

A Place to belong: investigating the relationship between landscape and identity

A pilot study in Psycho-Social research exploring the dynamics of two faith groups in an English village, situated within a World Heritage Site.

It is a mark of human nature that mankind impresses his identity onto the landscape. This is a pilot study investigating the relationship between landscape and environment from a psycho-social perspective. Society fashions the landscape that surrounds it but does the landscape also inform and colour the identity of both society and individuals? Object relations theory may suggest the inner landscape of the psyche is influenced by the external landscape; what is the relationship between identity and landscape?

This paper is also a field study. Exploring the relationship between the inner and outer dynamics of the individual and landscape, of society and identity, requires a methodology that extends beyond conventional social science and personal psychotherapy. The emerging field of Psycho-Social Studies indicates that the foundations of a methodology have already been laid, and in this respect, this paper has a dual purpose; to investigate both the relationship between identity and landscape and to also conduct an exploratory review of Psycho-Social research methods in practice.

Initially, the paper will give a background to the context and focus of the study and describe its original intention. It will then review psycho-social perspectives and the research methodology used for this study before proceeding to the research itself. I will show from the reflexive analysis how the dynamics of the research can be explored at a much deeper level

than merely reporting what is presented on the surface. The orientation, or identity, of the paper itself changes when emergent themes were revealed in direct response to application of psycho-social methodology in practice. The paper will describe the process of uncovering the unconscious material and explore both the value and potential for further study of this topic using psycho-social research methodology.

Avebury: history and society in its place.

This formative paper is the first step in an investigation of the reparative dynamics of the Stonehenge Truth and Reconciliation Committee (TRC), based upon the TRC in post Apartheid South Africa.

On the 1st of June 1985 a severe civil disturbance, known as the 'Battle of the Beanfield' (Hawkes, 2009), near the site of Stonehenge brought a temporary end to the use of Stonehenge as a temple of worship for Druids and other Pagan interest groups. There were scenes of unrest at the site for a number of years to the dissatisfaction of all parties concerned, mainly; Druid and Pagan groups, the police, local farmers and land owners, English Heritage. The Stonehenge TRC was instigated and conducted over a period of time, giving a voice and sense of value to all of the groups represented. This culminated in the restoration of the temple being opened for Solstice worship in the year 2000. It is reported that in excess of thirty thousand people attend the summer solstice celebrations at Stonehenge and have done so peacefully for the past nine years (BBC, 2008).

As a prelude towards this future study, this pilot study in psycho-social research investigates the dynamics between the two significant faith groups in Avebury. Avebury is a place of duality; it is both a traditional English village and a World Heritage Neolithic monument; the largest stone circle in Europe. Construction of the site began c 3000BCE (English Heritage, 2009), while other significant archaeological sites such as round barrows, long barrows, hill forts and Silbury Hill, that comprise and give shape to the ancient Avebury landscape were constructed over a period of time from c 3500 BCE until the Iron Age. The Neolithic

population that constructed Avebury Henge had left the area without any trace before the Celtic Druid priesthood had come to Britain. Hutton reports that there is only one reference in literature in which the Druids, 'are actually portrayed in Britain (or at least right next to it)', (Hutton, 2007, p.3). In the early 60s CE the Romans massacred the Druids on the island of Anglesey, virtually ending Druidism in Britain. The first modern Druid order was founded in 1772 (Hutton, 2007, p.21). Avebury village first appeared between 500-600 CE as a Saxon settlement (Panayi, 2009), and an early wooden Saxon church was constructed c 1000 CE (Wiltshire Council, 2009) . From the time of its construction Avebury remained virtually untouched until two destructions took place; the first in 1320 CE, followed by a period of destruction during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Wheatley & Taylor, 2008, p.7). In the 1930s, an archaeologist and marmalade millionaire, Alexander Keiller, bought Avebury and much of its surrounding landscape. A period of restoration began which continued after World War two.

Avebury is in a unique position; it is a small village set within an ancient stone circle. The community is comprised of secular elements and followers of various religions, the most visible of which are Christianity and Paganism. The church spire dominates the village and from each road approaching Avebury, huge sarsen stones stand like sentinel gate keepers. The church spire is an obvious religious icon, impressing its identity onto the village, while the Pagan presence is more subtle, made visible by the occasional gathering of Druids or other Pagans. Avebury is also a World Heritage site and is periodically host to thousands of visitors who also comprise of secular tourists, Pagan worshipers, Christian tourists, archaeologists, authors and media and university researchers.

The original intent of this paper was to explore psycho-social methodology by investigating the interrelational dynamics between the two most visible faith groups in Avebury; the Druids and the Christians. In the planning stage of this paper, Avebury was seen as nothing more than a small container for a micro-study of group dynamics. I was intrigued to discover how tolerances were managed and to what extent any issues of overt prejudice, transference or projective identification may be evident. Another possible line of enquiry was that of ownership; do either of the faith groups lay claim to being, or unconsciously behave as if they are the rightful inheritors of Avebury as a place of worship?

The Christians may face criticism that the temple has been ruined with their destruction of the stones, but Christianity is recognised in law. The Pagans and Druids have no legal position, and yet they may argue that Avebury is a pre-Christian temple and so it is their rightful place. As previously mentioned, Avebury is Neolithic in origin and all of the faith groups present have migrated into a landscape that was fashioned long before their arrival.

Researching beneath the surface: an overview of Psycho-Social research methodologies and approaches.

In *Object relations and social relations*, Susie Orbach writes;

The understanding of relational analysis starts from the premise that the individual is born into a set of social and psychological circumstances. The human infant is *a set of possibilities*, not id based, not instinctually driven, but, in order to become recognized as human, will need to attach. For those compelled by the notion of instinct theory, this was reframed in the 1940s by Fairbairn as a need for relationship, and by Bowlby as a need for attachment. The nature of the relationships the child is exposed to, experiences, and, of course, seeks to shape by her actions, is the template for that individual's self experience and relations to others. Relational psychoanalysis does not seek to understand the structures in a reductionist way, or by use of sociological tools. Its agenda is to understand how both the satisfactory and the problematic aspects of those profoundly influential relationships create the internal structuring of the individual. (Orbach, 2008, p 31)

Hoggett elaborates further, describing the relational turn in psychoanalysis as an approach which can, 'grasp the continued interplay between the real and the imagined', (Hoggett, 2008 p.73). A narrative style interview in which open questions are employed (Clarke, 2008 p.121) creates a relationship with the subject which allows a gestalt to emerge (Hollway & Jefferson, 2000, p.40). A similar approach is employed in the field of neuro linguistic programming (NLP) (Bandler and Grinder, 1975 p.41). The NLP model suggests that to begin a question with the word 'why', prompts the recipient to respond in a defensive manner and a search for justification will be initiated. The question, 'why ?' tends to stimulate the answer, 'because ...' and the recipient delivers a justification. However, if a question begins with the word, 'what ...?' it initiates a search for content, while 'how ... ?' stimulates an inner search for the process of something. 'who ...?' addresses the performer; who is present, or absent, while

‘where ... ?’, can generate a quest to determine either a geographical place or a place within time, which may also be sought by asking, ‘when ... ?’ (Harrison 2001, p.205).

An ontological approach towards identity and positioning (Hollway, 2008, p.141) that is both intrapsychic and interspsychic gives a renewed value to the subjective interpretation of narrative in research. Reminiscent of Ogden’s Third Way (Ogden, 1999, p.109), in *the epistemology of testimony*, Jennifer Lackey speaks of the dual nature of testimony; where both the speaker’s and listener’s condition play an equal role in the epistemic value of the material (Lackey & Sosa, 2006, p.170).

Wendy Hollway writes:

Bion’s concept of the container-contained relationship affords a powerful tool for understanding both intersubjectivity and individuality and provides a radical foundation for a psycho-social research epistemology. We learn through identifications with objects. This is at the core of the idea that researchers can use their subjectivity as an instrument of knowing (Hollway, 2008, p.149).

Using the researcher’s subjectivity as a research tool is controversial (Hollway,2008, p.156). However, of the three approaches to counter-transference outlined by Laplanche and Pontalis, two are of value to the psycho-social researcher. The recognition by Freud that, ‘everyone possesses in his own unconscious an instrument with which he can interpret the utterances of the unconscious in other people’, (Freud, 1931, cited in Laplanche & Pontalis, 1973) is supportive of the psycho-social method. However, Laplanche and Pontalis offer further comment;

... to allow oneself to be guided, in the actual *interpretation*, by one's own counter-transference reactions, which in this perspective are often not distinguished from

emotions felt. This approach is based on the tenet that resonance 'from unconscious to unconscious' constitutes the only authentically psycho-analytic form of communication (Laplanche & Pontalis, 1973, p93).

Bion's notion of reverie; a frame of mind, or state, in which another's emotions may be shared, held and understood (Craib, 2001, p.207), has verification in findings from neuroscience. Schore reports that a child fixates directly on a mother's eyes, the visible portion of the carer's central nervous system, which specifically reflect the activity and state of her right hemisphere; known to be dominant for gaze behaviour. This affords the child an opportunity to monitor the mother's internal states (Schore, 1994 p.75). The right hemisphere is also involved not just in the reception, but in the expression of affective states. Emotions are communicated to the face spontaneously and rapidly, stimulating motor responses in the observer's face. This describes an unconscious tendency to mimic and synchronize with another person's facial expression, gestures, movements and vocalizations (Schore, 2003, p.224). The discovery of mirror neurons in 1995 by Jeannerod, Arbib, Rizzolatti and Sakata (Cozolino 2002, p.186), suggest that phenomenon such as transference and counter-transference are constantly present in human communications and virtually impossible to avoid.

In Klein's paranoid-schizoid position, ambivalent feelings are split within the psyche (Hinshelwood, 1989, p. 156). Often the acceptable parts are retained by the self while the unacceptable are projected, or transferred onto another and experienced by the subject as if they are constructs of the object. The projection of unpalatable parts from subject to object may produce social phenomena such as the stereotype (Clarke, 2008, 114) or othering in the forms of racism or sexism, for example (Barnett, 2009, p.4).

While the depressive position in Klein's model seeks reparation once the split good-object and bad-object are apprehended as being one-whole again (Laplanche & Pontalis, 1973, p.114), another possible path for the subject is that of projective identification. Here, rather than

seeking reparation, repressed and unacceptable elements which have split from conscious awareness are not just projected onto another, but into them; introjected by them. Projective identification occurs when another person is coerced into behaving in a manner framed and projected by the subject. Holmes and Bateman write, 'projective identification becomes a mutual process in which projector and recipient interact with one another at an unconscious level (Bateman & Holmes, 1995, p. 85).

The psycho-social approach is mindful of Klein's theory of unconscious defences against anxiety. Hollway and Jefferson speak of the defended subject; a position in which the interview subject may employ psychodynamic defence strategies in order to avoid confronting anxieties invoked by either the research topic or the act of being interviewed (Hollway & Jefferson, 2000, p 19). The converse position is also considered; that of the defended researcher. Attention to the researcher's responses and experience is only a part of the psycho-social methodology. Reflexivity can bring a deeper awareness of unconscious communication from the interview subject (Hollway & Jefferson, 2000, p 40), and sustained self reflection continues to bring new insights into view.

A psycho-social researcher takes an ethical stance towards the interview subject, considering duty of care to be of paramount importance (Clark, 2008, p.121). In addition, maintaining empathy and a sensitivity to the interview subject's experience includes using and ordering the subject's ordering and phrasing; to participate in a form of careful listening (Clark, 2008, p.121). In this sense, it is more a question of eliciting the subject's experience rather than seeking to penetrate their knowledge or put them to the question. The free association narrative in which the interview subject sometimes steers the course (Clark, 2008, p.121), may seem on the surface to lack focus but a wealth of experiential data can emerge, and it is this which reveals the gestalt of the interview subject.

Methodology adopted for the study:

For this study three approaches were chosen for gathering data for analysis:

- a). The social photo matrix method (Seivers, 2008).
- b) Free association interview.
- c) Reflexive review and analysis.

I identified the following steps that would need to be taken:

- 1) Identify and locate interview subjects; obtain permission to interview and arrange to meet with them.
- 2) Conduct the interviews and begin a continual process of reflexivity.
- 3) Conduct the social photo matrix with fellow psycho-social research colleagues.
- 4) Conduct sustained reflexive analysis.

On the surface: analysis of interview themes presented in the interviews.

Identifying and contacting a key representative from each of the two faith groups is recounted in the reflexive journal. It also contains an account of how I came to conduct the interviews as a defended researcher.

A number of key themes presented themselves in each of the two interviews.

The church warden and his companion were aware that the Druids had no historical association with Avebury and did not acknowledge the validity of modern Paganism. 'Pagan really means, in my book, erm, people that don't believe in God'. This definition of Pagan is reminiscent of Hutton's *Pagan Religions of the Ancient British Isles*, which leans towards an anthropological and archaeological approach (Hutton, 1991, preface). In *Triumph of the Moon*, however, Hutton reinterprets Pagan as 'country folk' (Hutton, 1999, p. 4). It would appear that the church warden, who was also deputy curator for the Keiller Museum had read the archaeological book, but not the one leaning towards Witchcraft. There is a bookshop in Avebury which is stocked with the latest titles in Paganism and Witchcraft. The implication here is that the church congregation may not understand the beliefs and practices which accompany some of those who come to village, and they avoid taking an action of discovery. I was told the locals treat the head Druid as a 'bit of a fun figure', and tolerance is the attitude of the church to the 'Pagans'. The church warden ended his interview by asserting, 'Well, I spoken too much; I was told I mustn't say too much, but ...'. which implies a gate-keeper had placed restrictions upon the interview.

The head Druid, the Keeper of the Stones, appeared relaxed during the interview. He told me in a jovial fashion that he regularly faced religious persecution from the villagers, though not specifically from the church. He became markedly animated when discussing the shortcomings and incompetence of other Druid leaders and was very scathing of Wiccans and Witches, calling them, ‘... Lazy Druids. The Wiccans have a set ritual ceremony, and that will answer all their problems; ritual ceremonies which is Catholicism; Catholicism in black ...’. His closing statement was that, ‘I’m not a priest and it’s not a religion. Mine’s a belief system ‘cos I only work in arguable facts,’ which possibly calls into question his presence on the Swindon College faith counsellors advice panel.

Other incongruences presented themselves, but the two themes that caught my attention during the interview was firstly the Christian refusal to acknowledge the validity of the Pagans as Pagans, rather than people not of God, and second being the Druid’s rhetoric and dismissal of other Druid and Pagan groups. This appears to be a classic example of Freud’s *Narcissism of Minor Differences* (Freud, 1921).

Additional themes presented themselves when I began my reflexive practice.

The Social Photo Matrix research method:

In *Organisational & Social Dynamics*, Seivers suggests, 'Perhaps it is the role of pictures to get in contact with the uncanny', using the social photo matrix as a method to promote the understanding of the unconscious in groups and organisations (Seivers, 2008). I decided to conduct this method of research with a small group, comprising three fellow students and a professor of psycho-social studies. The exercise with the group was also to include a free association response to two pages of transcript from my interview with the Druid. To avoid any bias in the technique, I elected to do the social photo matrix first.

After a brief presentation I showed the group five photographs of Avebury village and church, intending this to be a presentation of ordinary life in an English village, with no mention of the prehistoric temple. This was to be followed by five photographs of the Neolithic stones of Avebury, without showing any details of the village, intending this to be a presentation of an ordinary stone circle.

Finally, two photographs were presented showing Avebury in its complete form.

This was followed by the free association of the presented transcript.

Avebury in duality: village life:











Avebury in duality: Neolithic temple:











Avebury as a whole:





The social photo matrix and free association prompted responses which yielded unexpected data:

The first student to speak said that I appear to be passionate about the place, and second asserted that I seem to hold a romantic view towards the stones. One concluded that I had more sympathy with the Druids, although that particular student may have been unconsciously referring to his own position, 'Makes you want to get down with the Druids rather than the Christians.'

The professor of psycho-social studies pointed out that there were no people in any of the photographs. The group looked puzzled as the realisation dawned and it was noted that in the temple pictures there was no modernity, while the village pictures had normal ordinary life; exemplified in one showing a romantic thatched cottage with a car parked outside. A student remarked that he felt 'at home' when looking at the village pictures, but the stones 'left him cold; the village represented the familiarity of rural England while the stones could be anywhere'. The discussion moved to the signpost that has the word, 'World' at its centre, perhaps suggesting that Avebury is a place where ancient and modern, secular and faith converge.

It was suggested that I could have made the church area more beautiful in the photographs; I acknowledge they are not as aesthetic as the stones. It was noted: there is a 'beautiful thatched cottage', and 'small villages are about people, about community'. It was pointed out that 'this is a social study with no people in it'. I replied that I wanted to see if the photographs would convey the differences of community without the images of people; is the landscape by itself indicative of the society it holds ?

A turn in orientation: an emergent theme and a new identity for the study

The morning after the social photo matrix and free association, I awoke in a state of reflexive awareness. I realised that my research focus was not the interrelational dynamics of the two main faith groups of Avebury; it was their relationship to the landscape. After more reflection an understanding emerged that what I am interested in is the relationship between landscape and identity. When reviewing my decisions, I became aware of how my unconscious had steered me along this path all along. For example:

- I had unconsciously decided to take photos of place with no people
- I asked questions in the interviews which addressed issues of territory, ownership and invasion.

My choice of study was to look at two faith groups who each tolerate the ‘other’ in their sacred space, and yet neither group has legitimate claim to the origins of the Avebury temple. Further reflexivity brought an awareness of more material than this paper can accommodate. There were, however, three key themes, and it is these I shall address.

- Group dynamics.
- Landscape and ritual practice as a secure base.
- Landscape and identity: a relational perspective.

Beneath the surface: analysis of interview themes which emerged from sustained reflexive practice.

Group dynamics

In attachment, evolution and the psychology of religion, Kirkpatrick postulates that Christians, and possibly followers of other monotheist religions, may form attachment style relationships with God; in effect, God becomes a secure base. Contrasting this, the deity groups of polytheistic religions have features which are less like attachment dynamics and more akin to social relationships; each deity has a specialised role and the worshiper forms a unique relationship with both the role and the deity (Kirkpatrick,2005, p.92). With regard to religious or spiritual leaders, Kirkpatrick stresses that attachments are formed with the person and not the role. Various people may play the role of temporary caregiver in a child's life, but attachment bonds are formed with specific individuals. Likewise, it is possible that a particular vicar or Druid priest may form attachment relationships with individuals who are followers, and strong bonds may be forged, but these do not necessarily constitute an attachment relationship with the role itself. On the surface, it may be tempting to form a superficial opinion that the Gods and Goddesses of the Druids and Pagans of Avebury are merely figures of mythical fantasy who only serve to constitute a set of projected objects; the pantheon taking the form of a network of social relations. However, the power of the affect released and expressed in relation to Avebury and other megalithic temples in Britain suggests that these places which feature enduringly in the landscape evoke powerful affectionate bonds. Visitors to ancient places can sometimes become aware of a sense of being a temporary performer on a permanent stage (Pearson, 2003). The continuity of the sacred monument within the landscape creates the conditions in which Avebury may become a secure base for followers of pluralist belief systems.

Landscape and ritual practice as a secure base

The historical continuity of the Avebury landscape provides a secure base for both the Christians and Pagans who reside there. Religious practice also has an enduring quality which allows patterns of social attachment and altruism to emerge (Kirkpatrick, 2005, p.257) and become neuro-associated (Bandler & Grinder, 1979, p.83) with both the community and its container environment. In addition, the landscape appears to represent a secure base for those who regularly attend the site while following a pattern of reverence and ritual. Berry, an author of a series of fictional works based in Pagan society testifies, 'I personally find security and grounding in the framework of the Wheel of the Year with its symbols and focus on movement and change' (Berry, 2009). It would seem that contemporary Pagan culture functions as an autopoietic system, gaining its structure from an attachment to both ritual that is located within time and to place (Capra, 1996, p.213).

For the Druids, Pagans and Christians of Avebury, whether resident or regular visitor, the landscape carved by Neolithic, Bronze age and Iron age hands represents a home for their spiritual practice; a place where matters of faith can reside. In *Geographies of Exclusion*, Sibley describes the fabric of the home as, 'a place where space and objects together provide aesthetic experiences and evoke memories' (Sibley, 1995, p.94).

Landscape and identity: a relational perspective.

The projection of identity into the landscape and the appropriation of the landscape's identity is evident with both the Druidic and Christian cultures of Avebury. During my interview with the Keeper of the Stones, the young people gathered were told that the curve on the south western embankment had been shaped deliberately by the Henge builders in order to specifically allow the setting of the Sun on the spring equinox to be observable for a slightly longer period of time; the gentle sloping of the bank did appear to hold the disc of the sun deliberately. However, it is easy for a modern mind to mistakenly interpret archaeological sites through a contemporary lens and for the external landscape to become imbued with a cultural mythos that is sometimes based on error, misunderstandings or on simply being uninformed. Five thousand years of English weather beating against the once high embankment of Avebury has taken its toll on both its height and shape (Wheatley & Taylor, 2008, p.6). An uninformed person viewing the passage of the Solar disc brushing the top of the south western embankment may mistakenly assume that it was designed that way. The suggestion by the Keeper of the Stones that, 'they did it this way because ...', reveals not only that he asserts power by suggesting he is the keeper of exclusive knowledge; 'We create a wall of superstition about what we did to sustain our magic', (Sibley, 1995, p.120). There is also a tacit relational attachment of the contemporary Druid order to the Neolithic builders of Avebury.

In *Geographies of Exclusion*, Sibley asserts that the ambivalence attached to stereotyped others may also be attached to place; a simultaneous repulsion and desire (Sibley, 1995, p.100). It may be tempting to presume that the Christian community of Avebury is indifferent, dismissive, disdainful or fearful towards the Pagan stones that surround their village; the church warden does tell us these were placed here by, in his definition, a Godless people. It

was with some surprise that I learned that two stones recently excavated on the far western edge of the site have been named by the villagers. I suggest this shows that landscape and identity are both introjective and intrajjective. Two sets of relational nicknames have given to the pair of stones; the first pair-name mentioned has its roots in British cultural folk law; Jack and Jill. On the surface, this appears to be indicative of a familiarisation, suggesting the formation of an affectionate bond with the new object in the landscape. The second set of nicknames suggest there is also something deeper beneath the surface; Adam and Eve. The two objects which originate from a Godless society of innocents, worshiped in the present day by, false Pagans who have turned from God, have now become identified with not only the first two names in the bible, but the first two names of anyone to walk the earth. This suggests a deep rooted appropriation of identity; a need for inclusion that brings the two external stones within the sanctuary of Christianity.

The landscape of Avebury may be viewed as a blank canvas for the imagination to play with. Its Neolithic shapes are alien to modern iconography and those within its landscape are somehow encouraged to participate in the search for meaning and identity; to find a secure base in a changing world that flows through an enduring place of history. I was told of a woman who would regularly travel across the county of Wiltshire to Avebury by taxi and insist that the church warden accompany her around the site while she, 'points out the faces she could see in the stones' (sic). The church warden also spoke of the many visitors who believe Avebury to be a spaceship, and not merely a relic of one from a long past visitation. Some believe that it is an alien landing site and that on some occasion in the future, superior beings from an order of a higher intelligence will return, suggesting that the believer's identification with having a higher intelligence has split from conscious identity and is projected on to something higher than the self, upwards into the stars. However, as delusionary as these beliefs may seem to an outsider, it has been shown there is a correlation

between Neolithic sites, the landscape and the cosmos. Clive Ruggles, Britain's first professor of archaeoastronomy writes;

In recent years, archaeologists have become increasingly aware that patterns of human activity within the prehistoric landscape are likely to have been influenced by more than just ecological and economic factors. Ancient landscapes might also have been structured according to symbolic or cosmological principles, forming what have become known as 'sacred geographies'. Specific places, and indeed whole landscapes, are 'contexts for human experience, constructed in movement, memory, encounter and association'. (Ruggles, 1999, p.120).

The prehistoric landscape of Avebury; rich in symbolism and aesthetically shaped by its crafted horizon to be a container for a ritualistic community, appears to retain its power to inspire affective relational dynamics with the faith groups and worshipers who find an enduring security within its landscape.

Conclusion:

I have shown in this study that the relationship between landscape and identity may be both introjective and intrajjective; each impressing itself upon the other.

Avebury, a Neolithic landscape encompassing both a Pagan temple and English village, acts as a container, holding and possibly regulating the affect of the faith groups within its boundaries. It would appear that Avebury comes to represent a secure base for the faith groups that reside within its symbolic landscape because of the continuity in which they are held. This, I suggest, fosters a tolerance which serves to underpin the peaceful stability of the Christian-Pagan community. I have placed the hyphen between the two faith groups of the community with deliberate care. I suggest that an autopoiesis is also at play here; there is a structural coupling between the two communities who are beginning to acknowledge and give value to one another. The continuity of both place and timed ritual, in addition to the affect regulation fostered by the attachment to a secure base of containment, appear to be significant factors in the embryonic, emergent reparation between the faith groups of Avebury.

The reflexive material produced from the attending to the progressive emergence of the researcher's counter-transference can add an enriched dynamic to the research that may not have been available had this methodology not been undertaken. The psycho-social approach in using subjectivity as a research instrument brings to light that which is beneath the surface.

Bibliography:

Avebury Tourist Information Centre, <http://www.ukinformationcentre.com/southern-england/avebury-tourist-information-centre.htm>, sourced 18th February, 2009.

Bandler, R. and Grinder, J., 1979, *Frogs into Princes*, Real People Press.

Bandler, R. and Grinder, J., 1975, *The Structure of Magic I*, Science and Behavior books.

Barnett, C , p.4, *Ways of Relating: Hospitality and the Acknowledgement of Otherness*, http://oro.open.ac.uk/7142/1/Ways_of_Relating_PHG_Final.pdf, sourced, 27th April 2009.

Bateman, Anthony and Holmes, Jeremy, 1995, *Introduction to Psychoanalysis*, Routledge.

BBC, *Thousands mark summer solstice*,

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/wiltshire/7465235.stm>, sourced, 4th May 2009.

Berry, K, *personal communication from the author*; email received 30th April 2009.

Capra, F, 1996, *The Web of Life*, Harper Collins.

Clarke, S., 2008, *Object Relations and Social Relations*, Karnac Books.

Cozolino, L, 2002, *The Neuroscience of Psychotherapy*, W. W. Norton and Company

Craib, I., 2001, *Psychoanalysis, a critical introduction*, Polity Press.

English Heritage,

http://www.wessexarch.co.uk/files/Learning/avebury_teachers_kit/history_of_the_avebury_monuments.pdf, sourced 26th April 2009.

Freud, S., 1921, *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*, *S.E.*, 18:65-143 (Chapter 6).

Freud, S., 1931, *The Disposition to Obsessional Neurosis*, *G.W.*, VIII, 445; *S.E.*, XII, 320. Cited in: Laplanche & Pontalis, *The Language of Psychoanalysis*, 1973, W.W. Norton and Company.

Fryer, J., *Druid wars: how a drunken row over 4000 year old bones in causing chaos in pagan circles*, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1127430/Druid-wars-How-drunken-row-4-000-year-old-bones-causing-chaos-pagan-circles.html>, sourced 18th February 2009.

Harrison, M., 2001, *The Master Practitioner Suite Volumes One, Two and Three*, Tao Te Publishing.

Hawkes Steve, *Revisiting Britain's biggest free festival*,

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/entertainment/music/3662921.stm>, sourced 26th April 2009.

Hinshelwood, R. D., 1989, *A dictionary of Kleinian thought*, Free Association Press.

Hoggett, P., 2008, *Object Relations and Social Relations*, Karnac Books.

Holloway, W. Jefferson, T., 2000, *Doing Qualitative Research Differently*, Sage.

Holloway, W., 2008, *Object Relations and Social Relations*, Karnac Books.

Hutton, R., 1991, *The Pagan Religions of the Ancient British Isles*, Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Hutton, R., 1999, *The Triumph of the Moon*, Oxford University Press.

Hutton, R., 2007, *The Druids*, Hambledon Continuum.

Kirkpatrick, L. A., 2005, *Attachment, Evolution and the Psychology of Religion*, The Guildford Press.

Lackey, J, Sosa, E., 2006, *The Epistemology of Testimony*, Oxford University Press.

Laplanche & Pontalis, 1973, *The Language of Psychoanalysis*, W.W. Norton and Company.

Mudhar, R., *Stonehenge*, <http://www.anima.demon.co.uk/stonehenge/index.html>, sourced 30th April 2009.

Ogden, T.H., 1999, *Reverie and Interpretation*, Karnac Books.

Orbach, S., 2008, *Object Relations and Social Relations*, Karnac Books.

Panayi May, *Avebury Stone Circle and Silbury Hill*,
<http://www.history.uk.com/articles/index.php?archive=57>, sourced, 26th April 2009

Pearson, B., 2003, *filled with awe (Stonehenge)*, <http://www.dooyoo.co.uk/destinations-national/stonehenge/425772/>, sourced 4th May 2009.

Ruggles, C., 1999, *Astronomy in Prehistoric Britain and Ireland*, Yale University Press.

Schore, A., 1994, *Affect Regulation and Origin of the Self*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Schore, A., 2003, *Affect Regulation and the Repair of the Self*, W. W. Norton and Company.

Seivers, B., 2008, *Organisational & Social Dynamics*, 8, 2: 234-254

Sibley, D., 1995, *Geographies of Exclusion*, Routledge.

Swindon College multi faith team, http://www.swindon-college.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=46, sourced 18th February 2009.

Wheatley, M, Taylor, B, 2009, *Avebury: Sun, Moon and Earth*, Wessex.

Wilkinson M, 2006, *Coming into Mind*, Routledge.

Wiltshire Council, <http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/community/getchurch.php?id=11>, sourced 26th April 2009.