now works in private practice offering treatment to adults and children, as well as clinical supervision. She holds a visiting lectureship position at the Tavistock Clinic and teaches and lectures internationally. She has published numerous papers in learned journals including the Journal of Analytical Psychology and The Journal of Child Psychotherapy.

Dr. Mary Coghlan, born in 1926, was a Consultant Child Psychiatrist in London as well as a training analyst (adult trained) at the Society of Analytical Psychology. She was instrumental in establishing a clinic for children at the SAP and for assisting in offering honorary placements to the earlier trainees. She became a close acquaintance of Michael Fordham's until his death. She lives in Oxford.

Miranda Davies is a retired member of the SAP where she trained in child analysis in the 1980s. With Elizabeth Urban she was co-consultant to the child training from 2000 up to its demise in 2006. During her working life she worked in Child and Adolescent Services in the NHS, as well as private practice and published numerous papers in learned journals. She played an important role in liaising between the SAP child training and its registering body The Association of Child Psychotherapists.

Oliver Foster trained at the Society of Analytical Psychology in child analysis. He is currently a Consultant Child Psychotherapist in the Royal Devon and Exeter NHS Trust as well as working privately. He has worked in various clinic and hospital settings providing therapy to children of all ages. In addition to his clinical practice he has taught on many postgraduate academic courses and therapy trainings.

Hugh Gee is a training analyst of both The Society of Analytical Society and the British Psychotherapy Foundation. After studying at Oxford he trained as a psychiatric social worker at the London School of Economics in 1964. He underwent personal analysis from 1969 and trained in adult analysis at the SAP from 1971. He held many executive positions within the Society including Chair of Council. He has written many papers including a book chapter on his experience with Donald Winnicott. Hugh continues to work clinically in private practice in Bath.

Dr. Barry D. Proner has been a Supervising and Training Analyst of the Society of Analytical Psychology since 1988. He was trained originally as a psychiatrist and a child psychiatrist at Harvard Medical School in the USA and came to England in 1972 to train at the SAP in both Child and Adolescent and Adult Analytical Psychology working closely with Michael Fordham. He has published, taught and lectured extensively. He is in private practice in London.

Marica Rytovaara is a training analyst for the Society of Analytical Psychology and the Association of Child Psychotherapists (ACP). She is a full-time Consultant in Adolescent Psychotherapy in an adolescent inpatient unit (NHS) in London. Marica has written several articles about adolescence and teaches widely. She received the Michael Fordham Prize 2010 for 'The transcendent function in adolescence: miracle cures and bogeymen'.

Dr. Elizabeth Urban is an SAP training analyst and member of the Association of Child Psychotherapists. She was co-organiser to the Child Analytic Training at the SAP before it closed in 2006 and continues as a training supervisor for psychoanalytic work with children. She has a long standing interest in Fordham's model of development and has a special interest in early development. Until recently she worked with infants and parents in an NHS psychiatric in-patient mother-baby unit. She holds a long-

standing interest in, and has published a number of papers on Fordham's model and early development, and the contribution of developmental and neurological research to our understanding. She works in private practice with adults and supervises child psychotherapists.

Gianna Williams is a child and an adult analyst, trained at both The Tavistock Centre and The Institute of Psychoanalysis. She is one of the most senior child psychotherapists currently working and has published highly regarded books and articles. She has taught the method of Infant Observation in Italy, France, Mexico, Ecuador, Turkey, Argentina. She has specialised in eating disorders and has published extensively on this subject. She has been for many years co-consultant at the Tavistock Clinic for the training of child psychotherapists.

Dr Judith Woodhead trained in adult analysis at the Society of Analytical Society and has worked for many years in private practice with adults. Alongside this she was a consultant parent-infant psychotherapist at the Anna Freud Centre in London until her retirement from there in 2012. This cutting edge work formed the subject of her doctoral thesis entitled, 'The Emergence of the infant self in parent-infant psychotherapy'.

The ongoing status of the recorded interviews is yet to be finalised. They were permitted by the interviewees on the basis of the content being used for the sole purpose of this thesis. Negotiations are ongoing with each individual about whether, and if so how, they might be kept in their entirety for posterity; perhaps joining the archive at the Wellcome Collection or the Oral History Project at The British Library.

Appendix x

Amplification on Hugh Gee's point (page 63) regarding Jung pre-figuring Melanie Klein's projective identification:

As soon as the dialogue between two people touches on something fundamental, essential, and numinous, and a certain rapport is felt, it gives rise to a phenomenon which Lévy-Bruhl fittingly called participation mystique. It is an unconscious identity in which two individual psychic spheres interpenetrate to such a degree that it is impossible to say what belongs to whom. (Jung, C.W.,1958. Vol.10 p.852.)

From Hugh Gee (1996, pp 545-546):

In looking at the origins of this profound level of relationship, it is interesting to read Jung's views on *participation mystique*, which he also refers to as *unconscious identity*. "The further we go back into history, the more we see personality disappearing beneath the wrappings of collectivity. And if we go right back to primitive psychology, we find absolutely no trace of the concept of an individual. Instead of individuality we find only collective relationship or what Lévy-Bruhl calls *participation mystique*. The collective attitude hinders the recognition and evaluation of a psychology different from the subject's, because the mind that is collectively oriented is quite incapable of thinking and feeling in any other way than by projection." (Jung, 1921). Regarding *unconscious identity* Jung's definition is: "To put it briefly, it means *a state of identity in mutual unconsciousness*." (Jung, 1927-31).

The reader will note that I prefer 'unconscious identity' to Klein's concept of 'projective-identification'. I make this choice because I believe that the sharing that I am trying to describe includes the characteristics of the archetypal world and therefore involves deeper levels of unconsciousness than are conveyed by the concept of 'projective-identification'. (Fordham (1993) once stated that he saw the 'collective unconscious' as being at a deeper level of unconsciousness than 'unconscious identity', and that, in turn, 'unconscious identity' is at a deeper level than 'projective-identification'.) It is also the case that Jung's concept of unconscious identity involves *mutual* unconsciousness, and unlike Klein's concept it does not place the emphasis on pathology. In relation to the process that I am describing, I

cannot follow Klein, who as part of her description of 'projective-identification' says, 'the ego takes possession by projection' (Klein 1952). In the generation of insight out of a state of unconscious identity, it seems to me that it is the *self* that projects the function of the ego into the object. However, this may be another difference between projective-identification and unconscious identity.



14 March 2013

Dear Melissa,

Project Title:	The Child Analytic Tradition of the Society of Analytical Psychology – Birth, Death and Beyond
Researcher(s):	Melissa Midgen
Principal Investigator:	Barbara Harrison

I am writing to confirm that the application for the aforementioned proposed research study received ethical approval at the meeting of University Research Ethics Committee (UREC) on **Wednesday 6 March 2013**.

Should any significant adverse events or considerable changes occur in connection with this research project that may consequently alter relevant ethical considerations, this must be reported immediately to UREC. Subsequent to such changes an Ethical Amendment Form should be completed and submitted to UREC.

Approved Research Site

I am pleased to confirm that the approval of the proposed research applies to the following research site.

Research Site	Principal Investigator / Local Collaborator
UEL Fieldwork	Barbara Harrison



Approved Documents

The final list of documents reviewed and approved by the Committee is as follows:

Document	Version	Date
Consent Form	1.0	6 February 2013
Participant Information Sheet	1.0	6 February 2013

Approval is given on the understanding that the [UEL Code of Good Practice in Research](#) is adhered to.

With the Committee's best wishes for the success of this project.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Merlin Harries', is written over a light blue horizontal line.

Merlin Harries
University Research Ethics Committee (UREC)
Quality Assurance and Enhancement
Telephone: 0208-223-2009
Email: researchethics@uel.ac.uk