

TIME PRESENT AND TIME PAST



SELECTED PAPERS OF
PEARL KING

TIME PRESENT
AND
TIME PAST



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

TIME PRESENT AND TIME PAST

Selected Papers of Pearl King

Pearl King

Foreword by
Brett Kahr

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2005 by Karnac Books Ltd.

Published 2018 by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017, USA

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Extracts on p. xvii from “Little Giddings” and on p. 97 from “East Coker” reprinted by permission from T. S. Eliot, *Four Quartets* (1949). In: *Collected Poems: 1909–1962*. London: Faber & Faber, 1969.

Copyright © 2005 by Pearl King

Foreword copyright © 2005 by Brett Kahr
Introduction copyright © 2005 by Ken Robinson

The rights of Pearl King to be identified as the author of this work have been asserted in accordance with §§ 77 and 78 of the Copyright Design and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Notice:

Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A C.I.P. for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 9781855759251 (pbk)

Edited, designed, and produced by Communication Crafts

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
ABOUT THE AUTHORS	ix
FOREWORD	
<i>Brett Kahr</i>	xi
Introduction to Pearl King and her work	
<i>Ken Robinson</i>	1

PART I

A psychoanalyst at work—clinical issues

1	Change: the psychoanalysis of a four-year-old boy and its follow-up	15
2	Experiences of success and failure as essential to the process of development	41
3	The curative factors in psychoanalysis	53
4	The therapist–patient relationship	59

- 5 On a patient's unconscious need to have "bad parents" 67
- 6 The affective response of the analyst
to the patient's communications 88

PART II
Psychoanalysis and the life cycle

- 7 Sexuality and the narcissistic character 101
- 8 "For age is opportunity no less than youth itself" 111
- 9 The life cycle as indicated by the nature
of the transference in the psychoanalysis
of the middle-aged and elderly 135
- 10 On becoming an ageing psychoanalyst 148
- 11 "In age I bud again"—achievements and hazards
in the analysis of older patients 155

PART III
Understanding the psychoanalytic process

- 12 Alienation and the individual 169
- 13 Time and a sense of identity 185
- 14 The timing of interpretations of transference
and interpersonal relations in psychoanalytic therapy 201
- 15 The supervision of students in psychoanalytic training
who have previously been trained as psychotherapists 213
- 16 On being a psychoanalyst: integrity and vulnerability
in psychoanalytic organizations 226

- APPENDIX*
Questions to ask (myself) about a patient's material 245
- REFERENCES* 249
- INDEX* 259

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my colleague, Brett Kahr, who informed Oliver Rathbone, the Managing Director of Karnac, that while I had already written a number of important papers, I had never published a selection of them. Brett had suggested that as well as giving me a contract to work on John Rickman's life and papers, Oliver should give me another contract for a selection of papers, covering my work as a psychoanalyst. I am also grateful to Brett for agreeing to give this book his blessing by writing a Foreword to it, in spite of his busy work schedule.

I would also like to thank Oliver Rathbone for agreeing to publish this book, which I have entitled *Time Present and Time Past*, with thanks to T. S. Eliot who in his poem "Burnt Norton" understands so much about the intersect of the present and the past.

I would especially like to thank Ken Robinson for being available, over two years, to discuss over the phone with him any of my papers that I was doubtful about, and for seeing contributions in them that I had not noticed or understood in the past. It was a difficult—and a very "self-revealing"—task that I had set myself to re-look at and assess work that I had done over a period of at least fifty years, and without Ken's encouraging comments on their usefulness to contemporary readers and colleagues, I could not have put together the selec-

tion of papers included in this book. For all this, I thank you, Ken, and I thank Katie Robinson, your wife, for lending you to me.

I would also, of course, like to thank Ken for agreeing to write the opening chapter, "Introduction to Pearl King and her work". It gives a background to my life, my interests, and my ways of working as a citizen and as a psychoanalyst.

I would particularly like to thank Jill Duncan, who worked with me on this book. She checked and typed all the references, and we regularly discussed together the different phases of this book, which I had written on my Macintosh computer. She has finally prepared all the text in a PC lay-out required by the publishers. She was my major help in the task of proof reading, but especially she is knowledgeable about my requirements, having worked with me in the Archives of the British Society and in their Library. Above all, she is good fun and is a pleasure to work with!

I would like to thank three colleagues who tried in the past to help me to publish some of my papers: Jennifer Johns, Bernard Barnett, and Susan Budd. Sadly nothing came of our efforts. Recently, there were other colleagues who, having read some of the individual papers included in this volume, encouraged me to publish them. They included Riccardo Steiner, Valerie Sinason, Jan Abram, and Marianne Parsons, along with others. I thank them for their encouragement.

Finally, I would like to thank those patients whose work with me helped to throw light on the various problems discussed in the papers in this book. Two of them agreed to make their own comments at the end of their chapters, for which I thank them.

I would like to dedicate this book to my teachers and colleagues in the British Psychoanalytical Society, who passed on to me their knowledge and understanding of how to practise psychoanalysis, on which the work that I have reported in these papers was based. These include John Rickman, Sylvia Payne, Marion Milner, Melanie Klein, Michael Balint, Paula Heimann, and Donald Winnicott. I am still grateful to them all.

London, 2005

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Pearl King, B.A.Hons Psych., started her professional life working as an industrial and social psychologist, before training as a psychoanalyst. She finally became an Honorary Member, and a Training and Supervising Psychoanalyst, of the British Psychoanalytical Society, having been a former President of the British Psychoanalytical Society and Honorary Secretary of the International Psychoanalytical Association. In 1984 she became Honorary Archivist of the British Psychoanalytical Society and co-editor with Riccardo Steiner of *The Freud/Klein Controversies 1941–1945*. In 2003 she edited *No Ordinary Psychoanalyst: The Exceptional Contributions of John Rickman*, which contains her biography of John Rickman. In 1992 Pearl King received the Sigourney Award for “outstanding contributions to Psychoanalysis”.

Brett Kahr is Senior Clinical Research Fellow in Psychotherapy and Mental Health at the Centre for Child Mental Health in London, and the Winnicott Clinic Senior Research Fellow in Psychotherapy at the Winnicott Clinic for Psychotherapy. He is also Senior Lecturer in Psychotherapy in the School of Psychotherapy and Counselling at Regent’s College, a Patron of the Squiggle Foundation, and a Trustee of the Institute of Psychotherapy and Disability. He works

in private practice in London as a psychotherapist and as a marital psychotherapist. Books he has written or edited include *D. W. Winnicott: A Biographical Portrait*, which won the Gradiva Award for Biography.

Ken Robinson was Head of the School of English in the University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne before training as a psychoanalytic psychotherapist in Edinburgh at the Scottish Institute of Human Relations. He worked as a psychotherapist while training as a psychoanalyst at the Institute of Psychoanalysis in London. He now works full-time as a psychoanalyst in private practice in Newcastle-upon-Tyne, where he is a training analyst for a number of groups offering training in psychoanalytic psychotherapies. He is currently Honorary Archivist of the British Psychoanalytical Society and chairs both The Contemporary Freudian Group of the British Psychoanalytical Society and The Freudian Study Group.

FOREWORD

Brett Kahr

N*omen est omen*: our names are our destinies. Thus spake the nearly Latin pundits. Many psychoanalysts over the years have wondered about the determinative influence of our names—and there can be no greater example than that of Pearl King, for no one could be more aptly named. Pearl King is both a gem and regal: indeed, if psychoanalysis were to have a Royal Family, she would easily be a contender for the role of Queen, if not the King. And how splendid that after more than half a century of tending to the business of others, whether through working with patients or training and supervising students, teaching, lecturing, administering, organizing, archivalizing, and spreading goodwill, the time should now be right for Pearl to publish the first volume of her collected papers, *Time Present and Time Past*.

The sixteen essays contained in this volume provide a glimpse into the life and the mind and the method of one of the most accomplished psychoanalysts in the history of the discipline. Erudite, thoughtful, lucid, visionary, and, above all, deeply compassionate, the papers of Pearl King have remained either unpublished or scattered in various journals for far too long—lamentably so, because those who have not had the honour and the pleasure of studying or working with Pearl King have missed out on the refreshing opportunity to sit at the feet of one of the true titans of the mental health field. Few of us will have

begun our psychology training in 1937 and still be alive to teach and write and educate in 2005. With the publication of *Time Present and Time Past* we have the great thrill of learning from a brilliant octogenarian (almost nonagenarian) who has spent over seventy years in the worlds of psychology and psychoanalysis! She brings a unique body of experience to her understanding of psychoanalysis and human dilemmas, and we would be foolhardy indeed not to imbibe her rich clinical research.

The various papers cover a wide variety of topics, ranging from a movingly written account in chapter 1 of her very first footsteps in the field of child psychoanalysis, supervised by Donald Winnicott, to a more recent essay—written fifty-one years later—on the vicissitudes of being an ageing psychoanalyst (chapter 10). Note that Pearl has elected to entitle chapter 10 “On Becoming an Ageing Psychoanalyst”, not “On Being an Aged Psychoanalyst”. Although she may be aged, she is also ageing, still growing, still developing, and this quality of continuous open-mindedness, curiosity, and epistemophilia must be admired. It cannot be accidental that Pearl has chosen as the epigraph to her collected papers a segment from T. S. Eliot’s “Little Gidding”, which begins with the inspiring line, “We shall not cease from exploration”. At a stage in life when most psychoanalysts have begun to dismantle their book collections (and one finds many of these in the second-hand section of Karnac Books on London’s Finchley Road), Pearl continues to prize her library, and she uses it constantly, always keeping abreast of new developments within psychoanalysis, while treasuring the great classics at the same time. In fact, when one spends time with Pearl, one not only learns substance and content, but even more important, one learns about an attitude—a way of being aroused, alert, alive, and fascinated. Although a dab hand at crafting genetic interpretations and transference interpretations when called upon to do so, I would imagine that one of Pearl’s greatest assets in her psychoanalytic work with patients over the decades has been her interest in the minutiae of her patients’ lives. This quality of being interested, indeed riveted, emerges very strongly in the clinical papers herein.

The papers themselves require very little background by way of introduction. Pearl King writes with such clarity that her essays really do speak for themselves. Each paper might be regarded as a little pearl in its own right, and, in reading them for the first time, I felt rather like a deep-sea diver opening up an oyster, delighted to find a gleaming surprise inside the shell. Ken Robinson has contextualized the papers most helpfully in his introductory essay. By contrast, and by way of

whetting the appetite, I wish to comment in particular on one of Pearl's papers, namely the very first in the collection, "Change: The Psychoanalysis of a Four-Year-Old Boy and Its Follow-up", written in 1951, updated in 1953, and then revised with a follow-up in 2004. This opening chapter accomplishes quite a lot in a relatively short number of pages. First of all, Pearl establishes herself as a 1950s pioneer in the study of trauma. Long before psychopathologists constellated the syndrome of post-traumatic stress disorder, and long before psychoanalysis embraced with its current intensity the general study of trauma, Pearl found herself treating a tiny boy who became traumatized after witnessing his younger brother falling out of a window and plunging to his death. The traumatic impact of such an episode cannot be underestimated. As a matter of interest, the famous Russian ballet dancer Vaslav Nijinsky experienced a similar trauma: his elder brother Stanislav became permanently brain-damaged after plummeting from a window during childhood, and Vaslav became very ill soon thereafter, eventually receiving a diagnosis of "schizophrenia" from none other than Professor Eugen Bleuler, the Swiss psychiatrist who in 1908 first invented the term "schizophrenia" (cf. Buckle, 1971).

In her account of this case, Pearl primarily establishes herself as someone who takes trauma seriously, not just the physical trauma of a brother's death, but also the recognition of the mother's infanticidal wishes (confirmed by Enid Balint, Pearl's colleague, who had the boy's mother in treatment). Furthermore, however, she distinguishes herself as a committed psychoanalyst of the most noble variety, for she makes it her business to follow up the case over more than fifty years! I can think of few clinicians who have maintained such dedication to their patients, not only clinically, but also empirically, over such a long period of time. "Philip", the young protagonist of chapter 1, certainly believes that Miss King's postcards and Christmas presents had a huge therapeutic impact on him over a very long period of time. Although the late Marion Milner—Pearl's clinical supervisor (and, later on, her second psychoanalyst)—did maintain therapeutic contact with "Susan", the patient described in Milner's (1969) masterwork *The Hands of the Living God: An Account of a Psycho-Analytic Treatment*, over more than fifty years, she never undertook a proper follow-up study in the way in which Pearl King has done. To the best of my knowledge, Pearl's opening chapter deserves a privileged place in the canons of psychotherapy research as the longest follow-up ever undertaken by one clinician of a psychoanalytic treatment! Furthermore, as clinicians, we rarely enlist the assistance of a patient in reading our clinical

writings for thoughts and reflections and accuracy, let alone invite the patient to make a written response. By having requested that Philip might wish to compose an afterword to the follow-up study, Pearl King has helped to usher in a new and more egalitarian style of clinical psychoanalytic writing. Above all, the paper documents quite clearly the impact of Pearl's constant devotion to her patient and describes in detail the way in which Philip emerges from shaky, trauma-filled beginnings to establish a rich and secure adult life, full of love at home, productivity at work, and creativity in both arenas.

In chapter 2, "Experiences of Success and Failure as Essential to the Process of Development", written in 1953 and presented to a Scientific Meeting of Associate Members of the British Psychoanalytical Society, set up by Michael Balint, Pearl has provided a most moving account of her work with a young man in his twenties, besieged by a multitude of anxieties and difficulties. In her assessment of this man, Pearl has noted that "He feels himself to be in a perpetual misty haze". This turn of phrase resonates with young Philip's description of his bereaved and traumatized mother, whom he characterized as living in "a vacuum isolating herself and me along with her into her own protective little world". After reading the many chapters in *Time Present and Time Past*, one encounters quite a number of Pearl King's patients who live in misty hazes or who find themselves sucked into vacuums, only to come out into a glowing world of colour and relatedness after their contact with Pearl. It has become increasingly fashionable within contemporary psychoanalysis to attack so-called "drive theory", and to privilege "attachment theory" and "relational psychoanalysis". Whatever one's view on these complicated and contentious matters, classical psychoanalysts can claim Pearl King as a heroine because of her devotion and well-thought out allegiance to the best of Sigmund Freud, but modern relational psychoanalysts can also claim Pearl King as a historical pioneer, because she roots her clinical work so much in her own relational abilities and capacities, to the ultimate benefit of all her analysands.

Although many historians and psychoanalysts have interviewed Pearl over the years, the time has now come for a proper academic study of her life and work. Fortunately, for those interested in her contributions, such a project is now under way, for in truth, one would need a whole book to pay full tribute to Pearl King's many achievements and contributions. Not only has she worked for over half a century as a clinical psychoanalyst and psychoanalytic educator, but she broke new ground as a leading organizer and administrator in

psychoanalytic politics on both the national and the international levels over an extremely long period. In the rather tolerant modern psychoanalytic climate, few will fully appreciate the radical achievement of Pearl King in having become the very first President of the British Psychoanalytical Society to have trained first as a psychologist—all previous presidents, beginning with Dr Ernest Jones and Dr Sylvia Payne, had trained as medical doctors. Many newly qualified psychotherapists in Great Britain may not appreciate that until recently, non-medically trained psychoanalysts and psychotherapists had to report to medically qualified colleagues, and patients in treatment with non-medical clinicians would have to undergo a preliminary assessment interview with a medical psychoanalyst, which created a lot of difficulties and resentments for analyst and patient alike. In having dared to stand as the first non-medical president, Pearl King broke important new ground in the de-medicalization of psychoanalysis, something that Sigmund Freud had always struggled to achieve but had failed to do within his own long lifetime.

Of course, no tribute to Pearl would be complete without mentioning not only her clinical, scientific, and organizational work, but most particularly, her unique achievements as the world's greatest psychoanalytic archivist. A talented and dedicated historian, Pearl modernized the Archives of the British Psychoanalytical Society, and she has tended to the Archives with the same love and attention that she has given to her patients. Pearl brought the very first computer into the headquarters of the British Psychoanalytical Society, amid fierce opposition, thus paving the way for the establishment of a truly modern, efficient archive. As one of the many grateful researchers who have spent happy hours trawling through the unique holdings of Pearl's archives, I can attest at first-hand to what a stellar collection of historical documentation Pearl has managed to acquire, and preserve with deep care and affection, ever committed to the idea that the past really does matter. Pearl suggested that colleagues might establish under the auspices of the British Psychoanalytical Society a Trust to support the work of the Archives, now renamed as the Pearl King Archives Trust.

Pearl King has had a rich life on the couch, behind the couch, and away from the couch, and those of us who have the pleasure of knowing her personally will appreciate the ways in which each of us has felt personally enhanced by the contact. Fortunately, reading her papers also provides a very effective and pleasurable means of spending time with Pearl, and it gives me enormous joy to recommend these beautiful essays to you.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

TIME PRESENT AND TIME PAST

We shall not cease from exploration
And the end of all our exploring
Will be to arrive where we started
And know the place for the first time.

T. S. Eliot, "Little Gidding"



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Introduction to Pearl King and her work

Ken Robinson

This is an extraordinary collection of papers by an extraordinary psychoanalyst. Pearl King has contributed to psychoanalysis, as analyst, teacher, office-bearer, writer, and, not least, as a stimulating and wise colleague, for more than five decades. In her biographical introduction (King, 2003) to her edition of the second volume of John Rickman's papers, *No Ordinary Psychoanalyst: The Exceptional Contributions of John Rickman* she remarks on how if she had learnt anything from Rickman, who had been her analyst, it was the importance of context in understanding the life and work of another. Working with Pearl has in turn strengthened my own sense of the importance of such contextualization. It would be odd, therefore, not to offer at least a bare outline of her own history at least as it is important for this volume.¹

Born in 1918 in the middle of a Zeppelin raid, a few months before Armistice Day, Pearl King began her university education at Bedford College, University of London, only months after the bombing of Guernica and days after Neville Chamberlain travelled to Germany to

¹Further information on Pearl King's life can be found in Steiner and Johns (2001), especially the "Introduction" and the "Chronology", and in Little (1993) and Williams (2000).

discuss the future of Sudetenland with Hitler and returned with the Munich Agreement. These were remarkable years. As she put it in an interview with Graham Little:

As soon as I came up to university, in 1937 I suppose, I got drawn into politics, the socialist side. Because by that time I had decided it was terrible to burn wheat and corn and use corn to drive engines when people were starving. Then the Spanish Civil War. It was practically impossible to be a student in London and not get involved; even Conservatives demonstrated, arms for Spain and so on. Then Czechoslovakia, the Anschluss, and so forth. It was a very politically active time for everybody.

In these years as a student, deeply engaged in the political struggles of her day, Pearl was already picking up “how to run meetings . . . [she] was quite interested in organisation and how as an institution to get change. [She] wanted to mobilise people” (Little, 1993). She finished her academic training in 1941 with an Honours Degree in psychology, with sociology (including anthropology) as a subsidiary subject. She then went to Edinburgh University for a shortened training in personnel management and volunteered for personnel work in the war industries. She worked as a Labour Officer in a Royal Ordnance factory near Leeds, for three years, until she was seconded to London University to undertake research on the “part versus the whole methods” of training assembly workers in industry. She was then asked to help with a problem in the hosiery industry, concerning training as “Linkers” workers who had been employed in the war industries (King, 1947, 1948).

She began training as a psychoanalyst in 1946 following the end of the war and became an Associate Member of the British Psychoanalytical Society in 1951. During her training she supported herself by her work in social and industrial research, first with the Medical Research Council and then with the newly formed Tavistock Institute of Human Relations. Here she was especially concerned with how one institution might learn from another, with the transmission of good practice and social skills between them. The world of psychoanalysis was to benefit from her interest in institutional dynamics. By the time she was recognized as an analyst allowed to provide training analyses for students in 1955, she had already begun to be known as someone who could play a significant role in the organizational life of psychoanalysis, at home and internationally. She had served as Secretary of the Organising Committee for the IPA Congress in London in 1953, and she would go

on to hold many offices, among them: Secretary to the Freud Centenary Celebrations Committee with Sylvia Payne in 1956 and, in the same year, Honorary Secretary of the British Psychoanalytical Society (BPAS) (from 1956 to 1958); Honorary Secretary of the IPA (from 1957 to 1961) when William Gillespie was its President; and Deputy President of the BPAS (from 1964 to 1966), overlapping with both Bion and Winnicott as Presidents. Eventually she became the first non-medical President of the BPAS in 1982, a post she retired from in 1984 to become the Honorary Archivist of the BPAS. She remained Honorary Archivist until 1994, mobilizing a group of colleagues and helpers to organize and catalogue the Archives to provide an indispensable computerized tool for anyone interested in the history of psychoanalysis in Britain. This work is an emblem of the woman, for history is essential to her view of what it is to live in the present, whether morally, politically, emotionally, or as a psychoanalyst—hence not only the title of this collection of papers but the epigraph to *The Freud–Klein Controversies 1941–45* (King & Steiner, 1991) edited with her successor as Honorary Archivist, Riccardo Steiner: “If we do not learn from history we are doomed to repeat it” (Santayana). In 1992 she and Hanna Segal became the first British psychoanalysts to be awarded the prestigious Sigourney Prize for “outstanding contributions to psychoanalysis”.

This is not the place to go into detail about Pearl King’s work for and writings about the institutions of psychoanalysis, or about her contributions as a historian—a second volume of her papers will be devoted to this work. It is nevertheless important to see them as of a piece with the aspects of her work represented in this present collection. They share the common concerns of her work in the consulting-room, in supervision, and in teaching right across her own life-cycle as a psychoanalyst. There is, for example, a telling story about how she used her role in her first job as a Labour Officer in the Royal Ordnance factory in Yorkshire before she had even considered training as a psychoanalyst. She has told me how she worked in a section of a filling factory, employing both men and women, responsible for making 12,000lb bombs:

There was a male officer in charge of the men and there was me in charge of the women. When people came to see me I asked them to sit down. After all I was also a woman and a communist and they were working class: we had a lot in common. But my male companion who was not secure in himself made them stand up. One morning the women came along to me and complained: “we’re short of money again, they’ve docked our money for being late and

it wasn't our fault. The buses were late again." I said: "That's terrible". But I didn't know how to read a wage card, so I said that I would consult the male shop steward and ask him to come round with me so that I could take down all that they were short of and that I would stay over and take the details up to headquarters and get them to do something about it.

When he heard about this the male Labour Officer said: "You can't do that sort of thing". I thought he meant go to headquarters, so I said: "Why can't I? It'll save us having a strike here". But that wasn't what was worrying him. He said: "But look how you let these girls behave, letting them sit down, and all that. They should stand up in front of you, like the men do with me". You see what I mean?! This idea of dignity. I threw all that out of course. Later I had a row with the manager of the section, because when he got news of what I was proposing to do he forbade me to enlist the help of the male shop steward. He said he couldn't afford the male worker coming around as the shop steward and helping me. So I said: "Well okay then you'll bring about the possibility of a strike". Then he quickly thought it over and said: "All right, you go ahead".²

The story encapsulates so many of the qualities and concerns that are contained in her analytic papers. In trying to put herself in the place of the other so as to understand from the inside another way of seeing and doing things, in her commitment to democracy (which has driven so much of her work within the institutions of psychoanalysis and still does) and in challenging assumptions operating behind the received way of doing things within the factory so as to go some way towards freeing the system from the unthinking dead hand of the past, she worked in a way that is not unlike her clinical practice, as she describes it in her papers. In the consulting-room she sought to help her patients to free themselves from the compulsive repetition of patterns of thinking, feeling, behaving, and relating that had been established unconsciously in the past and were still active in the present of the transference neurosis. For her, a good ego-structure in the individual is as necessary as a good social structure in an organization, as she argued at the Stockholm Congress in 1963 when she proposed revised statutes for the IPA.

Another example of significant cross-over between her organizational thinking and her clinical work lies in her recognition of the

²Little (1993) gives a slightly different version of this story.

relevance of the work she carried out with the help of Eric Trist on the learning process of a difficult task in the hosiery industry (King, 1947, 1948) to both the analytic process and the acquisition of analytic skills. She writes of this in her paper "Experiences of Success and Failure as Essential to the Process of Development" (chapter 2 herein) and in a further unpublished paper not included in this volume, "Some General Comments on the Communication and Acquisition of Psycho-Analytic Skills", which she read to the Albion Group in 1962.

The clinical and theoretical framework within which Pearl King has developed and practised is defined in a way by her analyst, John Rickman. Rickman was himself analysed by Freud, Ferenczi, and Klein. Pearl has described her initial meeting with him, in 1946:

Rickman started by explaining to me that there were two training courses; one was arranged along the lines that Anna Freud and her colleagues from Vienna had agreed and which they had called "Course B", to avoid linking it up with racial ideas by calling it "Viennese", and the other they had called "Course A" rather than "British", which catered for most of the other analysts in the British Society, among whom were those who agreed with Melanie Klein, who had said that she did not want a group for herself. In my mind I placed myself in "Course A", and I was happy to be in a group that included Melanie Klein. [King, 2003, p. 59]

At the time, Rickman was a training analyst for the Kleinians. He saw Klein's ideas, like Abraham's, as "a logical development" from Freud (King, 2003, p. 53). In terms of the technique of adult analysis, there was a much greater similarity between Kleinian and Freudian approaches than is often imagined on the basis of current post-Kleinian technique (Bott Spillius, 2004; King, 1996). Later it "leaked out" that Rickman no longer wished to be regarded as a Kleinian. Pearl got to know about this from Michael Balint, who, as Training Secretary, told her that she could now choose her second supervisor from any group she liked: she chose Michael Balint himself (King, 1996). Adhering to the basic assumptions about the nature of psychoanalysis bequeathed by Freud, Rickman sought to integrate later ideas, not only, for example, Klein's but Kurt Lewin's. As Pearl puts it, he was "not a missionary for anyone else's point of view" (King, 1996). This is the independent tradition, as represented by other earlier figures such as Sylvia Payne, Marjorie Brierley, Paula Heimann, Winnicott, and Marion Milner. Pearl herself is an important figure in this tradition. In a paper written in 1996, "What Has Happened to Psychoanalysis in the British Soci-

ety?", she quotes a passage from one of Sylvia Payne's contributions to the Controversial Discussions (King & Steiner, 1991):

The basic conceptions of psychoanalysis were laid down by Professor Freud, and this Society and Institute were founded on them.

It might be said why should we limit our basic principles to those laid down by Freud. My answer to this is that we have in the past done so publicly and voluntarily, both by adherence to the International Psycho-Analytical Association and by acclaiming our intention to the Committee set up by the British Medical Association, who passed the resolution that only those analysts adhering to the conceptions of Freud had the right to call themselves Psycho-Analysts.

The basic conceptions of Psycho-Analysis are:

- 1 the concept of a dynamic psychology
- 2 the existence of the unconscious
- 3 the theory of instincts and of repression
- 4 infantile sexuality
- 5 the dynamic of the transference.

In my view all work which really recognises and is built upon these conceptions has a right to be called psychoanalysis.

For Pearl, this remains our heritage. Within Freud's basic conceptions she is free to experiment and to incorporate later extensions of Freud as the clinical occasion inspires her. One notable area in which she extends Freud, as others too were doing during her formative period as an analyst, is in her understanding of pre-oedipal and preverbal clinical phenomena. Here she drew on Klein in particular. Another area is in her thinking about alienation, identity, and the false self, where she found the ideas of Winnicott and R. D. Laing, for example, useful. Within the papers in this volume we see her drawing on a wide range of psychoanalytic thinkers. We also see her entering into discussion with the Jungians, whose journal published two of her papers:³ There is no better example of her openness than her innovative papers dealing with old age, where she magisterially surveys the literature (including Jung) before making her own particular contribution to thinking about the particular tasks and hazards of ageing, with special reference to narcissism.

³"The Therapist-Patient Relationship" (chapter 4), published in 1973, and "Notes on the Psychoanalysis of Older Patients" (1974b).

Her clinical papers in general show how she could respond to the challenge of the individual patient who somehow or other asked questions of her understanding and technique. There is a fine example of this in her paper "On a Patient's Unconscious Need to Have 'Bad Parents'" (see chapter 5), first written in 1963 and revised as a tribute to Paula Heimann for her 75th birthday in 1974. In this she writes of an almost intractable analysis in which she came to realize that her patient needed "*to keep intact his myth of unsatisfactory parents*", leaving her with the "real clinical headache . . . of *how to discriminate between the 'return of the traumatic experiences' in the transference in the analytic setting*, where the main therapeutic task is the re-assimilation by the stronger adult ego of experiences that were overwhelming to the infantile ego, *and the exploitation of these traumatic experiences for the maintenance of unconscious and infantile omnipotence*. In this latter case, *they are not re-assimilated, but perpetuated*". This was an important contribution in 1963 to our understanding of the many and complex ways in which transference can be used as a resistance. Forty years later it remains important, and it is also a timely reminder of transference resistance as today the concept is much less part of our clinical lexicon.

Although "On a Patient's Unconscious Need to Have 'Bad Parents'" is published here for the first time, it did not pass unnoticed. The paper had been presented to a Scientific Meeting of the British Psycho-Analytical Society in March 1963. Pearl presented it again in the same year at the pre-Congress in London before the IPA Congress itself in Stockholm. In the London audience was Jacques Lacan, to whom Pearl King gave a copy of her paper. Lacan's interest was kindled by her analysis of the transference as an illusion. In fact, he was so struck by it (and, I think, by its author, whom he describes as "*fort active et fort aigue, fort intelligente . . . et après tout, non sans quelque audace*") that he devoted a whole session of Seminar XII on 3 February 1965 to her paper (Lacan, 1965). His admiration is all the more striking because there are such fundamental differences between his and Pearl King's thinking. Her paper served Lacan's particular interest in transference and the "*objet à*", but in replacing its interest in affect with his concern with the rhetoric of the analytic encounter, Lacan moves far away from it. Their differences are all the more marked in the revised 1974 version where Pearl, building on Heimann's work, emphasizes all the more strongly her concern with the analyst's use of her affective response to the patient as a clinical tool. She would, of course, return to the theme in 1977 in her acclaimed paper, "The Affective Response of the Analyst to the Patient's Communications" (chapter 6).

It is worth pausing over this last paper not only because it is a model of clarity in the often-confusing literature on countertransference—this clarity of definition, more often than not informed by the history of a given term, is characteristic of Pearl’s work—but because it contains so much about her distinctive clinical technique. Following Heimann’s 1950 paper, the term “countertransference” has for many come to cover all the analyst’s feelings indiscriminately. Preserving the original meaning of the term “countertransference” as a pathological phenomenon, Pearl King makes two important distinctions. First, she defines the affective response of the analyst as “the perception by the analyst of feelings and moods, unrelated to his personal life, and which may even feel alien to his normal way of reacting, but which when placed in the context of the patient’s material and the psychoanalytic setting, illumine and render meaning to those transference phenomena that are in the process of being experienced, consciously or unconsciously, by the patient”. Second, in a characteristically straightforward way, she stresses that not all the analyst’s affective responses should be understood in relation to transference. Some will be the ordinary human responses of one person to another. This affective self-awareness in the analyst needs, she believes, to be combined with a capacity for taking up a position of neutrality or “non-attachment”—she borrows the concept from Eastern philosophy—which allows the analyst to “monitor” her affective responses without discharging them. She had already argued in her contribution to a panel discussion in 1962 on curative factors in psychoanalysis (chapter 3) that this attitude “is a crucial factor in the curative process, and one of our main therapeutic tools”. It makes it possible for the analyst to play on the “psychological stage” of the analytic relationship those roles unconsciously required of her by the patient, so as to “become aware of what or whom [she is] being made into or treated as, and why”.

Pearl King’s concentration on the analyst’s affective response should not be confused with a fashionable tendency to make the affective relationship between analyst and analysand the focus of analysis. In her prescient 1976 paper on “The Supervision of Students in Psychoanalytic Training, Who Have Previously Been Trained as Psychotherapists” (chapter 15) she writes of the difficulties experienced by psychotherapists at that time when they were training as analysts. In psychotherapy, a sort of relational therapy substituted for transference as Freud understood it. In this relational therapy, therapist and patient concentrated on their “here-and-now” relationship shorn of its historical antecedents, whereas in transference proper the past is alive

through repetition compulsion in the here-and-now of the transference neurosis. By the time twenty years later she wrote "What Has Happened to Psychoanalysis in the British Society?" (1996), what had been true of psychotherapy had become increasingly true of psychoanalysis. And with the loss of the historical dimension to transference in psychoanalysis, other interlocking clinical concepts (free association, free-floating attention, the repetition compulsion, and so on) were also endangered. Analysts of different persuasions had voiced similar worries for some time. Melanie Klein was already complaining of "here-and-now" analysis in her unpublished notes on technique (Bott Spillius, 2004), Limentani addressed it in his Presidential address to the IPA in 1985 (Limentani, 1985), and more recently André Green warned of it in his contribution to the *Festschrift* for Pearl King in 2001 (Steiner & Johns, 2001). But within current British psychoanalysis, it has taken someone of Pearl King's standing and strength to raise it, much as she voiced the complaints of munitions workers all those years ago or later argued, for example, for the rights of Associate Members.

One central dimension of Pearl King's work which deserves final mention (and which she sees as also under threat from the slippage away from basic Freudian concepts) is the developmental approach and her particular interest in the vicissitudes of narcissism. It is evident from the first paper of this volume to the last. In "Change: The Psychoanalysis of a Four-Year-Old Boy and Its Follow-up" (chapter 1), Pearl has written a paper that is unique in the psychoanalytic literature, for it records the history of her work with a patient, "Philip", with whom she has stayed in touch for over fifty years, from 4-year-old boy through his troubled adolescence to the present day, and includes his own postscript written in his middle age. Although Philip was in formal treatment with her only as a child and then briefly as an adolescent, her paper describes the way that, beyond this work with her, she sent him presents and cards at Christmas to create a framework within which each had the other in mind and within which he could continue to grow. In "On Being a Psychoanalyst—Integrity and Vulnerability in Psychoanalytic Organizations" (chapter 16), Pearl charts the developmental tasks of the analyst as she establishes and re-establishes her identity in the progression from candidate to Associate Member, Member, Training Analyst, and retirement. This is only one of several groundbreaking papers that deal with ageing or older-age patients. In fact, at the 1979 IPA Congress, Pearl gave the first ever paper on middle-aged or older patients (see chapter 9). In "On Becoming an Ageing Psychoanalyst" (chapter 10), she gives her own account of the

tendency, following Freud, to regard patients beyond age 40 as unsuitable for analysis.

Although she does not use the concept explicitly, she has from her early work onwards a strong sense of what Anna Freud came to call "developmental lines". In "Experiences of Success and Failure as Essential to the Process of Development" (chapter 2), for example, Pearl King sketches the case of a young man who sought to master painful anxieties through conjuring, both literally and figuratively in his daydreams and fantasies. She shows that his conjuring up of an omnipotent phantasy world is necessary to protect himself against a fear of failure and disaster. Developmentally, he had not sufficiently progressed along the line of establishing within himself the capacity to tolerate the possibility of failure to enjoy "a graded experience of success", from the early feeding situation, through the development of sphincter control, to oedipal rivalry with his father.

Throughout these papers one has a sense of patients impelled by a developmental imperative towards finding relief from their mental pain through psychoanalysis. Pearl holds "that psychoanalytic theory and technique is based on the hypothesis that man has within himself . . . a life-promoting force that operates not only biologically but intrapsychically in each individual, which, given reasonably stable and good maturational and environmental conditions, will be stronger than any disintegrative forces at work" (chapter 3). These disintegrative forces, however, can be very strong. Once in analysis, patients often prefer the devil they know and resist change, trying to incorporate their analyst into their existing defensive structures and phantasies. For Pearl, as for Rickman, it is the analyst's task to find a technique by which to release the integrative processes within patients.

Pearl King's professional life as a psychoanalyst began at a time when there was much discussion about widening the scope of psychoanalysis to deal with different types of non-neurotic patients. Unlocking the prison in which such patients have had to place themselves to achieve some sort of life is all the harder even though they are still impelled forward by a desire to change. From her earliest work, Pearl took an interest in those patients who suffered early, pregenital, developmental failure or arrest. This is why she is especially concerned with narcissistic problems and why she returns again and again in her papers to discussion of techniques appropriate to their treatment. It is also why she has found the ideas of Winnicott, Milner, and Kohut so germane. Her own contribution is summed up in a passage from "Time and a Sense of Identity" (chapter 13):