Fifth Annual John Bowlby Memorial Lectures

Storied community as secure base: response to the paper by Nancy Caro Hollander`exile : paradoxes of loss and creativity'

Renos K Papadopoulos[1]

Nancy Hollander's (1998) paper is both important and topical despite the fact that it refers to historical events which are not very recent. Its importance lies in the fact that it addresses the crucial facet of analytical theory and practice which relates to wider societal dimensions as well as to social action. This is a thorny facet which never loses its topicality because, as analysts, we constantly face the challenge as to how to reconcile our position in response to violations of freedom, human dignity and justice in socio-political contexts, outside our consulting rooms. Although her paper refers to the political turmoil and oppression in one specific region, that of Central and South America, the same challenge is posed wherever there are violations of human rights. Moreover, similar concerns exist in all societies at all times, in connection with relatively minor incidents and circumstances where, nevertheless, ethical and moral issues are at stake. In these situations, the principles remain the same, regardless of the scale and specificity of the occasion.

The dilemma we face in relation to this kind of challenge questions some fundamental assumptions about the nature of the analytical enterprise. Psychodynamic theories, as they are applied to traditional analytical settings, tend to be based on a paradigm which is predominantly formulated within a pathology/deficit model, and which emphasizes the intrapsychic dimension at the expense of the social realities. How, then, can theories and practices which emanate from such a paradigm be in a position to offer us anything of relevance in turbulent socio-political contexts?

In response to this challenge, Hollander turns to attachment theory with her own selective emphasis and modifications, which she presents in a personal, moving and poetic style. Her choice of attachment theory fits well with the material she discusses, and her selection of personal narratives of survivors and victims of oppression to illustrate her position is equally appropriate and successful. My own response to her paper is in line, by and large, with her overall approach and is intended to explore certain implications of her stance. More specifically, I shall develop some ideas about the meaning of shared narratives and how these can extend our understanding of Bowlby's theories about the secure base.

[1] RENOS K. PAPADOPOULOS PhD is Professor of Analytical Psychology at the University of Essex, Consultant Clinical Psychologist at the Tavistock Clinic, and a training and supervising Jungian analyst practising in London. As consultant to the UN and other organizations, he has worked with survivors of violence and disaster in various countries. Address for correspondence: Tavistock Clinic, 120 Belsize Lane, London NW3 5BA.

A Paradoxical Impact Of Oppression

Hollander outlines clearly the horrifying effects of the `terrorist state's culture of fear'. She argues that this oppression `makes inevitable the development of the false self as a strategy for survival'. However, this particular type of `false self' is not identical to the one encountered in traditional psychoanalytic theories, where it is a product of unconscious defences (Winnicott 1960). According to Hollander, this 'false self' is partly created by a conscious and deliberate strategy: `adaptation to authoritarian rule requires extreme personal vigilance, entailing the conscious creation of a false self and the masking of the true self that hates and fears the very social order with which the individual citizen appears to identify' (Hollander 1998, p. 205). Thus, insofar as this `false self' is a tactical and calculated device to counteract the effects of an oppressive social system, it must be created by a fairly sophisticated and well-organized agency of the individual, a `self' with a very sound sense of judgement; moreover, such a `false self' does not seem to have many similarities with a `self' (however defined) insofar as it is an external facade, a mask which a person wears intentionally for reasons of convenience.

Undeniably, regardless of the initial adaptive purpose of its origin, this `false self' may have detrimental effects on the individual, especially if circumstances demanded that it lasted for a lengthy period of time. However, as its very existence also attests to the successful working of a skilful surviving mechanism which must emanate from another agency within the individual, it could be said that, paradoxically, oppression imposed by authoritarian states may also contribute to the mobilization of this most sensitive regulation mechanism. Moreover, insofar as this mechanism maintains a delicate balance between a public facade and private beliefs, it could be argued that this agency would be very close to a 'true self'. In this way, the paradox is that, under oppressive circumstances, individuals, by having the possibility of accessing this sophisticated mechanism in a tangible way, may experience a deep sense of achievement which, in the final analysis, could counteract the ill effects of the state-imposed 'culture of fear'. Thus, in addition to all its obvious terrible consequences, state terror may activate, inadvertently, in individuals an invaluable sense of liberation which could lead to remarkable creative expression.

Nancy Hollander touches on this possibility when she refers to the potential creativity that traumatized individuals may access if they could utilize 'this profound life disruption in the service of expanding the self' (1998, p. 203). However, she does not develop this idea as she approaches her subject matter from a different angle.

There is an abundance of evidence as to how individuals (alone as well as in groups), under the circumstances of such 'profound life disruption', may not only survive but also (paradoxically) benefit from these experiences. Moving testimonies from Dostoievsky (1979), Solzhenitsyn (1962, 1968) and Tertz (1973), to Primo Levi (1961), Terry Waite (1993), Brian Keenan (1992) and Mandela (1994) demonstrate that people not only can endure brutality but also can become an inspiration to others. What we learn from these individuals is that, along with the development of an acute sense of

finer and subtler discrimination (which was essential for their survival), it was possible for them to acquire new meaning which imbued their entire lives. Often such new meaning resulted in an upsurge of creativity.

However, there is an important difficulty here because, whenever we are confronted with serious incidents of human rights violations, it is very difficult to focus on the positive aspects of psychological strengths that individual survivors may achieve. It is understandable that we react with abhorrence in such situations, condemning the violations. The difficulty is that this inevitable (and just) condemnation also clouds our epistemological outlook, thus making it difficult for us to distinguish the various constituent dimensions involved, i.e. ethical, political, as well as the whole spectrum of psychological perspectives (both positive and negative). Understandably, a combination between the human tendency to respond with compassion to the victim and condemn the perpetrator (as we should, indeed, continue to do), along with the predisposition of our psychodynamic theories to emphasize pathology and deficit, make it difficult for us to appreciate the benefits that, paradoxically, can also be generated under adversity.

Collective Narratives

How are we, then, to understand the paradoxically positive impact that authoritarianism may, inadvertently, produce on individuals? Nelson Mandela, describing how he and his comrades managed to survive the long imprisonment and brutal conditions in the infamous prison on Robben Island, clarified:

> " Our survival depended on understanding what the authorities were attempting to do to us, and sharing that understanding with each other. It would be very hard, if not impossible, for one man alone to resist. I do not know what I could have done if I had been alone... We supported each other and gained strength from each other. Whatever we knew, whatever we learned, we shared, and by sharing we multiplied whatever courage we had individually". (1994, p. 463)

In this passage, Mandela identifies several key factors that contributed to their survival: that he was not alone, that together with his comrades they developed a shared understanding, that they relied on correctly anticipating the strategy of the authorities, and that they produced their own tactics to counteract the enemy's method. What is crucial here is that, as a group, they developed their own `shared understanding' which created a solid structure that sustained and protected them from the machinations of the prison authorities, which were an integral part of the apartheid regime. Mandela was acutely aware that the fight against racism was not interrupted by his imprisonment, as action against the prison authorities was a continuation of the same struggle: `We regarded the struggle in prison as a microcosm of the struggle as a whole. We fought inside as we fought outside. The racism and oppression were the same' (1994, p. 464). In this way, the prisoners were able not only to survive brutalization in prison but also to strengthen their political and moral resolve as well as to further their own education. What seems to have contributed to this achievement was their ability (a) to form a well-organized and

collective struggle based on a shared understanding, and (b) to limit their struggle and focus it against the prison authorities, in terms of day-by-day defiance. When people are confronted by a faceless authoritarian state of terror they are paralysed by impotence; however, the prisoners on Robben Island succeeded in concretizing the facelessness in the face of the prison authorities and defied it with their own coherent stance based on their shared understanding.

Organized resistance has always been recognized as one of the most effective forms of counteracting the destructiveness of authoritarianism. However, this does not need to happen in terms of forming actual resistance groups with elaborate organizational structures. What the Mandela experience exemplifies is that a shared understanding which enables the development of a culture contrary to the oppressive regime can produce equally positive results. Key to the creation of this culture are the shared narratives within a group, regardless of its size and whether they belong to an actual established organization or not. The most common way ordinary people survive oppressive regimes is precisely through the development of shared narratives which are opposed to the regime; this happens almost spontaneously and without any actual master plan, although organized resistance groups may also make use of them. These collective narratives, which can be fairly cryptic and ambiguous, are full of satirical innuendoes against the oppressive establishment, ridiculing the regime's main figures as well as the imposed ethos. Usually, they include humorous accounts of events and are formed in an idiosyncratic, coded fashion; in this way, they carry a specific connotation which is recognized by all who are opposed to the regime. A great deal of sensitivity is required to detect the precise way one's interlocutor responds when these narratives are introduced. One's survival depends on this sensitivity; moreover, once one identifies a fellow opponent of the regime, one experiences an immense sense of excitement and satisfaction which also brings mutual joy from sharing similar political beliefs, regardless of all the other differences.

Collective narratives of resistance against oppression may also become more elaborate and form part of a coherent strategy to counter the imposed authoritarian culture. In his book *Culture and Imperialism*, Edward Said (1994) recognized the significant role that such narratives play in the process of decolonization. More specifically, in discussing `resistance and opposition' to colonization, he emphasized the importance of developing a whole, coherent and integral' history of the community: `National culture organizes and sustains communal national memory... it reinhabits the landscape using restored ways of life, heroes, heroines and exploits; it formulates expressions and emotions of pride as well as defiance'; according to Said, such history may include `Local slave narratives, spiritual autobiographies, prison memoirs...' (1994, p. 260) and other similar collective expressions held in a narrative form and shared among the people. Thus, shared and collective narratives are indispensable in any form of resistance against oppression.

The power of shared narratives is such that even persons in solitary confinement, when they do not have the possibility of actually sharing any narratives with others, may, paradoxically, also benefit from them. Terry Waite, the British envoy who was taken

hostage in Beirut and spent 1763 days in captivity, most of them in solitary confinement, offers a characteristic example of this paradox. Whilst he was kept under the most inhuman and unpredictable conditions, one day he remembered that at home he had Jung's books and wished they were available to him in prison to read. That led him muse over several connections he had with Jungian friends, places and ideas and wrote, subsequently, in his book :

> "What I remember of Jung's work helps me now. I look to my unconscious to help me through these days. I abandon myself to it and let it guide me gradually towards my own centre. I know, now, that solitude need not destroy me... Jung helps me keep well in my mind, and I am grateful to him for that'. (1993, p. 335)

What we see here is that Terry Waite begins with one thread of memory and associates gradually to a wider theoretical opus which he then uses most profitably. Without discussing with others Jungian ideas and without the benefit of a shared discourse, nevertheless, by connecting with that collective narrative, he experiences a direct connection with it.

Therefore, collective narratives need be neither part of an actual political organization nor even shared with others in an active way. By locating oneself within them, one is able to access their therapeutic effect.

Transitional Space and Resilience

Nancy Hollander attributes the characteristics of `transitional space' to two situations she discusses in her paper. These situations are the oppression imposed by authoritarian regimes and exile. With reference to the first, she ascribes only negative consequences: `The culture of fear creates a transitional space whose persecutory political and special symbols... subvert the true self' (1998, p. 204). However, in discussing the psychological condition of exile, she accepts that this transitional space may also create a positive outcome :

> Like any life crisis, exile represents a transitional period, one that has various potential outcomes.
> Deprivation and loss may chronically undermine mental health... or else create the possibility for growth. Exile can potentially endanger or empower. (p. 211)

Hollander's insistence in not presenting the positive possibilities of the first situation requires further attention.

As Winnicott (1971) emphasized, transitional phenomena include a central paradox which `needs to be accepted, tolerated and resolved' (p. 62). This paradox refers to the fact that `the baby creates the object [which will eventually become transitional], but the object was there waiting to be created and to become a cathected object' (p. 104). This means that the transitional object is both the product, the creation of the individual as well as a given entity of its own, regardless of the individual's needs. The comparable paradox in the culture of fear' imposed by an oppressive regime is that

the inflicted authoritarianism has a reality and actuality of its own as well as being connected with the complex matrix of people's psychological states. The strategy of an oppressive regime to suppress all individuality and impose blind obedience through fear creates a powerful psychological state which inevitably interlinks with people's individual psychopathology, as Hollander aptly recounts. Yet, precisely because it is a planned, state-imposed culture, regardless of its vile deviousness and brutality, it can be transparent to most people and therefore there can be a degree of tangible predictability about it. This means that people can experience it as an externally inflicted threat and they may develop mechanisms to defend themselves from it, at least psychologically. Thus if the paradox (of its co-created status) were to be accepted, tolerated and resolved', this situation, too (not only exile), may also facilitate creative potentialities (in addition to producing negative effects). Winnicott insisted that every transitional space has the possibility of being used either to further the development of personality or to contribute to the solidification of a defensive psychopathology.

The difficulty, of course, is that the culture of fear which is devised by oppressive regimes is intensely persecutory in actuality and not just in terms of psychological experience; therefore, it is almost impossible to consider it as a transitional space with any positive potentiality. Yet, if we were to return to the basic nature of transitional space, we may be enabled to see this seeming impossibility in a different light. According to Winnicott (1971), central to the way we negotiate transitional phenomena is our capacity to play, which is 'not inside by any use of the word... [n]or is it outside' (p. 47). He argued that play as well as 'cultural experience' are located 'in the potential space between the individual and the environment' (p. 118) and that this space, which he also called 'third area' , 'both joins and separates' (p. 121) the individual with/from the environment. The collective narratives, mentioned above, fit perfectly the description of the potential space of the third area insofar as they are both individual and collective as well as having a distinct quality of play; moreover, they assist individuals to regulate their connection with their environment by providing them the means to selectively choose to join with the creative and cultural aspects of their country as well as to develop an appropriate and protective distance with regard to the inhumanity of the totalitarian regime. This is another important facet of the paradoxical impact of oppression (which will be developed further, below).

Hollander comments, in passing, on the resilience of certain individuals she had interviewed but she does not elaborate on this concept. This is a significant notion, particularly in this field, because it enables us to access a wider spectrum of the phenomena involved and also to focus on non-pathological aspects of these painful circumstances. Moreover, it offers the means to develop a deeper understanding of what makes people not only survive but also flourish under the most adverse conditions. Usually, resilience refers to a person's ability to bounce back after misfortune and calamity. Traditionally, the term was used to refer to an individual's `inner' capacity to resist the adversities from the environment. Another meaning concentrated on the individual's flexibility to adapt to the external world. Both meanings presuppose a dichotomy between the individual and the

external environment and locate resilience in the context of strength, ability, competence and other similar positive attributes of an individual.

More recently, attention has been turned to another way of understanding resilience which is more in tune with interactional, relational and ecological approaches. Some of this work has emphasized the ecological context of individual and family functioning (Bronfenbrenner 1979), the family framework of resilience in individuals (Wolin & Wolin 1993), and the `narrative coherence' of resilience (Cohler 1991). Notable contributions were also made by Werner (1993) and Werner and Smith (1992) who carried out a seminal longitudinal study on resilience, and Walshe (1996) who developed the concept of `family resilience'. What is common among these studies is that they all seek to understand resilience outside the boundaries of an individual personality. The traditional image of resilience in the form of a tough person (usually a man) who stubbornly struggles and keeps winning against all odds in hostile surroundings (physical environment as well as society) has gradually been changing. Instead, resilience is now understood in its wider context, as a product of a close collaboration and mutual co-construction between the individual and the collective. Resilience, therefore, is not a trait of one part of the whole, but a product of what emerges in the transitional space which is both individual and collective as well as, in a sense, neither individual nor collective. Thus, the third area in between is what seems to enable resilience to develop and it is there that the collective narratives seem to operate in a most facilitative way.

New Forms of Secure Base

Bowlby understood the secure base, which is the foundation of psychological stability and health, in a similar relational way, emphasizing its interdependent nature; strength lies in the mutuality and in the community rather than in the solitary might of an individual. Characteristically, he wrote:

> Paradoxically, the truly self-reliant person when viewed in this light proves to be by no means as independent as cultural stereotypes suppose. An essential ingredient is a capacity to rely trustingly on others when occasion demands and to know on whom it is appropriate to rely.

He went on to assert that a `healthily self-reliant person' is the one who is capable of exchanging roles when the situation changes: at one time he is providing a secure base from which his companion(s) can operate; at another he is glad to rely on one or another of his companions to provide him with just such a base in return. (1973, p. 407)

Thus, for Bowlby, the secure base is a product of a prudent interdependence among people. However, regardless of his strong accent on the relational factors, Bowlby seemed to have retained his understanding that the secure base is closely connected with individuals rather than the space in between them, as the above quotation attests: individuals exchange the provision of a secure base for each other. It seems to me that, if we were to combine the recent findings in four separate but interrelated

areas, we may be able to develop a new perspective which could further our understanding of the secure base. These areas are the following: (a) the importance of the `coherence' of narratives in the research on attachment, (b) the role of narratives in family therapy, (c) the findings of research on resilience and (d) the therapeutic impact of shared narratives in the work with survivors of traumatic experiences.

Mary Main and her team at the University of Berkeley, using the AAI, i.e. the Adult Attachment Interview (Main and Goldwyn 1995), found that the best predictor of people's ability to deal with adversity was the coherence of their narrative about their childhood rather than the actual history of what they had endured. The AAI, as the title suggests, records a person's narrative about his or her childhood in response to a skilfully conducted interview by a trained researcher or clinician. The interview is recorded, transcribed and analysed by specialist assessors. Regardless of how traumatic their childhood had been, people who were able to articulate coherently what had happened to them in a true, clear and complete way, following a relevant sequence of events, were able to cope better than those who could not narrate their lives in a coherent way. This rather astonishing finding demonstrates that what really matters is the way one is able to develop an appropriate narrative which conveys the sense of proportion and relevance of one's life events, along with a suitable affective response. It is the capacity to develop such a coherent narrative that helps people address further difficulties.

Family therapists have always been interested in the stories people tell about their difficulties, relationships and themselves. The narratives express the way people create meaning, organize their belief systems and communicate these to each other. In this way, narratives are not products of individuals but collective co-constructions. In recent years, there has been a strong interest in approaching their work from the narrative perspective (Byng-Hall 1995; Epston 1989; Epston & White 1992; Gorell Barnes 1998; Papadopoulos &Byng-Hall 1997; Parry 1996; Parry & Doan 1994; Roberts 1994; Sluzki 1992; White 1989,1995; White & Epston 1991). This approach has enabled therapists to understand communications from patients not as factual information but as mutual co-constructions -stories are valued as useful metaphors (Riikonen & Smith 1997); this allows therapists to move away from a linear cause-effect paradigm and from a concept of therapy which is centred on them as experts by emphasizing, instead, the patients' perspectives. Moreover, the narrative approach widens the scope of therapeutic interaction away from a problem-dominated exchange to a co-construction of meaning encounter (McNamee & Gergen 1992); narratives change and evolve easier than fixed problems (Shotter 1993). Finally, a narrative perspective opens up therapy to wider vistas; more specifically, it assists therapists to examine `how stories develop and in turn affect the clinical work in relation to four interconnected domains: (a) the therapists' own personal stories about their background and training, (b) the story of the institutional setting which provides the context within which they work, (c) the narrative of the actual therapeutic... material, and (d) in the background, the general theoretical paradigms and sociopolitical stories and myths of the time' (Papadopoulos & Byng-Hall 1997, pp. 3-4).

The concept of resilience has emerged as increasingly influential in recent years (Butler 1997). One of its characteristics is that it is not based on a model of deficit or pathology but enables therapists appreciate the positive attributes of the patient's context. Werner and Smith (1992) followed up 210 'high-risk' children from a Hawaiian island for 40 years and found that the majority of them, as expected, displayed several mental health symptoms, whereas 72 children, unexpectedly, turned out to be most resilient; the resilient children developed into confident and successful adults, able to cope with adversity. What the researchers found was that all the resilient children were able to recruit, throughout their lives, people who acted as surrogate parents and mentors to them, thus ensuring that they always benefited from the safety and support of a secure base. It could be said that these children were able not only to survive but also to thrive because they could hold onto a sense of positive identity which was sustained throughout by the continuity of shared narratives in the serial recruitment of surrogate carers. Walshe (1996) argued that `shared beliefs and narratives that foster a sense of coherence, collaboration, competence, and confidence are vital in coping and mastery' (p. 261). Advancing the concept of `family resilience' Walshe clarified that of `particular importance' to `relational resilience' is `a narrative coherence that assists members in making meaning of their crisis experience and builds collaboration, competence, and confidence in surmounting family challenges' (p.262).

Thus, the `narrative coherence' (Cohler 1991), which was identified as central in attachment research, reappears in the context of family therapy almost in an independent way. John Byng-Hall is one of the few family therapists who connects the two. In his book Rewriting Family Scripts, he combines attachment theory with systemic approaches to family therapy. Defining family scripts as `the family's shared expectations of how family roles are to be performed within various contexts' (1995, p. 4), and mindful of the importance of narrative coherence, he argues that in family therapy:

> Smooth changes are more likely to be achieved if the continuity between past and present is acknowledged. In this way there is a continual renewing of old elements that are still present in the updated script [of a family]. This suggests that re-editing or rewriting family scripts is a wiser way of approaching updating rather than trying to write a brand-new script. Discontinuous change or transformations have always struck me as an unrealistic and unhelpful aim for family therapy. (1995, p. 72)

Finally, therapeutic work with survivors of traumatic experiences has shown that shared narratives play a pivotal role in the humanization of their experiences of inhuman treatment. These survivors often become prone to compartmentalization, dissociation or repression which develop in order to isolate the painful and potentially disruptive experience. The indigestible nature of the experience makes it difficult to be accommodated within the psychological world of the individual and it tends to be kept insulated. However, there is a healing effect once such experiences become incorporated in shared, collective narratives where there can be accounted in the context of one's wider life perspective.

One of the less documented losses which people suffer due to traumatic experiences is the `capacity to predict and to "read life"'. Once exposed to traumatizing conditions:

> People can no longer rely on their ability to anticipate danger. In this way, it is not only that they feel unsafe, but their very sense of themselves and their identity is altered when they have to live knowing that they cannot possibly know anything certain about life and themselves. (Papadopoulos 1997, p. 14)

It is under these circumstances that a 'therapeutic witnessing' (Papadopoulos 1996) can be most useful. This approach refers to

> the activity where the central aim is to enable one (with minimal facilitation) to gradually discover by himself or herself the various cut-off pieces of memories, experiences and feelings which, due to the traumatic nature of the prevailing circumstances at the time, were left unassimilated and hence foreclosed. (Papadopoulos 1997, p. 18)

Essentially, therapeutic witnessing involves the active articulation of shared narratives within which all these dissociated parts acquire new meaning (see also Felman & Laub 1992).

Storied Community

What the above discussion has highlighted is the importance of collective and shared narratives as creating a transitional space which can provide a secure base. Collective stories locate individuals within them and reciprocally with individuals co-construct reality. Forasmuch as individuals construct stories, stories also construct individual identities. Moreover, stories form communities around them that share the same meaning and belief systems which they convey. Thus, stories of defiance against oppressive regimes create a community of opponents who share the same abhorrence of stifling authoritarianism. In this sense, one may speak of a `storied community' which is the group of people who are joined together by certain shared narratives. A storied community provides the coherent narratives which are essential ingredients of resilience and offers a transitional space which can act as a secure base. Ultimately, it may not be only the actual bond between children and parents (or their substitutes) that creates the secure base, but the supportive structure which their bond provides; this structure is also offered by the enduring presence of collective and coherent narratives which maintain a sense of continuity, purpose and meaning. Moreover, they are less connected with the specificities of people and places and are thus more portable.

Nancy Hollander's paper illustrates precisely this phenomenon: by sharing the collective stories of resistance against oppression, personal narratives of individual

survivors testify to the resilience which was developed in that transitional space which the stories provided. Hollander's survivors are part of a storied community opposed to `the culture of fear' and their success can be attributed, at least partly, to their membership of this `community'. I am in full agreement with Hollander that the refugee condition is itself traumatic and should not be characterized as a 'post'-traumatic phenomenon (Friedman &Jaranson 1992; Marsella et al. 1996; Papadopoulos & Hildebrand 1997). By belonging to a storied community, individuals can retain their sense of sanity and meaning even whilst leading an isolated life in exile, knowing that they are part of this community. A storied community may be more than a notional one insofar as it creates real and actual bonds among people. At the same time, its power should not be dismissed in the cases where it does not relate to actual interpersonal connections. Partaking of shared meanings has enormous benefits by itself, as the cases of people in solitary confinement testify.

Conversely, there are negative effects when totalitarian regimes fall: people who were bonded together by shared narratives of defiance and were part of a storied community of opposition lose the intensity of that meaning and tend to degenerate into meaningless existence losing the sharpness of their creativity. Once the culture of protest loses its purpose it may seek out new forms of intense meaning and fanatical nationalism may develop (Tishkov 1996). The tragic phenomenon of revolutionaries without a cause creates a painful vacuum because they lose their membership to the storied community and may either seek inappropriate replacements or lose their purpose for living.

Hollander has provided a valuable addition to the endeavours to extend our analytical concepts outside the consulting room (Papadopoulos 1998a, 1998b). What is now needed is to attempt to expand our theoretical perspectives in these contexts (Samuels 1993) and develop more appropriate paradigms. The introduction of the concept of `storied community' has been offered as a possible contribution in this direction. By adopting this concept, we are enabled to move further on from the intrapsychic model with its slant on deficit and pathology and to appreciate other, more appropriate, forms of the secure base which are based on non-reductive and more ecological paradigms.

References
Bowlby, J. (1973)
Attachment and Loss.
Volume 2.
Separation, Anxiety and Anger.
London: Pelican
Books, 1985.

Bowlby, J. (1988)
A Secure Base: Parent-Child Attachment and Healthy Human Development.
New
York: Basic Books.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979)
The Ecology of Human Development.
Cambridge, MA: Harvard University
Press.

Butler, K. (1997) The anatomy of resilience. In
Networker,
March/April: 22-31.

Byng-Hall, J. (1995)
Rewriting Family Scripts. Improvisation and Systems Change.
London: Guilford.

Cohler, B.J. (1991) The life story and the study of resilience and response to adversity.
In
Journal of
Narrative and Life History, 1:
169-200.

Dostoievsky, F.M. (1979)
The Diary of a Writer
(trans. B. Brasol). Salt Lake City, UT: Peregrine Smith
Books.

Epston, D. (1989)
Collected Papers.
Adelaide, Australia: Dulwich Centre Publications.

Epston, D. &White, M. (1992)
Experience, Contradiction, Narrative and Imagination.
Adelaide,
Australia: Dulwich Centre Publications.

Felman, S. & Laub, D. (1992)
Testimony. Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis and
History.
London: Routledge.

Friedman, M. & Jaranson, J. (1992) The applicability of the PTSD concept to refugees.
In
Amidst Peril
and Pain. The Mental Health and Social Wellbeing of the World's Refugees
(Eds. A.J. Marsella
et
al.).
Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Gorell Barnes, G. (1998)
Family Therapy in Changing Times.
London: Macmillan.

Hollander, N.C. (1998) Exile: paradoxes of loss and creativity. In
British Journal of Psychotherapy
15(
2): 201-15.

Keenan, B. (1992) An Evil Cradling.
London: Random House.

Levi, P. (1961)
Survival in Auschwitz
(trans S. Woolf). New York: Macmillan/Collier.

Main, M. & Goldwyn, R. (1995) Adult Attachment Interview. Berkeley, CA: University of
California (
unpublished manuscript).

Mandela, N. (1994)
Long Walk to Freedom.
London: Abacus.

Marsella, A.J.
et al.
(Eds.) (1996)
Ethnocultural Aspects of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder. Issues,
Research, and Clinical Applications.
Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

McNamee, S. & Gergen, K.J. (Eds.) (1992)
Therapy as Social Construction.
London: Sage.

Papadopoulos, R.K. (1996) Therapeutic presence and witnessing. In
The Tavistock Gazette
(Autumn):
61-65.

Papadopoulos, R.K. (1997) Individual identity and collective narratives of conflict. In
Harvest: Journal
for Jungian Studies 43(2):
7-26.

Papadopoulos, R. K. (1998a) Destructiveness, atrocities and healing: epistemological
and clinical

reflections. In
Journal of Analytical Psychology
43(4): 455-477.

Papadopoulos, R.K. (1998b) Cronicas y psycologizacion de la violencia. In
Violencia en Una Sociedad
en Transicion.
San Salvador: United Nations Development Programme.

Papadopoulos, R.K. (1999) Working with families of Bosnian medical evacuees:
therapeutic dilemmas.
In
Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry 4(1):
107-120.

Papadopoulos, R.K. & Byng-Hall, J. (Eds.) (1997) Introduction. In
Multiple Voices: Narrative in
Systemic Family Psychotherapy.
London: Duckworth.

Papadopoulos, R.K. & Hildebrand, J. (1997) Is home where the heart is? Narratives of
oppositional
discourses in refugee families. In
Multiple Voices; Narrative in Systemic Family Psychotherapy
(
Eds. Renos K. Papadopoulos and John Byng-Hall). London: Duckworth.

Parry, A. (1996) Story enactments. In
Context, 28:
20-24.

Parry, A. & Doan, R.E. (1994)
Story Re-Visions. Narrative Therapy in the Postmodern World.
New
York: Guilford Press.

Riikonen, E. & Smith, G.M. (1997)
Re-imagining Therapy. Living Conversations and Relational
Knowledge.
London: Sage.

Roberts, J. (1994)
Tales and Transformation: Stories in Families and Family Therapy.
New York:
Norton.

Said, E. (1994)

Culture and Imperialism.
London: Vintage.

Samuels, A. (1993)
The Political Psyche.
London: Routledge.

Shotter, J. (1993)
Conversational Realities. Constructing Life Through Language.
London: Sage.

Sluzki, C.E. (1992) Transformations: a blueprint for narrative changes in therapy. In
Family Process,
30: 285-305.

Solzhenitsyn, A. (1962)
One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich.
London: Sphere Books, 1970.

Solzhenitsyn, A. (1968)
The First Circle.
London: William Collins & Harvill Press.

Tertz, A. (1973)
A Voice From the Chorus.
London: William Collins & Sons.

Tishkov, V. (1996)
Ethnicity, Nationalism and Conflict In and After the Soviet Union. The Mind
Aflame.
London: Sage.

Waite, T. (1993)
Taken on Trust.
London: Hodder & Stoughton (Coronet edition, 1994).

Walshe, F. (1996) The concept of family resilience: crisis and challenge. In
Family Process,
35: 261-
81.

Werner, E.E. (1993) Risk, resilience and recovery: perspectives from the Kauai
longitutinal study. In
Development and Psychopathology, 5:
503-515.

Werner, E.E. & Smith, R.S. (1992)

Overcoming the Odds: High Risk Children from Birth to
Adulthood.
Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

White, M. (1989)
Selected Papers.
Adelaide, Australia: Dulwich Centre Publications.

White, M. (1995)
Re-authoring Lives: Interviews and Essays.
Adelaide, Australia: Dulwich Centre
Publications.

White, M. & Epston, D. (1991)
Narrative Means to Therapeutic Ends.
New York: W.W. Norton.

Winnicott, D. (1960) Ego distortion and the true and false self. In
The Maturational Processes and the
Facilitating Environment.
London: Hogarth Press, 1965.

Winnicott, D.W. (1971)
Playing and Reality.
Harmondsworth: Pelican Books, 1974.

Wolin, S.J. & Wolin, S. (1993)
The Resilient Self.
New York: Villard.