

There is nothing too great of accomplishment for
the man who knows the power of his word, and who
follows his intuitive leads. By the word, he starts in
action unseen forces and can rebuild his body or
remould his affairs.

Florence Scovel Shinn

1871 – 1940

Table of Contents

List of Figures		iii
List of Tables		v
Abstract		vii
Acknowledgements		vii
Preface		ix
Chapter 1	Some initial theoretical considerations	1
Chapter 2	Testing the idea	17
Chapter 3	Ischaemic heart disease and emotions	21
Chapter 4	Counselling and other psychological approaches	32
Chapter 5	Other relevant theoretical considerations	55
Chapter 6	Stress	78
Chapter 7	Investigating the hypothesis	94
Chapter 8	The pilot study	106
Chapter 9	The full study	131
Chapter 10	Discussion	207
References		222
Appendices		
1	General Health Questionnaire	239
2	Visual Analogue Scale	243
3	Consent to clinical trial form	245
4	Study explanatory sheet	246
5	Sample follow-up letter	247
6	Courtesy letter to GP	247
7	Questionnaire results in full	248
8	Statistical Analyses	299

List of Figures

Figure 1	Cause and Effects of the Neuroendocrine Response	23
Figure 2	Henry's S-AM/P-AC Axis	25
Figure 3	The Human Function Curve	26
Figure 4	The Relationship Between Dynamic and Stenotic Factors	27
Figure 5	Cross Section of the Brain to Show the Hippocampus and the Amygdala	53
Figure 6	Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs	67
Figure 7	The Psychological Make-up of the Human Being (Assagioli)	74
Figure 8	How the Reaction to Stress Varies with the Duration of Exposure to the Stressor	78
Figure 9	Selye's General Adaptation Syndrome	86
Figure 10	Average Percentage GHQ-60 Scores – Experimental Group	183
Figure 11	Average Percentage GHQ-60 Scores – Control Group	183
Figure 12	Average Percentage GHQ-60 Scores – Exp.Gp/Ctl Gp Comparison	184
Figure 13	Average VAS scores – Experimental Group	186
Figure 14	Average VAS scores – Control Group	186
Figure 15	Average Percentage VAS Scores – Exp.Gp/Ctl Gp Comparison	187
Figure 16	Average Percentage GHQ-60 Subsection Scores – Experimental Group (Appendix 7)	295
Figure 17	Average Percentage GHQ-60 Subsection Scores – Control Group	295
Figure 18	Average Percentage VAS Subsection Scores – Experimental Group	298
Figure 19	Average Percentage VAS Subsection Scores – Control Group	298
Figure 20	Average Percentage Improvement/Deterioration Comparison between the Experimental Group and the Control Group on GHQ-60 scores	(Text) 189
Figure 21	Average Percentage Improvement/Deterioration Comparison between the Experimental Group and the Control Group on VAS Scores	191
Figure 22	GHQ-60 Subsections – Experimental Group/Control Group	191
Figure 23	VAS Subsections – Experimental Group/Control Group	192
Figure 24	Wilcoxon Analysis for GHQ Experimental Group Base v 3 Months (Appendix 8)	299
Figure 25	Wilcoxon Analysis for GHQ Experimental Group Base v 6 Months	299
Figure 26	Wilcoxon analysis for GHQ Experimental Group Base v 12 Months	300
Figure 27	Wilcoxon analysis for GHQ Control Group Base v 3 Months	300
Figure 28	Wilcoxon analysis for GHQ Control Group Base v 6 Months	301
Figure 29	Wilcoxon analysis for GHQ Control Group Base v 12 Months	301

Figure 30	Wilcoxon analysis for VAS Experimental Group Base v 3 Months	302
Figure 31	Wilcoxon analysis for VAS Experimental Group Base v 6 Months	302
Figure 32	Wilcoxon analysis for VAS Experimental Group Base v 12 Months	303
Figure 33	Wilcoxon analysis for VAS Control Group Base v 3 Months	303
Figure 34	Wilcoxon analysis for VAS Control Group Base v 6 Months	304
Figure 35	Wilcoxon analysis for VAS Control Group Base v 12 Months	304
Figure 36	Mann-Whitney U-test analysis for GHQ Base – 3 months, Experimental Group v Control Group	305
Figure 37	Mann-Whitney U-test analysis for GHQ Base – 6 months, Experimental Group v Control Group	305
Figure 38	Mann-Whitney U-test analysis for GHQ Base – 12 months, Experimental Group v Control Group	306
Figure 39	Mann-Whitney U-test analysis for VAS Base – 3 months, Experimental Group v Control Group	306
Figure 40	Mann-Whitney U-test analysis for VAS Base – 6 months, Experimental Group v Control Group	307
Figure 41	Mann-Whitney U-test analysis for VAS Base – 12 months, Experimental Group v Control Group	307

List of Tables

Table 1	Comparison of the basic assumptions of the Allopathic Medical Model with the Paradigm of Health Model.	5
Table 2	The specific applications of Autogenic Therapy.	39
Table 3	The Synoptic Table.	45
Table 4	Charting the evolution of the notion of information transduction.	88
Table 5	Results of the Pilot Study in chronological order.	111
Table 6	GHQ-60 Pilot Study scores by subsection.	112
Table 7	GHQ-60 Pilot Study averaged percentage scores	112
Table 8	Complete GHQ-60 Results – Experimental Group	(Appendix 7) 248
Table 9	GHQ-60 Results – Control Group who switched to the Experimental Group after 12 months	251
Table 10	Complete GHQ-60 Results – Control Group	252
Table 11	Complete VAS Results – Experimental Group	255
Table 12	VAS Results – Control Group who switched to the Experimental Group after 12 months	264
Table 13	Complete VAS Results – Control Group	265
Table 14	Useable GHQ-60 Results – Experimental Group	275
Table 15	Useable GHQ-60 Results – Control Group	277
Table 16	Useable VAS Results – Experimental Group	279
Table 17	Useable VAS Results – Control Group	286
Table 18	GHQ-60 Collated Data	(Text) 182
Table 19	VAS Collated Data	185
Table 20	GHQ-60 Subsection Scores – Experimental Group	(Appendix 7) 293
Table 21	GHQ-60 Subsection Scores – Control Group	294
Table 22	VAS Subsection scores – Experimental Group	296
Table 23	VAS Subsection scores – Control Group	297
Table 24	Average Percentage GHQ-60 Improvement/Deterioration Comparison	(Text) 188
Table 25	Average percentage VAS improvement/deterioration comparison	190
Table 26	Additional Information Collected	193
Table 27	GHQ-60 Subsection Percentaged Results – Experimental Group	195
Table 28	GHQ-60 Subsection Percentaged Results – Control Group	195
Table 29	VAS Subsection Percentaged Results – Experimental Group	195

Table 30	VAS Subsection Percentaged Results – Control Group	195
Table 31	Wilcoxon Probability Analysis – GHQ-60 Experimental and Control	196
Table 32	Wilcoxon Probability Analysis – VAS Experimental and Control	196
Table 33	Mann-Whitney U-test GHQ-60 Experimental Group v Control Group	196
Table 34	Mann-Whitney U-test VAS Experimental Group v Control Group	197

Abstract

This thesis is predicated by the view that the basic paradigm underpinning Western medicine, ie that of Cartesian mind-body dualism, is fundamentally flawed.

It is described both how medicine came to think in this erroneous way and how the author's thinking evolved, starting with observations made as a student nurse and then developing over many years of practice in different specialisms, before becoming concretised as a hypothesis which predicted that addressing emotional issues would have a beneficial impact on physical disease. This hypothesis was then explored in a pilot study as part of an MA in counselling studies at the University of Keele.

The literature relevant to this area of study is reviewed, together with literature from diverse areas of human endeavour in an attempt to show the connections that link these diverse areas of human experience, from both pre-Cartesian and post-Cartesian times with the insight that is now developing into interconnectedness and which this study is designed to investigate. The full study, which was developed from the above pilot study, is described, and the results are calculated.

The results show an intervention related improvement in health status for the experimental group of over 800% at 3 months when compared to the control group, falling to 600% at the 12 months follow up. These results show considerable statistical significance, with a probability in the order of $p < 0.001$.

The results are then evaluated and the implications of the results are discussed before recommendations are made.

Acknowledgements

Sincere acknowledgements and thanks are owed to the following for their contributions to this research.

Dr RV Lewis, Consultant in Cardiology, Pontefract General Infirmary for his advice, belief and unwavering support.

Dr DI Williams, Lecturer in Counselling Studies, Hull University, for suggestions, critique and patience above and beyond the call of duty.

Judi Irving, Lecturer in Counselling Studies, Hull University, for taking over the support after Dr Williams retired.

Dr Peter Nixon, Consultant in Cardiology, Charing Cross Hospital, for his advice and support.

Dr P Wilson, University of Hull, for advice on the statistical analysis of the results.

Ms J Young, for her commitment to the study before ill-health forced her to retire.

Alvin Marper of Homework studios for the recording of the guided imagery tape and the composition of the accompanying music.

My wife and family for their support and forbearance during my many long hours at the computer.

Finally, and most importantly, the patients/clients who agreed to participate, and without whom, this study could not have happened.

Preface

In the beginning was an observation.

In 1973, I started training in mental subnormality (as it was then called) nursing in one of the old style Mental Subnormality Hospitals, where patients were kept isolated, as far as possible, from the outside world and where they were protected from the pressures of life that impinge on those of us not so incarcerated. This hospital, in keeping with most of the Victorian ‘bins’ that have only recently started to be dismantled, was located in a self contained country estate which had previously been the home of the local gentry and which had acres of beautiful grounds in which the patients could walk and commune with nature.

I noticed that those patients who had simple low intelligence, ie not complicated by any of the genetic abnormalities that created mental, intellectual and physical problems, were mostly incredibly healthy, even into very advanced age. Indeed, I can think of a number of people there in the 70 to 80+ age range who had no physical illnesses recorded in their medical records and who showed no sign of the illnesses which we have come to accept as a normal part of growing older – arthritis, failing eyesight and hearing, heart disease, pulmonary disease, bowel disorders, cancers and hormonal disorders.

As a firm disbeliever in the notion of co-incidence, I asked the question “why should this be so, that these people, who have no quality of life (as I might then have defined it), who have never accomplished anything, who are not free to go wherever they want, when they want, who have never known any other home than this not-quite-a-prison and who are dependent upon the staff for everything are so healthy and untroubled by physical ailments. I postulated, though at the time it went no further than this, that it may be due to an untroubled, stress-free lifestyle, where everything was provided, where there were no externally imposed expectations or pressures, where they were free to do whatever they wanted, within certain limits and where, because of their inherently limited intellectual ability, there was not the capacity to realise what they were missing and what the ‘outside world’ accepted as being normal.

As I have said, at the time, it went no further than a relatively idle musing, but the seed was sown, and when I moved from Mental Subnormality Nursing, to General Nursing, the seed found the conditions that it needed to start to grow.

The 'conditions' that it found were a further four observations: -

- That the majority of the people that I looked after during treatment for cancer (of any sort) were 'the nice guys'. They were the sort of people of whom it was said that they would do anything for anybody, would never say no to anyone, they were the 'salt of the earth' and how unfair it was that such a dreadful thing should happen to someone like that.

- That there seemed to be a large number of apparently healthy people admitted for a variety of illnesses, primarily cardio-vascular or gastro-intestinal, within the first two years following retirement. Many of these soon died of the illness.

- Similarly, that there seemed to be a significant number of people admitted for a variety of illnesses within the first 18 months after the death of a significant other person.

- That the majority of people admitted following a myocardial infarction (heart attack) did not fit the popular image of the driven high achiever, but did appear to be generally less than happy with life.

Over the years, this amounted to a significant body of information, albeit informal and anecdotal, that seemed to say very strongly that there was a link between mental state and physical state, a notion that was contrary to accepted wisdom at that time. Again, I did not formally do anything with this information, but it was always there in my thinking, slowly developing and maturing and awaiting the right stimulus to bring it into bloom. Probably because of this almost subliminal but omnipresent notion, it was at this time that I started to monitor my own feelings of physical and mental well-being (or otherwise) to determine if there was, or appeared to be, any correlation between the two.

What soon became clear was that there was, without doubt, a correlation. I could always relate personal episodes of sub-optimal physical health to a preceding period of emotional dis-ease, but generally, the literature did not agree with my (admittedly very limited) observations. Meyer Friedman had been developing his theory of a personality type that was causally associated with ischaemic heart disease since the late 1950's (Friedman et al, 1959), culminating in the recently published description of Type A Behaviour Pattern

(Friedman, 1974) and Hans Selye had been developing his General Adaptation Syndrome ideas since the 1930's (Selye, 1936), but the bulk of the nursing and medical professional literature continued to maintain the stance that the mind and the body were separate, and the workings of one did not impinge on the other.

This dissonance created a tension for me. The accepted view of the relevant scientific (apparently) community had no space for my observations - they simply did not fit into the existing paradigm. I use the word 'apparently' because to me, **Science** is about formulating a theory to explain the observations that one has made, and then applying that theory to an increasing number of situations to test whether it holds. If it does, all well and good, if not, then it is back to the drawing board to develop another theory that can explain the new observations. This sequence did not appear to be happening here. I could not believe that I was the only person to be making observations that appeared to be in conflict with the existing theory, but nothing seemed to be happening towards developing a more inclusive theory. On the contrary, what seemed to be happening was the development of research studies to try to invalidate similar observations. With hindsight, perhaps the people that I had thought of as scientists were, in reality, not true scientists but technicians!

Again, this tension remained with me, unacknowledged, but always present, for another few years. It was constantly informing my sense of what it meant to be human, but I did not have the opportunity or resources to attempt to formulate an investigation to test out my thoughts, working as I was in various nursing posts across the country. However, the observations continued and suggested nothing to disabuse me of the idea that was slowly developing.

The opportunity for further development of these ideas arose early in 1984 when I was asked to establish a working party to examine the provision of services for people with cancer within the District Health Authority where I had recently been employed as a Nursing Officer. This provided the impetus to read and explore more widely to discover what may be available in other areas of the country, both within and without the National Health Service (NHS), and one of the results of this exploration was the discovery of the widespread use (outside of the NHS) of different complementary therapies, either as part of the ongoing treatment of cancers or as part of the overall treatment and support of the individual so affected. Why, I asked myself, did people invest financially, emotionally and time-wise in something that the wonderful NHS did not provide and which, indeed, was condemned as useless, dangerous, raising false hope and other such derogatory statements by the authors of orthodoxy? Clearly, since the investment was being made, they got something that was not

available for free on the NHS and I started to read as widely as possible about the different approaches that were employed and to attend relevant trainings and seminars whenever I was able. What I read and heard about affirmed the attitude that I had always held of looking at the whole person rather than, as seemed to be taught, looking primarily or solely at the condition affecting the person. Further, they also seemed to concur with the observations that I had started to make 11 years earlier that there appeared to be a relationship between physical and emotional health, a notion that at the time was considered to be heretical.

The opportunity to explore further occurred in 1985 when I was awarded a Yorkshire Regional Health Authority Travel Fellowship to study the use of counselling and visualisation (or guided imagery) in the treatment of people with cancer at the Health Training and Research Center, Little Rock, Arkansas, USA. This intensive 5-day seminar was facilitated by Stephanie Simonton, a psychotherapist who had developed the approach along with her radiotherapist husband Carl Simonton (Simonton et al, 1978).

This very powerful seminar had a number of effects, not the least of which was the further affirmation of the observations that I had been making over the years, together with an explanation of the psycho-emotional mechanisms involved using insights from the psychodynamic tradition and especially the work on child development by Jean Piaget (1937). I returned to the UK inspired and enthused - and trying hard not to get carried away by 'Missionary Zeal'.

I anglicised the American visualisation scripts that I had learned and, almost certainly naively, started to offer workshops and therapy as widely as possible. Despite my naivety and lack of experience, the results that I achieved were such as to give considerable encouragement, and I therefore continued to develop the approach, mainly outside of the NHS, within the Cancer Self-Help Group that I had started in response to some of the findings from the Cancer Care Working Party of the previous year. Whilst the people actually using this approach, ie those affected by cancer, seemed to gain significant benefit, the professionals within the group were more dismissive. Indeed, I remember an oncologist saying after one of my talks on the subject "Carl, there is no way that I can imagine that *anything* that you can do with your mind will have *any* effect on the body." Strangely, he became very quiet when I asked him to picture a very beautiful girl seductively taking her clothes off in front of him, and then asked him if there was an effect on his body!

Once again, there seemed to be concurrence between the experiences of people using a psycho-emotional approach to dealing with their cancer(s) and my previous observations, but there was clearly a need for more than very limited anecdotal support for such a radical notion as the one that I was, by this time, developing – namely that physical health is to a very significant degree dependent upon psychological health. The scepticism of orthodoxy was absolutely right and proper, and what was essential was some far more rigorously scientific evidence of a causative connection between emotional health and physical health. For far too many years, the field of cancer care had been beset (and indeed still is) by ‘miracle cure claims’ based on flimsy evidence which then leads to disappointment and dismay amongst those affected and increasing antipathy on the part of orthodox practitioners towards anything which falls outside the realm of the familiar allopathic approach. Unfortunately, such was the success of this approach that the local newspaper got hold of the story and with typical journalistic excess printed a front-page story under the large banner headlines “Carl Offers New Hope for Cancer Sufferers!”

Needless to say, this resulted, especially since I was a clinical manager in the NHS, in a hugely antagonistic backlash, which effectively sealed the fate of the germ of a research idea that I had formulated to investigate my developing hypothesis. Clearly ‘cancer’ was too emotive a disease for it to be a viable subject for this type of study, especially in the first instance. However, since none of the observations, the build up of anecdotal evidence, the written work that was increasingly emerging or my belief in the fundamental rightness of this idea were in contradiction, it was equally clear that I had to find some means of investigating this hypothesis.

The combination of weathering the storm created by overly enthusiastic journalists and finding a less emotive disease as a subject for a mind/body research study took a number of years, but at least provided a breathing space to enable further reading and study to be undertaken.

The next possibility as a research subject presented itself in 1990 when I was temporarily in charge of a Unit that included a dermatology ward.

Psoriasis, a disease which is determined genetically – either one has the potential for developing it or one does not – but whose expression is moderated by emotional factors seemed to be the ideal choice. It is difficult to find a disease that is less emotive as far as the press and the general public are concerned and yet limited

experience of treating the disease indicated that it would be amenable to an intervention that focussed on addressing emotional issues.

I duly developed an outline proposal for a study and offered it to the Consultant in Dermatology who promptly dismissed it with the words “Waste of time. Level headed people get psoriasis just as much as fruitcakes do!”

In the face of such an obviously closed mind, it seemed pointless to argue the case eg by producing the work of other dermatologists, which tended to support my hypothesis, and I therefore returned once more to the metaphorical drawing board.

Fortunately, the wait this time was of much shorter duration. One of the clients with whom I was using visualisation as part of his dealing with cancer told me about a TV documentary about an American Cardiologist who used an approach which included visualisation and which had apparently recently been published in the Lancet. A quick word with a friendly librarian produced a copy of the report by Dean Ornish (Ornish et al, 1990), and even though there were a number of methodological problems with the study (see later), it was sufficiently interesting for a newly appointed Consultant in Cardiology to agree to my proposal for developing a formal study to investigate the effect of a programme using counselling and guided imagery on people with ischaemic heart disease (IHD). Since I had also just begun a MA in Counselling Studies (1991), there was a wonderful synchronicity in the timing, and this study also provided the necessary research project for the MA.

The rest is history. I developed a pilot study, using just 10 IHD patients, to test the methodology and documentation that I had developed and the results, though necessarily limited in usefulness, were of sufficient interest to warrant a more detailed study which I subsequently developed and present later in this current work.