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Abstract

My research investigates the impact on the survivor of loss of a twin in childhood. Using the qualitative method of thematic analysis applied to a single case, I analyse a published biographical account of surviving this traumatic loss. My findings point to the extreme emotional suffering involved. Among the defences employed to protect the survivor from the anguish of separation and from survival anxiety and guilt, the dead twin is internalised. The trauma and the dead twin are encapsulated in the psyche, unaffected by Time. They are experienced as holes in the psyche and contact with them is avoided. The result can be a half-life for the adult survivor, with a sense of his secret self as wounded, weak, frightened, inhibited, and haunted. This impact of the traumatic loss endures until it is actively mourned and integrated, so far as possible, into the survivor’s life. My findings indicate that external and internal containing objects are needed for this task. It is through mourning that the surviving twin dis-identifies from his dead twin and re-finds the living twin as a life-giving and loving internal object. Through mourning, other containing and protective internal objects are rediscovered and reconfigured. The result is an enlivening of the survivor and a new sense of himself as emotionally capable and contained. In my conclusions regarding the clinical implications of my findings, I suggest that there needs to be recognition of and respect for the survivor’s great sorrow. Above all, treatment needs to be about connectedness and finding a way to the lost good objects. Lastly, I suggest how future research might test the implications of my findings for other kinds of loss of a twin and sibling loss in general.
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Chapter 1
Introduction and Literature Review

1.1. Introduction and Background

1.1.1. Development of Research Interest

My research has developed from my clinical work with A, an adult survivor of childhood sibling loss. When, in the course of that work, I began looking for psychoanalytic writing on the impact of childhood sibling loss, I became aware of its prevalence as a clinical phenomenon, but I found that those contemporary British psychoanalytic thinkers, who had made siblings their specialist subject, had written relatively little on the subject (Coles, 2003, p.5; Mitchell, 2003, pp.169,210-215; Lewin & Sharp, 2009, pp.57-60,163-164). By contrast, I found several authors in the fields of psychology, the psycho-social and biographical journalism, who wrote convincingly and movingly about the experience of losing a sibling during childhood (Rosen, 1986; Fanos, 1996; Farrant, 1998; DeVita-Raeburn, 2004; White, 2006; Rowe, 2007; Knatchbull, 2010; Moorhead, 2011). I searched for possible explanations for the neglect of sibling loss by psychoanalysis. These concentrated upon its founding parents and their ambivalent feelings regarding their own dead siblings (Coles, 2003, pp.35-37,52; Schellinski, 2014, p.191), and upon the traditional focus of psychoanalysis on vertical relationships (Bank and Kahn, 1997, p.299). I noted that North American psychoanalytic thinkers began writing about childhood sibling loss earlier than their British counterparts (e.g., Pollock, 1972; Bank and Kahn, 1982/1997, pp.271-295; Agger, 1988). Even so, as late as 2012, the psychoanalyst Edward regards the failure to appreciate the impact of sibling death in childhood “of great concern” and, echoing her fellow Americans, Bank and Kahn, 30 years earlier, pleads that sibling loss “needs to be recognised as such by their families and by society as a whole” (2012, pp.157,187; Bank and Kahn, 1997/1982, p.295).

1.1.2. Development of Research Project

My project began as a proposed clinical case study of an adult survivor’s experience of childhood sibling loss. However, ethical considerations prevented my using my patient A’s clinical material for that purpose.

---

1 My duty of confidentiality means that I say no more about A other than that our work is on-going.
2 In 2013, I attended a FPC scientific meeting on sibling loss led by the psychoanalytic psychotherapist, Patricia Galliland, which discussed the clinical prevalence of this phenomenon and the lack of psychoanalytic resources.
3 Coles’ monograph on transgenerational transmission of trauma (2011) is concerned with Fraiberg’s “ghosts”, “the visitors from the unremembered past of the parents” (1987, p.100; Cavalli, 2012). A chapter on intergenerational sibling loss refers to the impact of sibling loss on the surviving sibling (pp.28-29,34-35,40-41), but the focus is the impact of parents’ lost siblings on future generations.
4 In addition to these possible explanations, I suggest below that the neglect of sibling loss by psychoanalysis has much to do with the neglect of sibling love (1.4.7). The availability of a loved and loving sibling as a good internal object and the potentially devastating impact on the survivor’s internal world of loss of that good object is central to my thesis (1.4.8 below).
In the course of my research, I had read “From a Clear Blue Sky” (“the book”) by Timothy Knatchbull (“Timothy”) (2010). Timothy was 14 when he suffered the loss of his identical twin, Nicholas (“Nicholas”), in the Mountbatten bomb (3.1 below). Timothy published his book 31 years later. The book tells the compelling story of how it took 23 years before Timothy was able to return to Ireland to investigate Nicholas’ death and mourn fully his terrible loss. The book is a methodically-composed and emotionally-charged document, in which a surviving sibling maps the changes in his subjective state over time, while also providing a historical account of relevant events, using original documents (e.g., journals) and verbatim (audio-recorded) eye-witness accounts.

In consultation with my supervisor and supervisory board, I chose the book as my substitute research material. We had in mind Schreber’s Case (1911). Freud explains the practical exigencies, leading him to use Dr. Schreber’s published biography for his case study of paranoia (1911,p.9). The exigencies influencing me have been ethical exigencies regarding potential harm to the patient, confidentiality and privacy. Pollock notes how these kinds of ethical difficulties may be avoided through the study of a biography which, while “not the same as the report of an ongoing psychoanalytic therapy .. still has its value” (1982,p.333). I recognise that, in the field of history, the value of the application of psychoanalysis to the study of the past has been “very controversial”. To the extent that my work can be classified as psychobiography and therefore a genre of psychohistory, I discuss the potential dangers of psychobiography, together with other potential limitations of using a published biography for a psychoanalytic case study, in detail below (2.1.1 and 2.1.4.5).

Following completion of my first draft thematic analysis of the book, my supervisor and I discussed the distinctive treatment of twins in the literature. I agree with Edward that symbiotic-like relationships between siblings are not confined to twins (2012,pp.8-10); and with Mitchell that, although the literature regards twins as an exceptional case, they can equally well be regarded as extreme instances of conditions of siblinghood, with much to tell us regarding sibling dynamics generally (2003,pp.209,225). Nevertheless, though future research could test the implications of my findings for non-twin siblings (4.4.1 below), my supervisor and I agreed that my research question needed to be reframed to reflect that the sibling loss the subject of my research material is the particular loss of an identical twin. My research question, thus revised, became: what is the impact on the survivor of loss of an identical twin in childhood?

1.2. Critical Literature Review - Introduction

1.2.1. How I undertook my Critical Literature Review

Consistent with the scope of my original research project, I commenced by reading the key English-speaking psychoanalytic texts on siblings (1.1.1 above). After my research project was revised to focus on twins, I turned to the key psychoanalytic text on working with twins (Lewin, 2004/2014). I also

---

5 For the assistance of the reader, I provide a synopsis of the book below (3.1), together with a Family Tree, listing of People and Places, and Timeline (Appendices 1-3).


studied Lewin and Sharp (2009); Volkan and Ast (2014); Skrypek et al. (2014); Hindle and Sherwin-White (2014); Woodward (2010); and as many other publications relating to childhood sibling and twin loss as I could find (1.1.1). In my search for relevant case studies, I consulted PepWeb, the Single Case Archive, and ResearchGate. 8

1.2.2. Introduction

I begin with an overview of the psychoanalytic literature on twins, showing how twin-ship is understood by psychoanalytic thinkers generally and, in particular, by Lewin (2014). I next give an overview of the literature on twin and sibling loss in childhood, discussing the particular aspects of these losses which have been identified by psychoanalytic thinkers as relevant to both kinds of loss and specifically to twin loss. I conclude with my understanding of the limitations of the psychoanalytic literature on childhood twin loss and my analysis of what, specifically, is missing from Lewin’s approach to the subject. This gap gives rise to the necessity for my research project. I explain how my work seeks to take forward Lewin’s work and expand current psychoanalytic thinking about childhood twin loss.

1.3. Critical Literature Review – Twin-ship

The emphasis in the literature is strikingly negative. 9 Twin-ship is theoretically formulated as a much wished-for state of being, envied by non-twins, and with in-built particular pleasures and satisfactions for twins themselves, but which is developmentally highly problematic and frequently pathological (Burlingham, 1963; Sheerin, 1991; Magagna, 2009; Lewin, 2014, pp. 48, 54, 61). Lewin’s thesis is that twins are “fundamentally” affected in their development by being twins, and that some twins will use the internal structure of twin-ship as a psychic retreat (Steiner, 1993) (Lewin, 2014, pp. 2-3, 7). 10

1.3.1. Twin-ship’s Satisfactions

Lewin’s thesis is that the infant’s close preverbal contact with the unconscious of the mother provides the experience of being completely understood, and that the loss of this experience gives rise to the feeling of internal loneliness, which in turn gives rise to the “universal” longing for a twin (2014, pp. 1, 9, 12). 11 The child fantasies a twin – “a companion created in compensation for the lost love object.. who will be ever-loving and ever-present” (Arlow, 1960, p. 178). The function of “the imaginary twin” is to deny the reality of the loved object which is outside the child’s control (Bion, 1950, p. 19).

8 I used the search terms “sibling loss”; “loss of a sibling”; “sibling death”; “twin loss”; “loss of a twin”; and “loss” and “twin”. I sourced 181 psychoanalytic case studies and journal articles. I retained 36 of these as significant.

9 Arlow warns: “it should be noted that [the twin] relationship is basically a highly ambivalent and narcissistic one fraught with a series of special psychological hazards” (1960, p. 197). Sheerin, writing 30 years later, refers to “the wealth of psychological difficulties that may complicate the maturational process of an identical twin”, adding that these “complexities of twin-ships cannot be understated” (1991, pp. 13, 22).

10 See also Lacombe (1959) and Ortmeyer (1970, 1975) who postulate that twins inevitably suffer a deficit as a result of being twins.

11 Klein writes about the internal loneliness in everyone as the “yearning for an unattainable perfect internal state” (1963, p. 300). Lewin draws attention to the Platonic discourse on the nature of love: “human nature was originally one and we were a whole; and the desire and pursuit of the whole is called love” (2014, pp. 27-28). Lawrence writes about the fascination twins hold because “on some level we are all searching for ‘our other half’ to provide that elusive feeling of being complete” (2005, p. 101).
Twins are envied for their capacity to prolong the relaxed and blissful state of being perfectly understood, through their capacity for deep affective contact with each other (Lewin, supra). They share the unique experience of always being present for each other in utero and in their mother’s mind (Lewin, 2014, p.57). Sheerin refers to twins’ “undoubted advantage” of being able to face together “the frequently terrifying moments of their early development; for instance, the periods of loneliness and abandonment” (1991, p.14).

Magagna and Dominguez show from their observational study of twins how the capacity for empathy and expression of emotion can develop very early (2009, pp.50, 53, 57). The psychoanalyst, Engel, (who was a twin), refers to the availability of constant companionship; the extent to which the reliable physical presence of each other “mitigate[d] the trauma of separation” from their parents; and the “extraordinary power” he and his twin felt in being able to deceive others as to their respective identities (1974, p.33). The emotional and mental communion twins experience means that they can enjoy a level of continued emotional self-sufficiency and potency, even omnipotence.12

1.3.2. The ‘we-self’

Twins can experience themselves as a “we-self” (Ortmeyer, 1970, p.125, and in Lewin, 2014, pp.61, 126-129). This is not about sameness; it means that they do not distinguish between their own and their twin’s personality, but use each other’s personality as an adjunct to their own (ibid.). Conflict needs to be kept to a minimum, since harm to the other is harm to oneself (Bank and Kahn, 1997, p.225). Difficulties will be resolved and aggression contained by complementarity, similarity or interchangeability, or aggression will be externalised (Lewin, 2014, p.60; Sheerin, 1991). Magagna shows how projection of aspects of the self into the other twin can substantially weaken and limit personality development (2009, p.120).

Both identical and fraternal twins commonly have a sense of shared identity. Leonard (1961, p.307, and in Lewin, 2014, p.58), proposes the existence of a “psychological syncytium”, a sense of fusion or oneness and lack of perception of separateness or boundaries, which leads gradually through the continued confrontation with a mirror image to a state of primary identification with the co-twin which persists throughout life.13 Joseph and Tabor (1961) refer to the mutual inter-identification between twins and the fusion of self and object representations, leading to a diffuseness of ego boundaries, as the “twinning reaction”. They note the tendency of twins to form twin relationships with other people in their lives. Lewin argues that the twin relationship is internalised and forms a permanent and enduring dynamic structure within the brain (2014, p.177).14

12 The narcissistic advantages of twin-ship can combine, not only to help twins feel special, but also to give them a sense of superiority and invincibility – they are “doubly powerful” (Lewin, 2014, p.15; Sheerin, 1991). Lewin draws attention to the Platonic idea that the original nature of man was a double being, whom the gods split into two halves (man and woman), because the double beings were so full of themselves that they rose up to attack the gods (2014, pp27-28).

13 Orr (1941), cited by Lawrence (2005), suggests that being confronted with a mirror image of oneself can have stunting effects on ego development.

14 Lewin’s substantial contribution to the field is her thesis that it is in the transference that the internalised twin-ship can be most keenly felt; the analyst is treated as part of the patient (Lewin, 2014, pp.84-88). Lewin discusses
1.3.3. Developmental Factors

The literature emphasises the disadvantages of having to spread maternal resources between two (Lewin, 2014, pp.3,70). As Mitchell puts it, “food can.. become insufficient” with twins (2003, p.200).

As soon as she knows she is pregnant with twins, their mother has two babies in mind and her attention is divided (Lewin, 2014, pp.49-50,174-175). A twin never has the experience of being alone with his mother or of being his mother’s unique child (Lewin, 2014, p.49). Sheerin writes about the reality of having to share parental supplies leading to the dawning realisation that the co-twin is a rival for those supplies (1991, p.14). Unconscious hostility and a need to negate the co-twin arise from resentment about the lack of singularity (ibid.). Lewin, referring to Davison’s (1992) observational studies of twins, suggests that their mother’s state of mind is critical to twins’ individual development and, in particular, her sense of the individuality of each of them (Lewin, 2014, pp.76-79). Where their mother is unable to create a space in her mind for each twin separately, rivalry and violent hatred between them are likely to result (Lewin, 2014, p.30).

Lewin writes that each twin impinges on the other’s relationship with the mother and that twins inevitably suffer less containment by their mother as a factor of the twin-ship (2014, pp.49,67-69). Having to wait longer for attention, and therefore suffering greater frustration and rage than a single infant, twins will turn to each other as a developmental object (ibid., p.129). Piontelli writes of infant twins between 12 and 15 months who only cried or rejoiced when separated from or reunited with each other: they had developed a “strong and prevailing horizontal attachment” (2002, p.90). Lewin suggests that where the horizontal relationship becomes the primary relationship, twins will be locked in an emmeshed and rigid relationship, impairing development (2014, p.51).

Lewin’s thesis is that where twins use each other developmentally, this can result in an immature container for each twin (2014, pp.49,176). What is internalised is a narcissistic twin-ship which does

the twins Bert and Bill, written about by Burlingham (1963), who had no object relationships except in attacking each other or others in the children’s home where they lived. She notes that, after he had aped their rowdy and destructive behaviour, the twins made a kind of relationship with the therapist (Barron) who ran the home. Lewin comments that Barron had to become a twin to Bert and Bill, in order to make some kind of emotional connection with them (2014, pp.133-134).

An identical twin may well feel there is nothing unique or personal about him (Sheerin, 1991, p14). Arlow writes of the “wish for an unshared childhood” held by both his twin survivor patients (1960, p.195). Lawrence (2005) writes of the wish for an unshared breast and the deeper wish to have been born single.

Sheerin concludes that there can be no feeling of close contact between mother and identical twin until they are distinguishable (1991, p14). When their own mother cannot tell them apart, identical twins “have every reason to feel unrecognised, alone and angry” (ibid.): cf. Patricia, the mother of Timothy and Nicholas, who put a small gold bracelet on Nicholas “to differentiate us” (p.8). Lewin writes that mothers often feel guilty and neglectful towards their twins for not treating them individually or equally (2014, pp.64-66).

The experience of their present and absent mother is all the more intense, since their mother always has another baby to attend to, or another baby in mind (Lewin, 2014, pp.10, 50).

Magagna and Dominguez write that it is “obvious” that in early infancy and childhood “the other twin can never be an adequate substitute for the mother or adult caregivers” (2009, p.53).
not reduce anxiety (Lewin, 2014, pp. 11, 14, 54-56, 137). Deep and empathic understanding between the twins is preserved, but which is hostile to object relationships outside itself, including with the parents: “While the ‘skin’ between the twins is ‘thin’, the ‘skin’ around the twin pair is thick.” (Lewin, 2014, p. 19). Lack of relationships with mother, mother-substitutes, siblings, and other adults deprives twins of useful identifications (Burlingham, 1963, p. 410). Instead, the twin-ship acts as a refuge from experiencing loss of, and awareness of need for, the mature object (Lewin, 2014, pp. 3, 10, 15, 16, 76). Lewin concludes that this means that there is no development of a capacity to mourn and the good object is insufficiently established (2014, pp. 14, 55-56).

I comment here that Lewin seems to have in mind a very particular patient group, when she writes of twin pairs who side-line their mother and other adult carers to such an extent during infancy that no good, mature internal object can be established. Piонтелли (supra) remarks that although for many twins “sooner or later, each necessarily becomes the major figure of attachment for the other”, out of all the twins she observed, only one couple of identical twins were “locked in an exclusive relationship of total closure to the outside world”, and “their post-natal environment” had “played an important role in fostering their pre-natal tendencies” (1989, p. 425).

1.3.4. Separation and Individuation

The struggle to separate and create individual identities is very difficult and evokes “intense reactions” because loss of the co-twin being experienced as loss of part of the self (Sheerin, 1991, p. 15; Burlingham, 1963, p. 403; Agger, 1988). Where the other is experienced as part of self, it cannot be given up (Lewin, 2014, p. 40). Magagna’s identical twin patient Hannah experienced her sister as “part of me” and even her separate social life was unbearable (2009, pp. 130, 132). Lewin regards conjoined twins as the embodiment of the twin dilemma – “to separate and lose something of oneself, perhaps with a disabling consequence; or to remain entwined with the consequent disfigurement of the individuality that might have been achieved through separation” (pp. 181-182). Magagna and Dominguez write movingly of their observation of the impact of physical separation on two conjoined twin infant boys. Separation for both was “frightening and difficult, as if they had lost a part of themselves” (2009, p. 48). Following separation, both were suffering from “their profound sense of loss of each other” (ibid.). One of them, Tom, “began to shrivel like a leaf torn from a nourishing tree” (ibid.). The authors’ sense was that he was grieving the loss of his better self, which he experienced as located in his brother (ibid.). Separation from his brother had been “too traumatic” and he “was not psychologically prepared to live alone”, his psychic structure resembling that of a “newborn when exposed to anxieties” (2009, pp. 50-51). With conjoined twins, separation often risks

---

19 The contrast is with the reparative capacity of the internal parents and their creative intercourse, which can transform nameless dread into an experience that is tolerable (Lewin, 2014, pp. 11, 137).
20 The greater the maternal deprivation and lack of maternal affection, the greater the likelihood that twins will look inwards for soothing (Sheerin, 1991), becoming self-regulating objects for each other (Lawrence, 2005), with consequential deepening and embedding of the twin bond (Lewin, 2014, pp. 66-67,107,122).
21 Cf. Bank and Kahn’s discussion of the painful process of separation of the identical twins, Marilyn and Vickie (1997, pp. 42-46); and Lewin’s discussion of the Gibbons twins who, though separated, were still trapped in an emmessed internal twin-ship which prevented either of them finding a separate identity (2014, p. 17).
annihilation of one of them and hence the twin-ship. Lewin’s thesis is that all twins seeking separation face annihilation anxiety (Lewin, 2014, pp. 184, 197; Lawrence, 2005, p. 90).

1.4. Critical Literature Review – Loss of a Twin

1.4.1. Enduring Trauma


1.4.2. Surviving Twin is Child: Impossibility of Mourning

The literature emphasises that loss of a twin in childhood, before the occurrence of any of the standard life events (e.g., university, work, marriage, family) which might facilitate gradual individuation for each twin, will be experienced as potentially identity-shattering and destabilising (Woodward, 2010, p. 60). The emphasis is upon the premature experience of separation at a time when the twin bond will predominate. Further, the younger the child when their twin dies, the greater the lack of developmental capacity to understand and make sense of the death and the greater the dependence upon, and impact of, the grieving parents (Lewin, 2014, p. 209; Woodward, 2010, p. 23). If the twin dies at birth, the surviving baby is especially vulnerable (ibid.). He does not have the capacity to deal with the traumatic event of loss of his twin, his grieving parents and the triumph of his survival and is likely to emerge feeling persecuted and fragmented (Lewin, 2014, p. 201).

---

22 They are exposed to paranoid anxieties and fear of fragmentation (Lewin, 2014, p. 136). In the case of emmeshed twins, where no good internal object has been established, separation is especially terrifying (Lewin, 2014, pp. 56, 136-137). The experience is of abandonment into the void outside the common psychic membrane (the ‘thick skin’ around the twin pair referred to in 1.3.2 above) (Lewin, 2014, pp. 137-138).

23 Crehan is a child psychoanalytic psychotherapist. Rustin contrasts adult psychoanalysis with child psychoanalytic psychotherapy’s long tradition of interest in sibling relationship and significant contributions in this tradition (2009, pp. 147-148). This is an intriguing and puzzling dichotomy between these two branches of the one profession, but outside the scope of my research project.

24 Guntrip describes the “severe trauma” of the death of his younger brother when he was 3 (1975, p. 145). This trauma was subject to a “total amnesia” which persisted through two analyses by Fairbairn and Winnicott (ibid.). (Rudnytsky, contrasting Freud’s and Guntrip’s responses to loss of their respective brothers in childhood, suggests that Freud’s guilt signified greater psychological development (1988, p. 424).) Abend writes that the detailed memories of the “traumatic deaths” in childhood of his two adult patients’ respective older brothers were “unearthed only with great difficulty”, and brought forth “affective components of the traumatic sequences which were warded off in the initial recountings of the facts” (1986, p. 100).

25 The loss will be experienced as overwhelming if the natural process of separation and individuation has not yet begun. Timothy contrasts his situation with that of his friend and fellow twin-survivor, David. He was 25 when his twin, John, died. John had lived long enough for them to want to go their own ways”, and this natural process of “going in separate directions” had been “painful”, full of “difficulties .. tensions .. [and] sadness” (p. 221). Timothy writes: “David made me realise that in adolescence and adulthood our lives might have been very different.” (p. 222). Until then, he had “assumed that Nick’s and my experience of twinhood would have been an extension of our childhood” (ibid.). That was a childhood in which they were “hardly ever separated”, spending only a “handful” of days apart (p. 11).
The literature emphasises that it is a child’s mind that has to make sense of their sibling’s death. There is a premature existential crisis. The child’s “sense of order and meaning” in a “now explicitly uncertain and unpredictable universe” is disrupted (Charles and Charles, 1986, p. 73). The bereaved child can take for granted no longer “the safety of the world and the efficacy of adults” (Charles and Charles, 2006, p. 74). There is a “breaking of a basic trust and sense of faith in the external world” and “terrible recognition of the parents’ inability to keep the world safe” (Charles and Charles, 2006, p. 87). Michael Rosen, who was a ‘replacement’ child for an older brother and who lost his own son at 19, writes about bereaved parents’ lost confidence in themselves as protectors of their children (Rowe, 2007, p. 183; Edward, 2012, p. 156). The surviving twin’s dependency on the parents is shaken by their inability to prevent the death of the twin (Lewin, 2014, p. 209; Woodward, 2010, p. 13).

Woodward treats the actual circumstances of a twin’s death in childhood as a significant factor (2010, p. 1). Whether the survivor witnessed a horrible or shocking death, or whether the dead child had prolonged or gruesome suffering before dying, will contribute to its traumatic impact on the immature and developing mind of the survivor (Bank and Kahn, 1997, pp. 278-280). Rosen emphasises the element of shock and surprise and whether the survivor was unprepared for the death (1995, p. 80). Whether the survivor attends the funeral is also influential (Pollock, 1986, p. 7).

The loss will be experienced differently according to the child’s developmental age when it occurs (Woodward, 2010, p. 3). The younger child may lack sufficient language and intellectual capacity to understand death (Charles and Charles, 2006, p. 73), so that intense fears about death can develop (Davids, 1993), and “magical attributions and fantasies about the dead sibling can go unchecked” (Bank and Kahn, 1997, p. 281; Pollock, 1982, p. 350). Crehan suggests that the older child may be able to conceptualise death, but the result may be to fill them with a terror of death and leave them with a premature and heightened sense of their own mortality (2004, pp. 204, 213; Edward, 2012, pp. 166-167).

Although Crehan distinguishes between different capacities of comprehension, depending on the age of the survivor, she concludes that, even if the bereaved child has a realistic understanding of death, he is unready “to decathect a lost object through the work of mourning” (pp. 203-204). This is not to challenge that even a very young child may miss terribly their dead sibling and yearn for them (Edward, 2012, p. 157, following Bowlby (1980).) However, full mourning is only possible post-adolescence (ibid.; Davids, 1993, p. 290; Klyman, 1986, p. 325). Mitchell concludes that, absent mourning, “the reality of a dead sibling will have to be dealt with by unresolved fantasies” (2003, p. 212).

The reality of a dead twin is frequently avoided by creation of a fantasy twin (Lewin, 2014, p. 201; Bion, 1950).26 The dead-twin fantasy allows the surviving twin to keep control over his twin object, retain his identity as a twin, and avoid the reality of the experiences of loss and aloneness and the

---

26 Only one of Bion’s three patients with an imaginary twin was an actual twin who was an infant when his sister died. The significance of this actual twinship is not commented upon. (Lewin, 2014, p. 91; Mitchell, 2003, pp 210-213). Mitchell’s view is that this patient’s imaginary twin enabled him to fend off the traumatic reality of his sister’s death (2003, p 212; cf. Lewin et al., 2009, p. 54).
process of mourning (Lewin, 2014, pp.44,198).\textsuperscript{27} The fantasy twin may be felt to be, and spoken to as if they are, actually present (Arlow, 1960; Engel, 1975; Pollock, 1978). Disavowal will operate, so that the fact the twin has died is both known and not known (Lewin, 2014, p.205).\textsuperscript{28} Reeves (1973) writes about his 7-year-old patient, who was 3 when the family fishing boat capsized. Although he and his mother survived, the patient’s father and non-identical twin brother drowned. Reeves shows how his patient sustained a belief in the continued existence of his father and brother and the possibility they might one day return. Reeves concludes: “it is precisely the capacity to apprehend the real that seems to be at least partially imperilled as the result of trauma” (1973, p.25). Disavowal means there is a refusal to perceive the reality of the loss, but this is a pre-requisite of mourning: “One cannot grieve what one does not know” (1973, p.26).\textsuperscript{29}

1.4.3. Multiple Losses

In addition to loss of their parents to grief\textsuperscript{30}; loss of the sense of their parents as protectors (1.4.2); and loss of their family as it was before their twin died\textsuperscript{31}; there are losses suffered when a twin dies which are unique to twin-ship.

Lewin conceptualises death of a twin as a narcissistic injury because aspects of the self are lost and all the unique satisfactions associated with the twin-ship have to be given up (Lewin, 2014, p.207). Lewin’s focus is upon the primitive nature of the feelings aroused in the survivor, which she regards as consequential upon the internal twin-ship psychodynamics. Since the internal twin-ship and the internal twin object are inextricably linked with the self at a deeper and chronologically earlier level than other internal objects, separation from the internal twin is experienced as a threat to the integrity of the self at a primal level (2014, pp.4,205). This involves a terrifying sense of danger and loss of known boundaries (ibid.). The loss is experienced as an amputation leading to fragmentation and annihilation (ibid.). To the extent that the twins interact with each other and the external world as a ‘we-self’ unit (1.3.2), the absence of the dead twin also creates acute anxiety, because of the loss of personality traits needed for the survivor to function (Lewin, 2014, p.127; Magagna and Dominguez, 2009, p.48).

\textsuperscript{27} Lewin writes about her patient who had created an imaginary twin to take the place of his dead twin sister, who died at birth. This imaginary twin-ship had also acted as a refuge from contact with a withdrawn, depressed and frequently absent maternal container (2014, pp. 202-204 and see 1.4.5 below).

\textsuperscript{28} Cf. Pollock (1978) writes about Kerouac’s loss of his nine-year-old brother when he was four, and how Kerouac refused to believe his brother was dead. Kerouac’s ‘Visions of Gerald’, written 30 years later, testifies to his sense that his brother continued to be available to him (reproduced in Pollock, 1978, p.465). In his mid-40s, learning of the death of the friend who was the inspiration for Dean in “On the Road” and whom he called his “long lost brother”, Kerouac for months refused to believe it (Pollock, 1978, pp.469-470).

\textsuperscript{29} Cf. “...the patient is aware of the loss .. but only in the sense that he knows whom he has lost but not what he has lost in him.” (Freud, 1917, p.245, discussed in Brenman, 2006, p.25).

\textsuperscript{30} 1.4.4 below.

\textsuperscript{31} Crehan points to the loss of the survivor’s family as it was before the death: life at home will never be the same again (2004, p.214). Mia Farrow, referring to the death of her older brother when she was 16, writes poignantly that there were “no more parties” (Farrow, 1997, p.60).
1.4.4. Parental Grief and Guilt

The literature emphasises the persisting influence of the twin-ship on the minds of the bereaved parents, despite the fact that ‘the twins’ as an entity no longer exist. Parents are likely to be unable to provide the emotional containment the surviving twin needs (Lewin, 2014, p.201). They will struggle with difficult contradictory feelings, and the surviving twin’s experience of his parents is likely to be confusing and troubling. The survivor is a painful reminder for the parents of the child they have lost: “The missing twin is always present in the reflection of the surviving twin.” (Ibid.).

When one twin dies during pregnancy or soon after birth, the birth is an event to be celebrated, but it is also laden with grief and loss (Ibid.). There may be intense relief for the survival of the co-twin, which may lead them to be over-protective of the survivor (Lewin, 2014, p.209; Woodward, 2010, pp.13-14). Alternatively, the dead baby may be idealised, so that the survivor may not be accepted fully and may feel devalued and neglected (Lewin, 2014, pp.201, 209). Woodward regards parental over-protectiveness and rejection to have the same source, namely, parents’ inability to bear their helplessness in the face of severe loss (2010, p.15).

Pollock recognises the devastation of bereaved parents and that, though they may appreciate the suffering of their surviving children, they would need “herculean strength” to attend to their emotional needs (1986, p.7). Edward acknowledges that bereaved parents do well to meet the basic needs of their remaining children (2012, p.157). She writes that it is “essential” that other family members or friends recognise the importance of the loss for the surviving children and be available to offer support and help with understanding (Ibid.).

For Crehan, it is in the “emotional absence of bereaved parents” that “the primary threat to the bereaved sibling resides” (2004, p.214). This aspect of parental grief is critical for Crehan, as it was for Pollock (1978, p.480; 1986, p.7). The people to whom the surviving sibling would ordinarily expect to turn for help and support are themselves in urgent need of help, and will be emotionally unavailable (2004, p203; Bank and Kahn, 1997, p.273; Charles and Charles, 2006, p.86). As Freud indicated, the experience of physical or psychical helplessness is the essence of trauma (1926; Garland, 2004, pp.204-207). Crehan considers it central to the trauma of childhood sibling loss and its potential catastrophic consequences for the survivor that he is on his own with it (Crehan, 2004, pp.203, 214-216).

---

32 The idealised dead cannot be brought in for realistic scrutiny (Agger, 1988, p.23; Reid, 2014, p.281).
33 Crehan describes the surviving sibling as the “forgotten griever” (2004, p.203). Edward describes surviving siblings as “unrecognised mourners” and “disenfranchised grievers, whose loss is not publically or socially recognised” (2012, p.156). Klyman writes that, “Too often, in the house of mourning, the parents are comforted while the bewildered children stand around unattended without words to express their confused emotions” (1986, p.325). She suggests that the resources within and available to the family will determine whether the loss will be a “major trauma that leaves a major scar” on the survivors (1986, p.326). Cf. Bank and Kahn’s *cri de coeur* to medical, psychological and educational communities to help bereaved parents cope with their loss and help surviving children cope with theirs (1997, p.295).
34 Bank and Kahn describe the child survivor in a family that has lost a child as a ‘double orphan, losing not only a sister or brother but also an emotionally available parent’ (1997, p.273). Klyman describes the child survivor as a “double loser” (1986, p.325).
However, the impact of parental grief on the remaining children when a child dies extends beyond parents’ emotional unavailability (Crehan, 2004, pp. 203-205, 214-216; Edward, 2012, pp.158-172). A recurring feature is parents’ inability to talk about their dead child (Bank and Kahn, 1997, pp. 274-276). Edward notes that this will add to the disconnection between parents and their surviving children (2012, p.160). Crehan argues that silence about the dead child may contain any number of frightening communications (2004, pp. 207-208). The developmental immaturity of the survivor is relevant here. Lack of information about the death may ‘fuel magical thinking and give rise to more frightening and painful interpretations of the event’, such as that the parents were responsible for the death or that the survivor himself was responsible (Crehan, 2004, pp. 203, 213; Edward, 2012, pp.160-161,177). Distorted and irrational fantasies about the whereabouts of the dead child may persist uncorrected in the absence of open communication (Bank and Kahn, 1997, pp.281-282; Crehan, 2004, p.203).

Bank and Kahn suggest that it is parental guilt that lies behind the ‘unspoken rule of silence’ in families who have lost a child (Bank and Kahn, pp.274-275). Parents’ remaining children are only too available for parents to use for their projections, including guilt and shame (ibid.; Crehan, 2004, pp.205-209; Coles, 2011, pp.34-35). Parents may ‘impose’ guilt upon their surviving child, either blaming the child for the death or rebuking him for not showing sufficient grief (Crehan, 2004, p.210) or telling him he is not as good as the dead sibling (Coles, 2011, pp.78-79). Crehan and Berman draw attention to surviving siblings who become scapegoats for parental and family guilt as a means of avoiding individual and family breakdown (2004, pp.208-209; 1973, pp.162-163). The survivor may already have his own guilty feelings, depending upon the circumstances of the death and the nature of his attachment to the dead child (Bank and Kahn, 1997, p.281). If the sibling relationship has been marked by rivalry and jealousy, Berman suggests that the survivor can experience intense guilt for having survived and for their hostility towards their dead brother or sister (1978, pp.575-576). On top of the survivor’s own guilt, the additional burden of the parents’ projected guilt can be ‘crippling’ (Crehan, 2004, p.208; Bank and Kahn, 1997, pp.275-276).

1.4.5. Influence of Guilt

The influence of guilt is by far the dominant narrative in the psychoanalytic literature\(^{36}\) - whether projected parental or family guilt, or the survivor’s own guilt (for having survived, or for past conflicts, or for past hostility towards their dead brother or sister, or for unconscious rivalry with them) (Colonna and Newman, 1983, p.301; Davids, 1993, p.288; Lewin, 2014, pp.200-204,206-208). Within this dominant narrative, guilt arising from rivalry (whether conscious or unconscious) predominates (Berman, 1978; Christian, 2007; Lewin, 2014). With respect to survival guilt, Pollock argues that “guilt over successful

\(^{35}\) Smith’s patient and her twin sister were born prematurely: she survived and her twin died. The patient believed that she had murdered her sister. Smith concluded that her parents’ refusal to talk about her dead twin had pushed her sister’s death back into her and had contributed to her guilt (1992, p.58).  

\(^{36}\) cf. Woodward’s Bereaved Twin Study (1987) where she interviewed 219 twins. Some had lost their twin around the time of birth; some in childhood; and others in adulthood. Although guilt was a theme that emerged from the Study, its clearest finding was the enormity of the loss for the survivor (2010, p.9). Guilt feelings were strong in those twins who felt responsible for the death or whose parents wished the other twin to have survived instead (2010, p.15). Some survivors attempted to ‘live for two’; some put themselves at risk through dangerous sports; some felt they had not taken sufficient care of their co-twin; others felt remorse for times they had wished their twin ‘out of the way’ (pp.15-16).
survival is as important in some childhood-sibling-loss cases as in the concentration-camp survivors” (1978,p.477; also Pollock,1982,p.350).

Bereaved siblings affected by intense guilt may engage in repetitive, self-punishing behaviour (Berman,1978). Berman’s patient’s self-punishing took the form of a passive, self-defeating life-style involving relationships in which he was exploited. Other possible forms of self-punishing behaviour include anti-social acting-out; academic or other failure (Pollock,1978,pp.474-476); living a depressive, deadened existence almost in mimicry of the dead sibling whom (in attempted compensation for their guilt) they dare not surpass; and attempted or actual suicide (Bank and Kahn,1997,pp.285-286; Berman,1978,p.578; Agger,1988,p.18; Crehan,2004,p.217; Garland,2004,p.214; Edward,2012,pp.165-166).37

Alternatively, the surviving sibling affected by unconscious guilt may become the ‘good child’, ‘seeking the reassurance that she has not committed murder’ (Agger,1988,p.18; Crehan,2004,p.212; Edward,2012,p.162), maybe in adulthood entering a life-saving or life-bettering profession in an unconscious attempt to undo the childhood loss (Pollock,1972; Berman,1978,p574; Crehan,2004,p.217). Christian attributes his patient’s submissive character and inhibition of aggressiveness to her unconscious guilt following her brother’s death when she was 3 (2007,pp.48-49). Kernberg and Richards refer to the finding by Cain and Cain (1964) that intense guilt for some survivors turned into a fear of losing control of anger and experiencing themselves as potential murderers (1988,p.53). Pollock (1978) draws attention to the interplay between guilt and aggression. He argues that the survivor feels guilty for his aggression towards the parents and carries a “fantasy of responsibility for the terrible occurrence which hurt the parents” (1978,p.454). This guilt may protect the survivor from the fear that the dead sibling was actually killed by the parents (ibid.). Abend considers that the “need to be perfect” carried by his patient, born a year after his brother died, was derived from the fantasy that his parents had “got rid of an unsatisfactory child” (1986,p.101).

In the twin literature specifically, consistently with a psychoanalytic perspective which regards twins as primarily rivalrous objects, the emphasis is upon guilt derived from rivalry (Arlow,1960,1975; Sheerin,1991). Lewin gives an account of her work with a man whose twin sister died at birth (2014,pp.202-204). Her patient’s phantasy was that he had taken too much in utero, and that had he taken less, his twin would have survived. He felt responsible for his sister’s death and feared inevitable retribution. In the transference, he could take nothing from Lewin safely without fearing punishment and would negate all gains made in the therapy.38 Lewin (2014,p.206) refers to Arlow’s (1960) patient, whose older identical twin died at the age of 18. The boys had enjoyed being twins. Ten years after the loss, on military service, the patient was separated from his unit, which was decimated. He returned home to visit an aunt who was a second mother. Her critically ill husband died in the patient’s arms. Shortly afterwards, the patient developed a sense of depersonalisation, a feeling of losing his identity.

37Abend (1986) writes about his patient with self-destructive trends, who was 17 when his older brother died from a self-destructive lifestyle. The brother had been intensely loved and intensely hated. Abend concludes that his patient identified with his older brother out of guilt in order to punish and even destroy himself (1986,p.98). Thus, the surviving sibling reinforces his guilty sense of being undeserving or worthless.

38For the surviving twin whose twin dies at birth or earlier, the birth story or family myth which the child learns about the birth will be influential and may add to the burden of survival guilt (Lewin,2014,pp.202-204).
and an intense fear of being alone. He awoke from nightmares in great panic and suffered acute anxiety. Arlow interpreted his patient’s symptoms as related to conflicts concerning his unconscious guilt over the death of his brother as a hated rival, and his introjection of the lost object as a defence against such guilt and denial of the death.39

In a later paper (1976), Arlow returns to this case and redefines his patient’s loss as a traumatic loss and suggests that defences of denial and introjection were used to master the trauma.40 Consistently with this approach, Charles and Charles regard the child’s experience of guilt to be less about unconscious hostility towards the dead sibling, and more about an attempt to gain mastery or control over a trauma, even at the price of holding himself responsible (2006,p.76). They point out that the child’s experience of guilt may be quite different from that of the adult, and that children are often preoccupied with guilty feelings and self-blame (ibid.).41

1.4.6. Unconscious Identifications/Identity Formation

When twins are identical or very alike, the confusion about who is who will be experienced by the twins themselves and by their parents (Lewin,2014,p.98).42 Loss of a twin gives rise to further confusion and a disturbing crisis of identity in the survivor (Bank and Kahn,1997, pp.284-285; Lewin,2014,p.96). Bank and Kahn suggest that where there is a predominance of narcissistic mirroring or idealising of a sibling relationship, as in a twin-ship, the loss of the pleasing reflection provided by the dead sibling, can lead to a devastating loss of self (1997,p.283).43 Pollock writes about the significance of childhood sibling identifications in adult life (1978,p.446) and how the “frozen images” of the dead child can become fixed in the psyche of the surviving sibling (1986,p.32).

Edward suggests that, despite their parents’ silence, the remaining children will know about and be deeply affected by the sight of their parents’ grieving (2012,p.161). She suggests that some may identify with their parents’ depressed state as a means of connecting with them (2012, pp.158,173). Crehan, referring to Green’s essay ‘The Dead Mother’ (1997), writes that “the dead mother complex to some degree, or in some fashion, is the experience of the surviving sibling” (2004,p.216). The loss of

39 “As long as the patient suffered, he was satisfied that his denial of his brother’s death was effective. The brother still lived within him and he had no need to feel guilty” (1960,p.188). He adds, “Expelling the introject was unconsciously equated with killing the brother again” (ibid.). Lewin draws attention to the heart attack suffered by Engel on the last day of the period of mourning for his twin in the Judaic tradition (2014, pp.68-69). Engel’s reaction was relief (1975,p.25). He could now exonerate himself of the fantasied crime of killing his brother (who had also died of a heart attack) and the associated guilt (Lewin,2014,pp.68,207). A contemporary approach might conclude that the two traumatic events occurring 10 years after the loss reactivated the original trauma, leading to the patient re-experiencing the intense pain of loss of his beloved twin, acute loneliness, fears for his own survival and survival guilt (Christian,2007,p.51). They conclude that, if guilt feelings remain unresolved, the sibling may struggle to shift their attachment from the lost loved object to new love objects; intimacy generally may be avoided, out of fear of being responsible for the death of another love object (ibid.). Cf. Woodward,2010,pp.12-13.

40 Timothy writes about how, when they were toddlers, the gold bracelet their mother had put on Nicholas’ wrist at birth “broke, fell off his wrist and was lost” (p.8). He “realised everyone was going to be confused about which twin was which and I felt a flash of fear as I wondered if they would ever sort us out” (ibid.).

41 Instead of using the other twin as a mirror and being seen by him, there is only the dark mirror in which the survivor is not reflected and which signifies death (Mitchell,2003,pp.210-213)
the maternal object (to grief) is experienced as a ‘catastrophe’, causing a ‘psychic hole’ in the survivor who defensively identifies with the ‘dead’ or depressed mother (Green, 1997, pp.152-154; Coles, 2011, pp.ix-x, 28-31; Schellinski, 2014, p.198).

Some surviving siblings, out of love for their grieving parents and possibly with the added benefit of assuaging their own guilt, may seek to undo the cause of their parents’ pain by unconsciously identifying with and thereby ‘resurrecting’ the dead child (Cain and Cain, 1964; Bank and Kahn, 1997, pp.277-278; Coles, 2011, p.29; Edward, 2012, pp.158-159).44 Davids (1993) writes about her patient, who was 7 when his baby brother suffered a cot death. Some months later, hearing his mother crying, he comforted her, saying, “I’ll be him for you” (1993, p.280).45

Ainslie and Solyom provide an account of a patient who was the eldest sibling and a second mother to her younger siblings, when her infant brother died. Her age (14) at the time of the death left the patient susceptible to experiencing the loss as if it were her own child. When she gave birth to her first daughter two decades later, she experienced her own child as a replacement for her dead infant brother. All of the daughters of the family gave birth to children during adolescence. The authors understand the patient and her sisters to have participated in a pattern aimed at undoing the mother’s loss (1986, p.260). This is also Klyman’s understanding of the reparative aim of pregnancy for her patients who had suffered early childhood sibling loss, but she adds that for these women, pregnancy also gave them control over life and death (1986, p.327).46 Similarly, Pollock suggests that, for surviving siblings with the gift of creativity, the creative product can become a “restitutional or reparational product to replace the lost object” (1978, p481) and part of the survivor’s mourning process (1982, p.351).

Identification with the dead sibling may take the concrete form of developing or imitating physical symptoms of the illness from which the sibling died (Abend, 1986). Alternatively, it may take the form of a depressive and deadened or bland and compromised existence marked by failure and loss (Crehan, 2004, p.213; Bank and Kahn, pp.286, 289). Krupp (1965), in his paper addressing identification as a defence against loss, writes about his patient who was nine when her older sister died. The nine-year-old responded, “My sister is not really dead. I will carry her around with me” (1965, p309). Like her kind and protective sister, she became a “good” child, but also like her sister who had died in her

44 Lewin draws attention to Rosenfeld’s (1987) thesis that, in states of mind governed by primitive forces of a paranoid-schizoid kind, which would include the extremely vulnerable state of mind of a surviving twin, the life and death instincts become defused resulting in an increased intensity in the destructiveness of the death instinct (2014, p.143).
45 James M Barrie recalls his 13-year-old brother’s death when he, Barrie, was seven. Weeks later, in an effort to comfort his mother, he entered her bedroom to which she had retreated. In response to his mother’s “Is that you?”, he “said in a little lonely voice, ‘No, it’s not him, it’s just me’” (reproduced in Pollock, 1978, p.457). This led to an “intense desire to become so like him that even my mother should not see the difference”, culminating in his slipping into his mother’s bedroom, dressed in one of his brother’s suits, standing with his legs apart (as his brother stood) and whistling (as his brother whistled) (ibid., p.458). Pollock comments that Barrie’s identification with his brother was an attempt to have a relationship with his mother “who otherwise was withdrawn and dead for him” (ibid., p.464).
46 Gilkey’s research study of teenage pregnancies draws attention to the proportion of these who had a dead sibling (1988).
senior year, and despite previous academic success, she failed her senior year. If parents unconsciously identify the surviving sibling with the dead sibling and become over-protective (Crehan, 2004, p.209), the result may be that the surviving sibling lives a kind of half-life, afraid of taking the normal developmental risks and unable to separate from his parents; alternatively, angry with his parents and dead sibling for their deadening effect on his life, he may court danger, seeking to triumph over all of them in a manic display of aliveness or to protest his own invulnerability (Bank and Kahn, 1997, pp.276-277; Crehan, 2004, p.213; Christian, 2007; Klyman, 1986). Bank and Kahn argue that the child who identifies with their dead sibling lives a dual and confused identity (1997, pp.277-278).

There is a distinct body of theory relating to the “penumbra baby” (Reid, 2003, 2014), born after the death of a child and understood to suffer from the “replacement child syndrome” (Cain et al., 1964, p.454), a “handicap with important psychopathological risks” (Porot, 1993/1966; Coles, 2011, p.28; Schellinski, 2014). Abramovitch describes a replacement child as “a living child who comes to take the place of a dead one” (2013). I agree with Crehan that ‘for parents who have buried a child, any child they parent before or after the event will in a sense be a replacement for the one who has died’ and ‘carry expectations, projections and displacements from the one who has gone’ (2004, p.207; Hartman, 2008, p.536; Edward, 2012, p.162). Schellinski writes that “the lifelong challenge for the replacement child is to be or not to be” (2014, p.201). For Porot (1993/1966) there are three ways out of this dilemma: madness, creativity, or becoming a psychologist. Schellinski sees a fourth way, “a path of resurrection of the true self through individuation” (2014, p.207). On that path, the replacement child will “face the shadow and discover a living rather than dead image” (2014, p.204). “Paradoxically”, she writes (p.205), “in order .. to live his or her own life, the replacement child must ‘kill’ the dead (Couvez, 1979, cited in Porot, 1993/1966,p135), the phantom identity of the dead sibling within him or herself.” She adds, “The killing is, of course, a symbolic endeavour”.

1.4.7. Loss of The Loved Twin Object

Hayton, who has written extensively on womb twin loss survivors from an attachment perspective (2011,2012), argues that “the grief that twins experience when one twin dies is without equal anywhere in the field of human relations, for nowhere else in human life is the attachment bond so strong, the love so deep, and the grief so overwhelming” (2009,p.149). Woodward, also writing from an attachment perspective, also focuses on the overwhelming sense of loss and longing, with the survivor “endlessly seeking an attachment that cannot be found” (2010,p.19). She is emphatic that “the enormous significance of the loss is the most important issue” and that the loss is “very profound” (2010,pp.1,10).

Lewin agrees that, “whatever the age of the twins or the nature of the twin relationship,” the loss is a “considerable loss” (2014,p.200). However, her analysis concentrates upon the psychic structural dimensions of the loss: it is the loss experienced as loss of part of self and the consequential threat to

47 The replacement child often feels responsible for the death (Nagera, 1967; Hartman, 2008; Reid, 2014). Ainslie and Solyom refer to the unconscious attribution by parents of blame to the replacement child for the loss of the original child (1986,p.266), who becomes the “cuckoo in the nest” (Reid,2014,p.281).

48 Reunion is yearned for (Lewin,2014,p.28). Piontelli reminds us that, when Castor is doomed to die, Pollux prays to Zeus, “Father, let me not outlive my dear brother!” (1989,p.413).
the integrity of the self, involving intense survival anxiety, that are critical for her (1.4.3). There is no discussion of the love shared between twins and the impact on the survivor of loss of the loved and loving twin as a good internal object. This is an intriguing omission, especially since Freud regarded negation of awareness of loss of the good object as constituting the condition of melancholia (1917,p.245). Might Lewin’s apparent blind-spot regarding twins’ availability to each other as good internal objects be understood as a projection of her patients’ melancholia? The clinical implications of this omission are significant. The practitioner, reading Lewin’s work in search of a theoretical model for her clinical work with her surviving twin patient, might well conceptualise the internal twin object as rivalrous and obstructive, rather than caring and containing, and understand the predominant psychic impact of twin loss to be guilt, not grief. The risk is that both patient and therapist collude in negating awareness of loss of the good twin object.

The lack of attention by Lewin and other psychoanalytic writers to the love between twins may reflect the more general neglect by psychoanalysis of sibling love (Rustin,2009,p.149; Pollock,1978), which I also connect to the relative neglect by psychoanalysis of sibling loss (1.1.1).

Following Freud, psychoanalysis has tended to describe the sibling relationship with incest at one end and murderous rivalry at the other (Freud,1886-1889,pp.261-262; 1900,pp.249-255; 1916-1917,pp.333-334; 1918,p23; vide the full title of Mitchell’s seminal text (2003), ‘Siblings: Sex and Violence’). I agree with Agger, who remarks how most analysts see sibling love as “defensive”, and continues: “Clinical and personal experience leads me to wonder if we have not underestimated the strength and durability of this separate reservoir of love objects” (1988,pp.26-27). Klyman, referring to the “cliché” of sibling rivalry, remarks, “For every Cain and Abel, there is a Hansel and Gretel pair” (1986,p.325; see Pollock,1978,pp.478-479 and Edward,2012,pp.168-169). Coles writes about the positive aspects of sibling relationships including the reality of the experience of sibling love and cooperation (2003,pp.3,26-27,52-58,69-78,83,92). Agger (1988) writes about the mutual dependence and attachment of siblings who look to each other for love and support.

Rustin writes about the contemporary sociological factors that may combine to make today’s siblings “the most steadily available attachment figures” for each other (2009,p.151). Bank and Kahn point out that sibling attachment can be particularly intense in the absence of reliable parental care (1997,pp.19,123; Agger,1988,p13). There are ‘real-life Hansels and Gretels’ for whom their sibling relationship is the only caring force in their lives (Bank and Kahn,1997,pp.112-113). For them to lose a sibling will mean losing the one person to whom they look for love and object constancy (Bank and Kahn,1997,pp.28-31). Even absent parental deficiencies, the loss of a sibling may still be a deeply and intensely felt loss. Even if other relationships in the family system change (e.g., through divorce), the sibling relationship can provide continuity, stability and familiarity (Bank and Khan,1997,p.64; Crehan,2004,p.205). That is not to say that prolonged access between siblings is necessary for the loss

---

49 (not even in the chapter addressing death of a twin in her classic text on twins [pp.200-214])
50 Coles considers that sibling relationships can “crucially enrich” what Stern (1985) calls the capacity for “affect attunement” through the “self being with an other” (2009,p.110).
51 Charles and Charles, writing from an attachment perspective, conclude that childhood sibling loss entails enduring grief responses for survivors, including fears regarding investing in relationships, so that their ability to build satisfying and long-term relationships in adulthood is impaired (2006,pp.74,76,87).
to be deeply felt (cf. Bank and Kahn, 1997, p. 10). Piontelli (2002) understood her patient, Jacob, to be obsessively searching for his twin brother who had died in utero 2 weeks before his birth. Davids understood her patient (who was 7 when his 8-week-old brother died) to yearn for reunion with his baby brother and to persist in searching for him (1993, pp. 281-282). Guntrip’s brother was only a year old when he died. He recalls that he (Guntrip) fell “mysteriously ill and was thought to be dying” (1975, p. 149). The family doctor told his mother, “He’s dying of grief for his brother.” (Ibid.).

1.4.8. Loss of the Good Twin Object - Research Project

The pressing need for clinically useful psychoanalytic thinking about twin and sibling loss in childhood is acknowledged. Lewin observes that “it is to the detriment of psychoanalytic work” that “twin (and other sibling) relationships have been neglected in both practice and analytic understanding” (2014, p. 167). Charles and Charles note that “there is little empirical literature on the effects of sibling loss” in childhood, despite the “profound long-term effects” and “the enormity of the impact of this type of experience”, (2006, p. 74).

It may be that the emphasis in Lewin’s work on survivor guilt and survival anxiety reflects the particular composition of her patient group. If her clinical experience is predominantly with twins in deeply emmeshed relationships, hostile to outside influences and deeply resistant to ordinary developmental processes of separation and individuation, the notion of twins as potential good and containing internal objects for each other would be inconsistent with that clinical experience. But what of twins who fall outside this more disturbed patient category? I regard it as a significant limitation of Lewin’s work and current psychoanalytic thinking on twins that there does not seem to be room for consideration of how the loss of a deeply loving relationship, involving mutual understanding, care, acceptance, and containment, might impact in and of itself upon the twin survivor’s internal world. I suggest that there is a pressing need for analytic understanding of the impact of loss of the good twin object. The intense emotional pain of loss of a twin may be connected with shared identity and shared history, but will also have to do with the particularity of the lost object of whose constant presence the bereaved twin is now bereft (Piontelli, 2002, p. 90). I seek to take Lewin’s work forward by investigating through my research project the impact on the survivor’s internal world of loss of the internal good twin object.

Engel’s paper (1975) is unique in analysing from a psychoanalytic perspective the impact on him of his twin’s death when they were both middle-aged. My psychoanalytic case study seeks to add to Engel’s work by investigating the impact of twin loss in childhood through my analysis of Timothy’s account of his experience of that loss. The specific contribution which I seek to make to current psychoanalytic

---

52 cf. the literature of child psychotherapy and infant observation, e.g., Piontelli’s (1989) observations in utero of repeated gentle, stroking contact between twins she nicknamed “the kind twins”; and the observations by Magagna and Dominguez (2009) of loving and protective gestures in newly-separated conjoined twins not yet 2 years old.

53 Woodward explains how the lack of recognition in her psychoanalytic training and in her two Freudian analyses of the significance of the loss of her twin in childhood led her to attachment theory as a theoretical base for her practice (2010, p. 8).
thinking about twins, and how I seek to expand upon Lewin’s work, is by investigating and analysing the impact of the lost good twin object in the survivor’s internal world.
Chapter 2
Method and Ethics

2.1. Method

In this section, I explain and examine my choice of research data and research methodology. I do not repeat my account of how I arrived at my research question (1.1 above).

2.1.1. Psychobiography

First, I discuss certain intriguing questions which arise regarding the relationship between my research project and psychobiography. Psychobiography is a genre of psychohistory, which is “the application of psychology, in its broadest sense, or psychoanalysis in a specific sense, to the study of the past, of history” (Szaluta, 1999, pp. 1, 171-213). Szaluta advocates for psychohistory on the basis that “it offers a more profound and fuller understanding of man and his past”, but he recognises the “serious problems and unique challenges” which this interdisciplinary field presents (1999, pp. 13, 227). If my application of psychoanalytic principles to a published biography may be regarded as a kind of psychohistory (or psychobiography)54, what are the criticisms of this particular genre of special study? I discuss these criticisms below and respond to them in so far as they relate to my case study.

2.1.1.1. The Criticisms

There are four main lines of argument against the application of psychoanalytic principles to the historical study of individual and collective life: (1) psychohistory is an attempt to fill gaps in the historical record by using the techniques of psychoanalysis to infer and reconstruct the past of the

54 It is an interesting question whether my research project falls within the genre of psychobiography. There are arguments both ways. On the one hand, it is arguable that my work falls within this genre since, for the purpose of arriving at findings about what happened to Timothy’s mind in the wake of his brother’s murder, I am “using psychoanalytic theory as a technique of investigation” (Szaluta, 1999, p. 4). On the other hand, psychobiography involves the application of psychoanalysis for a particular purpose - in order to advance psychological explanations and motivations for why the subject did what he did with his life: “Psychohistory is concerned with the question of motivation in human behaviour, whether of the individual or the group” (Szaluta, 1999, pp. 2, 3, 64, 66, 68). Thus, by way of example, Brenman, discussing Bowlby’s biography of Darwin (1990), connects the fact that Darwin lost his mother when he was 8 and had no memory of her with his dedicated pursuit to find the “Origin of Species” (2006, p. 103). A comparable approach might be if I sought to argue that the murder of his brother explains Timothy’s decision to work as an investigative journalist on the television programme “Crimewatch”. However, my work does not advance this kind of reasoning or attempt to explain Timothy’s life in this way. Further, the book focuses, and I focus, upon one aspect of Timothy’s life only - the destructive impact of his brother’s death on Timothy’s internal world, and how that internal world came to be reconstructed (and the good internal objects recovered). It is therefore arguable that my work does not fall within the genre of psychobiography, because it is concerned, not with “motives for actions” (Szaluta, 1999, p. 3), but with the psychic consequences of others’ actions, that is, the psychic impact on Timothy of the murder of his twin. I do not seek to resolve these arguments, but instead address directly whether the acknowledged potential pitfalls of psychobiography undermine my work.
historical subject: what results is a kind of fiction-writing or “conjecture” masquerading as fact-finding (Barzun, 1974, pp. 42-45, 59; Stannard, 1980, pp. 3-24); (2) to apply the principles of psychoanalysis to a historical subject without regard to the cultural context leads to conclusions which are structurally unsound: it is “cultural naïveté” to judge the historical past based on criteria of the historical present (Barzun, 1974, pp. 133-136, 148, 150; Stannard, 1980, pp. 28, 119-144, 156); (3) psychoanalysis is a therapeutic technique for use in the consulting room, requiring the existence of a living subject and his active participation in the cooperative process of gaining insight: it is not an intended use of psychoanalysis to analyse retrospectively a historical figure who cannot participate in the task of analysis (Stannard, 1980, pp. xvii, 35, 115-116); (4) psychoanalysis is not a useful addition to history or biography because it is not a stable and academically respected body of knowledge.\(^55\)

### 2.1.1.2. Response to 2.1.1.1

As to (1), although I recognise readily the potential pitfalls of attempting to reconstruct the childhood of a subject using psychoanalytic theory and inference from known facts in adulthood, this is not the task in which I am engaged. Timothy’s autobiography records the facts of his childhood and later life: my task has been to arrive at hypotheses and interpretations regarding the changing content of Timothy’s inner or mental life over time, based on my analysis of the facts he records. As to (2), the psychoanalytic writers whose work informs my approach to my research topic are writing around the same time as, and within the same broad cultural context of, the events and people the subject of my research. Further, qua researcher, I have the advantage of a particular familiarity with the relevant political, cultural and historical context, as explained in 2.1.9 below. As to (3), I address in 2.1.4.5 below the advantages and disadvantages of my application of the psychoanalytic case method to a published biographical account as opposed to clinical case material. As to (4), while I accept that there remain important questions for debate regarding the epistemological status of psychoanalysis (which it would not be appropriate fully to examine here)\(^56\), I draw attention to the development over recent years of an evidence-based practice ideology\(^57\), together with the elaboration of systematic case study research\(^58\). I suggest that many of the objections levelled against psychoanalysis as a body of knowledge some 40 years ago\(^59\) are outdated: contemporary psychoanalysis is an evidence-based treatment method and a respected university discipline, whose leading thinkers make substantial

---

\(^{55}\) The argument has two main planks: (a) there is insufficient credible evidence either to indicate that psychoanalysis works as a clinical method or to support its significant theoretical concepts as an explanatory scheme (Stannard, 2018, pp. xiv-xv, 26-28, 33-50, 88-114, 149-150); and (b) it is reductionist and deterministic (ignoring difference, individuality and conscious decision-making); theoretically irrefutable (its concepts being incapable of being negated by contradictory evidence); logically inadequate (through its reliance on the questionable existence of the unconscious and post hoc ergo hoc propter reasoning which confuses temporal relationships with causality; lacking in common sense; uses language which is technical, arcane and obscure; and its practitioners are dogmatic and biased, closed to alternative explanations, with no consensus among them (Barzun, 1974, pp. 23, 44, 48-50, 108, 134-135, 139, 147-151; Stannard, 1980, pp. xiii-xv, 24-26, 53-82, 86-87, 148, 15; and see Szaluta’s rebuttals (1999, pp. 9-10).)

\(^{56}\) See Kachele, Schacter and Thoma (2009, pp. 21-97) and Hinshelwood (2013) for comprehensive discussion of the nature and validity of psychoanalysis and its body of knowledge and the research challenges it presents.

\(^{57}\) See e.g. Fonagy et al. (2015).

\(^{58}\) Kachele, Schacter and Thoma (2009).

\(^{59}\) see footnote 55 above.
contributions to the understanding of mental health by producing work of academic rigour and high research value.60

2.1.2. Design

My study is an independent research study, which uses the qualitative research method of thematic analysis, applied to a single case. Harper observes that qualitative research methods are particularly appropriate for identifying the key elements of a phenomenon being studied and providing rich descriptions of it (2012,p.84). My single case study explores the phenomenon of surviving loss of an identical twin in childhood.

2.1.3. Case Study

2.1.3.1. Why a case study?

The case study was the method by which Freud reported on his findings.61 Although, since Freud, the case study method has become “very controversial”, many respected researchers62 argue for it to rank as “one method within a range of research methods in the field of psychoanalysis” (Wilemsen, Della Rosa and Kegerreis,2017,p.3). The case study method provides a unique method of analysing how the patient’s psychic depths reveal themselves in the clinical encounter. My application of a psychoanalytic case study approach to a published biographical text has a similar aim - to analyse the psychic phenomena experienced by the author through his written account. In both cases, the aim is to try to understand “the one”, i.e., one person only in all his “particularity and complexity” (Stake,1995,pp.1-2). The focus is upon specificity, on the basis that there is power and depth in specificity. Stake writes, “Case research is not sampling research. We do not study a case primarily to understand other cases. Our first obligation is to understand this one case.” (1995,p.4). Timothy emphasises that his book is an individual and personal account.63

2.1.3.2. Objections against the case study method

Willemsen, Della Rosa and Kegerreis, following Midgley (2006b), list three main lines of argument against the clinical case study as a research methodology. These are: (1) the data problem – the data used in case studies is unreliable because it generally consists of the therapist’s observations, subjectively arrived at and recorded by them in process notes; (2) the data analysis problem – case studies lack validity because generally the data are selected and interpreted by the therapist, subjectively, unsystematically, and in line with a particular theoretical agenda; and (3) the generalizability problem - it is not possible to generalise from case studies, so they are of limited value (2017,pp.1-2).

---

61 Anna O. (1895); Dora (1905); Little Hans (1909); The Rat-Man (1909); The Schreber Case (1911); The Wolf-Man (1918).
62 listed by Willemsen Della Rosa and Kegerreis (2017,p.3)
63: it is “an account of the path I took” (p.xii). He continues, “I hope it will encourage others to find their own”, adding, “My story is a description not a prescription” (ibid.).
As to (1), Midgley proposes several practical measures (e.g., audio-taping, methodical writing-up of notes) to address the concern that the therapist’s process notes are unreliable data (2006b, pp.126-131). As to (2), he advocates the use of clearly defined systematic research methodologies and, following Edelson (1985), emphasises that case-study authors need explicitly to discuss alternative explanations for therapy outcomes, and identify data which tell against their conclusions (2006b, pp.131-136). As to (3), Midgley suggests that “the use of carefully-designed single case designs is the only meaningful way to achieve generalisation” (2006b, p.139). He argues for a model of aggregating single case studies, much as case law developed under English law, “in which the comparison of successive cases leads to incremental conceptual refinements and reformulations” (ibid.).

I take in turn each of the three perceived weaknesses of the clinical case study – the data problem, the data analysis problem and the generalizability problem - and set out my response below so far as they apply to my case study (2.1.4 – 2.1.7).

### 2.1.4. The Data Problem – the book

I explain below why the book qualifies as data of sufficient quality for the purpose of exploring my research question.\(^{65}\)

#### 2.1.4.1. Relevance

What led me to my research project was my curiosity about how the mind of a child might be affected by a sibling’s death and how that might affect the adult that the child becomes. This is the ground covered by the book, from the particular perspective of a surviving twin who was 14 when his twin died. The book is an exploration and examination of the “mental and emotional wounds” (p.xi) with which the author was left after his twin’s death and “the journey” he undertook in adulthood to “heal” those wounds (ibid.). Thus, the scope of the book falls squarely within my research project.

#### 2.1.4.2. Discovery of text

I read the book in the very early stages of my project. It was one of several books written by survivors of sibling loss. It stood out for me then in terms of its journalistic rigour (the author had undertaken a thorough and systematic investigation of the facts surrounding his twin’s death); the author’s sensitivity to and reflectiveness about what he and those around him were feeling before and after his twin’s death; and his willingness to write openly about his emotional state. The other books I had read

---

\(^{64}\) Willemsen, Della Rosa and Kegerreis note that efforts in this direction are being made within the context of The Single Case Archive, an online archive of published clinical and empirical case studies in the field of psychotherapy (http://www.singlecasearchive.com) (2017, p.6).

\(^{65}\) Save where otherwise stated, references to page numbers are to pages in the book.
included accounts of sibling loss\textsuperscript{66} and twin loss\textsuperscript{67}, but Timothy’s book was the only work to focus exclusively, in depth and at length, on one person’s experience of childhood sibling loss.\textsuperscript{68}

2.1.4.3. Qualities of text in general

The book is an accessible, well-organised, and clearly-expressed text. It has a powerful narrative thrust, without sacrificing important descriptive detail. The writing of the book grew out of the author’s own investigative project, namely, “to discover what had happened” to his twin and “to understand [his] death” (pp.xii,5). This project was a serious and substantial commitment, involving the author in time and expense and intense emotional turbulence and pain. He “spent a year travelling back and forth to Ireland, staying for up to ten days at a time” (ibid.,p.5) and for much of that time was “incapable of touching business or personal matters other than the sole, all-invading issue of the bomb” (p.364). All sources of information contained in the text and not within the author’s direct and personal knowledge are clearly and fully referenced (pp.382-408). All interviews for the purposes of the book were audio-recorded and transcribed (p.378). The transparency of the investigative process, and the systematic way in which the investigation was pursued, reflect the author’s background in investigative journalism. The book is part historical document, part investigative report, and part personal biography.

The result is a richly detailed, highly-contextualised and multi-dimensional account of the author’s loss of his twin, which is able to focus on the personal and domestic, as well as on the broader historical and political canvas of which Nicholas’ death formed part. The book has received countless favourable reviews in the British and international media. Reviewers agree that it is a work of high quality, both in terms of creative expression and journalistic rigour.\textsuperscript{69}

2.1.4.4. Qualities of text in particular

There are particular features of the book, which render it especially suitable for a psychoanalytic case study of the impact of loss of a twin.

The book is the story of how the author was affected emotionally and psychologically by the tragedy (p.xii). The thread running through the book is what the author felt (or did not feel) in response to critical events, together with his reflections (then and now) upon his emotional state.\textsuperscript{70} Thus, the focus of my research – the surviving twin’s psyche and what becomes of it – is the subject at the heart of this book.

\textsuperscript{66} E.g., Joanne Moorhead’s account of the loss of her sister, Clare, and Louise Patten’s account of the loss of her brother, Charles (Stanford,2011, pp.37-46; 65-75).
\textsuperscript{67} E.g., Woodward (2010).
\textsuperscript{68} DeVita-Raeburn (2004) gives a detailed account of the impact of losing her older brother after an eight-year illness when she was 14. Her book describes the impact on her of her brother’s long illness as well as his death. I have preferred to choose a biographical account of sibling loss without the variable of a long-term illness preceding the death. This variable is outside the scope of my research question. (Following submission of my thesis, I discovered a newly-published account of childhood sibling loss, “The Day that went Missing”, [Beard,2017].)
\textsuperscript{69} The book won the Christopher Ewart-Biggs Memorial Prize for 2009-2010. It was also shortlisted for the PEN/Ackerley prize for 2010, which recognises a literary biography of excellence written by a British author.
\textsuperscript{70} e.g.,pp.138,144-145,149,167,175,189,214,223,355.
Further, when he writes about his emotional responses, or lack of them, the author does so with reflectiveness. His facility with metaphor and descriptive language means that he is able to convey what he was feeling at any given time, vividly and strikingly. His creative gifts mean that his descriptions of people he interviewed and of the impact on them of remembering the key events are equally vivid and striking. When relating how other members of his family and other witnesses reacted to key events, he concerns himself, not only with what they did, but what they felt. The author has had his own psychotherapy (p.239). The careful attention paid by him to his and others’ inner states may reflect that experience. His capacity to express and reflect upon his own subjective responses may also be connected with his therapy experience.

Importantly, in terms of research data reliability, the book rings true. Light-hearted moments continue to occur, even in the wake of appalling tragedy. The author’s sparing use of the light touch and comedic makes this story of overwhelming sadness believable.

2.1.4.5. Shortcomings of text as data?

I follow Freud in concluding that it is legitimate to apply the psychoanalytic case study method to an individual who “has written his own case history and brought it before the public in print” (Freud, 1911, p.9). I am encouraged in so doing by Timothy’s expressed motivation in writing his book, namely, to help “others who have suffered trauma or grief” (p.xii). I seek to extend Timothy’s original motivation by using his book to provide resources to clinicians working with those “others”.

However, I accept that reading and analysing a biography is not the same as the therapist’s experience of her patient over the course of a therapy relationship. I am missing all the information, which I might have learned, if Timothy had been my patient and I had been able to ask him questions. I am without the knowledge of Timothy’s emotional state which I might have gained from my counter-transference responses over time; noticing nuances in Timothy’s appearance and demeanour, his tone of voice, gestures, and patterns of speech; and, more generally, noticing patterns and changes in his manner of relating to his therapist and to others outside his therapy.

Aside from the above accepted limitations of the book relative to clinical material, there are two particular objections against the book as research data, which I want to address. These objections are: (1) the book is a selective document, having been written and intended for publication; and (2) the author puts forward in the book his understanding of himself and the meanings he attributes to his and others’ actions and events, but all of these have been arrived at consciously. Thus, so the argument runs, the book is not suitable data for a psychoanalytic exploration because psychoanalysis is the study of the unconscious through non-selective remembering and free association.

71 e.g., pp.82,125-126,155,156,185,195,205,206,211,213,227,229,245,292-293,350,355-357.
72 e.g., pp.159,216,249,256,284,351,370-373.
73 e.g., pp.283-284,348-350.
74 e.g., pp.83-84,114,294.
75 e.g., pp.136,151,156,160,169,184,197,199,257,260,263,276,291,355.
76 He writes, “Had I learned from someone else who had trodden a similar path I would perhaps have started my journey earlier and found a more direct route” (ibid.).
As to (1) it is right that the book is a constructed account of twin loss. The author’s background in television journalism is likely to have been instrumental in the quasi-cinematic quality of his descriptions of places and people (e.g., pp.255-257) and in his compelling story-telling – the book is a gripping page-turner. Further, Timothy acknowledges that, “as a picture of the Troubles, my account will be highly incomplete” (p.xii). He did not return to Ireland “to analyse the Troubles”: “I went to engage in a human process, not a political one. I went to understand my twin’s death” (ibid.). So the reader is left with gaps in her knowledge, and some of these give rise to questions, for example, the near-absence77 of any explicit expression or discussion of negative feelings on the part of the author towards his brother’s murderers or towards anyone else.

The fact that Timothy has selected the material for inclusion in his book means that my exploration of the impact of him of being a surviving twin cannot be treated as total and exclusive. It is possible that material relevant to my research question has been omitted for presentation purposes, out of consideration for the feelings of others, or for other undisclosed reasons. I note, though, that Timothy emphasises throughout the importance to his recovery of uncovering the truth and the detail, however “upsetting” and however “disgusting” (pp.279,292). Further, he tells the reader when he has withheld specific information (e.g., pp.217,265,272). The fact that I may notice an absence of material, which would conform to my theoretical expectations regarding certain sequelae of sibling loss, is not of itself sufficient to indicate that material has been excluded, although it does give rise to certain questions, especially regarding material that might have been omitted unconsciously. I discuss more fully how the apparent gaps in my data set may impact upon my findings in 4.2.6 and 4.3.4 below.

With respect to (2) and the suggestion that the book is an account of conscious meaning, as opposed to unconscious meaning, the position is more involved than this argument would suggest. Many of the author’s reflections include reflections about what might have been going on unconsciously in him at the relevant time (e.g., p.364). I referred earlier to the psychotherapy undertaken by Timothy and which he regarded as instrumental in his “emotional recovery” (pp.231,239). Further, using my psychoanalytic psychotherapy training and experience, I have concluded that the material in the book is expansive enough to permit interpretations of unconscious meaning and I make a number of such interpretations in my Results chapter. In order to make these interpretations, I have adapted the interpretative skills I use in the consulting room. Although there are certain clinical skills I am unable to use (noted above), my familiarity – intimacy even - with the content of the book, through repeated reading, re-reading and continuing analysis, has resulted in my developing an attuned response to the voice of the author. My alertness to certain subtle changes in the voice of the author, together with my familiarity with the author’s use of language and metaphor, have informed the interpretations which I have felt able to make.

2.1.5. The Data Analysis Problem – Thematic Analysis

I answer the data analysis problem through my use of thematic analysis. Thematic analysis is an explicit, defined, and standardised research method for “systematically identifying, organising, and

---

77 Timothy writes about his “one and only episode of fury at the IRA” (pp.206-207).
offering insight into patterns of meaning (themes) across a data set” (Braun & Clark, 2012, p.57). The overall aim of the method is to identify themes from the data set relevant to answering a particular research question. The data set should be “good quality”, with clarity “regarding what, why, and how they were collected, and offer[ing] rich, detailed and complex accounts of the topic” (Braun & Clark, 2006, p.98). I have explained in 2.1.4 above why the book constitutes “good data” (ibid.).

Braun & Clark have developed thematic analysis specifically in relation to psychology, providing researchers in this field with a clear step-by-step procedure to be followed (2006, 2012, 2013). However, they “emphasize” that “certain skills of analysis develop only through experience and practice” (2012, p.60). I mention below (2.1.7) that the revision of my research question meant that I undertook two thematic analyses of the book. Although this substantially increased the time I spent with my data set and slowed down my progress, it gave me valuable additional practice (cf. Braun and Clark, 2006, pp.86-87).

Braun and Clark describe thematic analysis as a non-linear, “recursive” process, requiring immersion in and repeated iterative engagement at a deep level with the relevant data (2006, pp.86). It involves a “constant moving back and forward between the entire data set, the coded extracts of data you are analysing, and the analysis of the data you are producing” (Braun & Clark, 2006, p.86). My experience of this immersive, iterative engagement with the data set has been that a certain level of mental strain has to be borne and contained over an extended period. Although the different procedural steps in, and the content of, the analysis can be recorded in writing, my experience has been that a critical part of the process has been to hold the analysis as a work in development within my mind, and allow my mind to work on and with it, continuously and over time. The mental activity, effort and concentration involved have been strenuous and extensive. The aim has been to create a convincing analytic narrative, composed of key themes abstracted from my data set, using a systematic, standardised approach, but without sacrificing what makes Timothy’s account of his experience of losing his twin a personal, intimate, and deeply moving document.

### 2.1.6. Why I chose Thematic Analysis

#### 2.1.6.1. Subjectively relevant material

It is a particular advantage of thematic analysis that it can be applied flexibly, systematically, and transparently to subjectively relevant material, without sacrificing the richness and complexity of the data being examined (Joffe, 2012, p.210; Braun & Clark, 2012, p.65). Joffe suggests that the kind of data most appropriate to thematic analysis is subjectively relevant material, elicited with the minimum of interference from the questioner, tapping naturalistic ways of thinking about the given topic and pursuing the respondent’s own chains of associations (2012, p.213). These criteria are satisfied here. The book is Timothy’s account of his subjective response over time to his terrible loss. Timothy alone wrote, selected and organised his book. He pursues his own chains of associations throughout. His orderly presentation of the book’s content, reflective of his professional background, can still be consistent with a description of the book as the product of his own “naturalistic ways of thinking” about loss of his twin.

---

78 e.g., pp.144-145,166-167,216-217,247,249,255-256,364-369.
2.1.6.2. Accessibility of method

I concluded that thematic analysis was a particularly suitable research method for my psychoanalytic case study. The method’s requirements, which demand in-depth and repeated engagement with and exploration of the data set, have resonances with psychoanalysis, the aim of which is to find meaning through a process of reflection, reconstruction and après coup. An experience is re-lived by therapist and patient jointly, again and again, with the ultimate aim of distilling the particular meaning or meanings that the experience holds for the patient and relating that meaning to the patient’s life. Similarly, in thematic analysis, the researcher repeatedly immerses herself in the richness and depth of the data set. This deep work aims to arrive at meaning through identifying patterns, themes and categories in the data, and taking them to a higher level of abstraction. Perez et al. note that, as a defined method, thematic analysis allows psychoanalysts to investigate texts in a manner which “helps prevent the formation of any one ‘overvalued idea’ (Britton and Steiner,1994), potentially as misleading in research as in analytic practice (Midgley,2006a).” (2015,p.661). They make the further point that thematic analysis is grounded in the ordinary everyday reality of how human beings perceive the world: its principles are familiar because “they form part of how we attempt to make sense of the world – we look for patterns in the information in front of us and this allows us to ‘hold’ and develop ideas in our mind” (2015,p.663, following Saldana,2013). For these reasons, I consider thematic analysis to be a relatively accessible research method for me: it is based on the reality of how humans make sense of the world around them, and involves analytic skills relatable to those used in the consulting room.

2.1.6.3. Transparency

Joffe describes thematic analysis as one of the most systematic and transparent qualitative methods (2012,p.210). The defined requirements of the method mean that the researcher/psychoanalyst can show clearly how she went about analysing her data and trace the steps taken to arrive at her eventual thematic framework (see 2.1.7 below). This makes it possible to evaluate her research (Braun & Clark,2006,p.80; Yardley,2015,p.268).

2.1.6.4. Manageability

Thematic analysis can be applied to a complete text, such as a published biography, so that it is possible to focus on the meaning of the text as a whole, together with individual parts of the text. This stands in contrast to other methods, such as IPA, for instance, where in order to make application of that method manageable, I would have had to restrict my analysis to text extracts. I favoured a research method which could be applied to the whole book and which would result in findings grounded in the book read as a whole, as well as in the detail of the narrative (2.1.7.1 below). Joffe describes certain key features of a high-quality thematic analysis, including that the analysis should describe the bulk of the available data (2012,p.219).

2.1.7. Procedure

In undertaking my thematic analysis, I followed the guidelines demarcated by Braun and Clarke (2006,2012) (2.1.5). I orientated myself by reference to their general principle that “a theme captures something important about the data in relation to the research question, and represents some level of patterned response or meaning within the data set” (2006,p.82).
2.1.7.1. Analysis of whole book

The book has been read multiple times. My first step was to re-read the book to gain a basic sense of its overall content and structure, viewed simply as a story. I then read the book a third time, “in an active way”, annotating, highlighting, cross-referencing, and marking pages (Braun & Clark, 2006, p.87).

My supervisor and I discussed whether to undertake a thematic analysis of only some chapters of the book. This issue had been raised at my second supervisory board. My board had asked whether thematic analysis of the whole book was realistic, or whether it would turn out to be unmanageable, in terms of the volume of material and the time needed to analyse that material thoroughly.

We identified several factors in favour of analysing the complete text. First, it seemed important to identify themes patterned and repeated, not only in the detail of individual chapters, but also having regard to the overall substance and shape of the book, viewed as a whole. Second, it also seemed important, from the perspective of the credibility and trustworthiness of my findings, to be able to identify and discuss apparent omissions from the book. Third, we considered that, to select extracts from the book and confine my research to those extracts, would have risked producing findings which did not reflect accurately the meaning for Timothy of his loss. Timothy is clear that the book is his “account of the path [he] took” to “heal” the “mental and emotional wounds” left by the bomb and “which refused to go away” (pp. xi, xii). The book is the “story” of that “journey” (p.6) and of how (he writes) he found the “sense of inner peace that I had lost the day Nicholas was killed” (p.xi). Everything Timothy troubled to write in his book was prima facie relevant to my research question and deserved my attention. To select for analysis some sections of ‘the path’ taken by Timothy, and not others, risked a partial and incomplete analysis, possibly even a misleading one.

2.1.7.2. Pilot projects

Having attended two training courses at my university aimed at teaching basic skills in thematic analysis, I undertook two pilot projects. The first was a thematic analysis of a short published biographical account of sibling loss written by another journalist, Joanna Moorhead (Stamford, 2011, pp.37-46). I presented my analysis and workings to my supervisor, who is experienced in the use of thematic analysis for psychoanalytic research. He showed me how a higher level of abstraction was needed. Having reworked my first pilot project, I moved on to my second. This was a thematic analysis of the Preface to the book. The problematic aspect with this second piece of work, discussed in supervision, was the extent to which my proposed themes provided an incomplete account of the data (cf. Braun & Clark, 2006, p.89). I reworked my analysis and presented it to my fellow students in our doctoral workshop. Their feedback helped me further to reflect on the codes and themes that I had abstracted and how convincingly I might argue they were supported by the data.

2.1.7.3. First thematic analysis

Having undertaken these trial analyses, I began my initial coding of the book. I took each chapter of the book in turn (together with the Preface, Prologue and Epilogue) and, having numbered the paragraphs in each chapter, proceeded to develop: first, a series of codes for each paragraph; second, a series of revised codes for the chapter overall (noting relevant paragraph numbers for each revised code); third,
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a list of potential themes, abstracted from the revised codes, for each chapter. I repeated this exercise for all 28 chapters of the book. As I went along, I wrote up my codes, revised codes, and potential themes in a searchable Word document.\textsuperscript{80} I also wrote up in a companion Word document quotations from the book in which the author spoke directly about the impact of his loss of Nicholas and his feelings (or lack of them).\textsuperscript{81}

2.1.7.4. Second thematic analysis

When my first thematic analysis was well under way, my supervisor and I agreed that my research question needed to be revised to focus upon loss of a twin (1.1.2). Following review of the psychoanalytic literature on twins and loss of a twin, I now had in mind an expanded theoretical framework including theories relevant to both sibling loss and twin loss.\textsuperscript{82}

Since my research focus and my theoretical framework had changed, I began my thematic analysis afresh. With the benefit of my earlier work, I had a good feel for the shape of Timothy’s story, especially the inner “journey” Timothy had traced in his book (p.xii). Second time around, I was also familiar with the book’s content and layout, so I was able to adopt a more confident, flexible, and freestyle approach. My first attempt had also provided me with valuable coding practice, so I progressed more quickly.

For the purposes of this second coding exercise, I coded the book sequentially as before, chapter by chapter. I collated the codes in three separate Word documents, each of which represented three broad areas of experience, which I had identified from my first analysis. These were: Impact, Twin Relationship, and Objects. By ‘Impact’, I meant all data directly relevant to the impact of the loss of Nicholas on the author and everyone else. By ‘Twin Relationship’, I meant all data relevant to Timothy’s identity as a twin. By ‘Objects’, I meant all data concerning those objects peopling Timothy’s external and internal world.

I wrote up my codes and themes in the three separate Word documents, according as codes and themes seemed to fall within one or other of the three broad subject-headings. This facilitated the identification of themes though, inevitably, there was overlap. As with my first coding, my codes were descriptive and stayed close to the text. For this second coding exercise, I included quoted extracts from the book. After rearranging the initial codes into revised codes, I identified clusters of sub-themes, which I then grouped into general themes.

Alongside the writing up of the three Word documents, as a separate exercise, I prepared sets of postcards. I wrote the more prevalent codes on white postcards (one code per postcard), collecting these manually in piles and using them as a visual aid to help me pinpoint potential themes, which I

\textsuperscript{80} Although I had attended a training session on the use of certain computer software programmes for coding and analysing research data, I coded manually as a personal preference for a “hands-on” experience. I felt this suited me better and would help me sustain a good level of attentiveness and active engagement with the data.

\textsuperscript{81} This proved a useful reference document, to which I frequently returned. It reminded me of certain metaphorical language and other modes of expression favoured by the author and what they might imply for my analysis.

\textsuperscript{82} I suggest that my familiarity with the literature on sibling loss generally and twin loss in particular has added depth to my analysis and discussion of my findings.
then wrote on coloured postcards (one theme per postcard). As a still further parallel exercise, I also prepared a series of mind-maps on A3-size white card. These helped me maintain awareness of how potential sub-themes were clustering and how they might inter-relate. Throughout this process, I continued to annotate and cross-reference my copy of the book. Making these explicit connections within the book helped me increase my understanding of Timothy’s psychodynamics and the dynamics of his family relationships (e.g., pp.230 and 351; 150,174 and 192).

2.1.7.5. Results

The result of my second coding exercise was a draft Results chapter identifying proposed themes and sub-themes. I presented this draft chapter to my third supervisory board. Their feedback helped me to see how my themes, though embedded in the data and involving an appropriate use of metaphor and symbolism, needed to be reframed more explicitly in terms of psychoanalytic concepts, using my knowledge of psychoanalytic theory and practice.

I went through my research data again and reconsidered my analysis from the position of a practising clinician, reframing my themes and sub-themes explicitly in psychoanalytic terms. I gave myself the freedom to think more widely in terms of psychoanalytic theory. I also re-read those chapters of the book that had generated the more plentiful codes. The result was a deepening of my understanding of my data set, which led to a broadening of my thematic map, and an improved sense of how my themes and sub-themes related to each other. I provided my redrafted Results chapter to my supervisor in sections. Our discussions led to removal of two proposed general themes in their entirety and reordering and refinement of the content of my remaining themes. After much working and reworking, I arrived at a clearly-structured analytic narrative (or story) which reflects my understanding of my data set, derived and developed from my analysis. My final general themes are broad clinical concepts. The detail of the analytic argument is contained in the subthemes. I illustrate the sub-themes with a limited selection of data extracts which support the important points I seek to make.

Thus, the identification and development of the themes described in my Results chapter (Chapter 3 below) have involved focused and deep concentration, with continuing review and re-interrogation of the relevant data, and continuing reflectiveness about how the data, and my application of thematic analysis to the data, were helping me to answer my research question. Although I have presented my analysis above as a linear, step-by-step procedure, it was an on-going analytic and creative process, where themes were defined and constantly redefined over time. Many formulations were clarified as I wrote up my Results. After I had completed the first final draft of my thesis in its entirety, I returned to all my coding documents and re-read them, alongside the book. This was a worthwhile exercise, since at this stage of near-completion of my work, I had a very good overall perspective of the material and my draft conclusions, so it helped me to refocus and refine the essential cornerstones of my work.

Braun and Clark note that thematic analysis often in practice uses a combination of inductive and deductive approaches (2006,p.83). As appears above, I used first a data-driven, inductive approach to explore the text and secondly a more explicit a priori, theory-driven, deductive approach. The data-driven approach, although informed by psychoanalytic theory, assisted me in identifying themes direct from the data, and the theory-driven approach involved a marrying-up of the themes I was finding in the data with psychoanalytic theoretical concepts. This hybrid approach permitted a careful exploration of my research question and made appropriate use of my experience and theoretical knowledge derived from my clinical work.
For completeness, I point out that I did not include prevalence of examples of a theme across the entire data set as a criterion for inclusion. In the context of an analysis of a biographical narrative, I considered the recurrence of a theme, together with its psychological gravitational weight within the data set viewed as a whole, to be a stronger indicator of its “keyness” regarding my research question, than statistical prevalence (Braun & Clark, 2006, pp. 82-83; Joffe, 2012, p. 219).

2.1.8. The Generalizability Problem

I do not seek to make generalisations about the subjective experience of most or all surviving twins on the basis of the inferences I make regarding Timothy’s inner world. I have sought to make a careful, rigorous and in-depth study of Timothy’s individual and unique subjective experience (cf. Giannoni, 2003, pp. 650-651). I adopt, *mutatis mutandis*, Midgley’s argument regarding the possibility of aggregation and comparison of carefully-designed single case studies in order to arrive at meaningful generalisations (2.1.3.2); (cf. Yardley, 2015, pp. 259-260).

2.1.9. Validity and credibility

I suggest that the following factors enhance the validity and credibility of my research findings.

2.1.9.1. Prolonged engagement, holistic approach and thick description (Geertz, 1973)

The “holistic” processes which I have adopted in my analysis, together with my “prolonged engagement” with my data set, which I have descriptively presented to “let readers ‘see’ for themselves,” go to support the validity of my findings (Cho & Trent, 2006, pp. 326-329, following Wolcott, 1990, p. 129).

2.1.9.2. Provision of supporting evidence

I support my findings with relevant quotations and text extracts. These testify to my close reading of the data set and allow the reader to assess the sufficiency of the evidence supporting my analytic narrative. Ambert et al (1995, p. 882), quoted by Wallerstein (2009, p. 129), write that “the richness of the quotes, the clarity of the examples, and the depth of the illustrations in a qualitative study should serve to highlight the most salient features of the data”.

2.1.9.3. Audit trail

I have retained all the postcards, mind-maps (2.1.7.5), and word-processed documents I produced through the different stages of my analysis. These are available for inspection and review and allow all the stages of the work to be retraced and form a paper trail, “linking the raw data to the final report” (Yardley, 2015, p. 264; Mays & Pope, 2000, pp. 51).

2.1.9.4. Triangulation and alternative understandings

Triangulation in qualitative research is generally seen as the use of multiple methods or sources to bolster accuracy and reliability (Cho & Trent, 2006, p. 323). In thematic analysis, triangulation is sometimes understood in terms of the concept of “inter-rater reliability” and the use of multiple independent coders to increase the “accuracy” of the coding. Braun and Clark (2017) “understand coding as an active and reflexive process that inevitably and inescapably bears the mark of the
researcher(s)”. Consequently, “there is no one ‘accurate’ way to code data”, so that “the logic behind inter-rater reliability (and multi-independent coders) disappears”.

Triangulation may “be better seen as a way of ensuring comprehensiveness and encouraging a more reflexive analysis of the data than as a pure test of validity” (Mays & Pope, 2000, p.51) or as a “method of enriching understanding of a phenomenon by viewing it from different perspectives” (Yardley, 2015, p.264). This reflects my approach - an openness to involvement of “the third”, in order to promote reflectiveness, help avoid blind spots, and deepen and widen thinking.

Adopting this understanding of triangulation, I have sought to develop my thinking by using frequent supervision; feedback from my annual supervisory board; regular research workshops with my peers; and feedback following presentation of my work at my university’s annual research conference. I also provided a copy of the book and my draft Results chapter to a fellow doctoral student and to a Jungian analyst. My psychodynamic colleague provided me with suggestions for the amalgamation of certain of my themes and confirmation that my themes were embedded in my data set. The Jungian analyst’s considered response refreshed my thinking by reminding me of certain striking features of Timothy’s story, as well as identifying particular Jungian perspectives on the material. This underlines the point, which I accept (2.1.10 below), that my analysis reflects the object relations perspective in which I have been trained. Another psychotherapist, analysing the same data, might arrive at different themes reflecting their preferred psychoanalytic model.

Midgley draws attention to the traditional narrative structure of the psychoanalytic case study, with the therapist as hero or heroine battling with but finally overcoming the patient’s resistance to cure. Though the result may be ‘a compelling and persuasive account of the treatment’, the failure to leave ‘space for alternative understandings or even for doubt and uncertainty’ has grave implications for its scientific value (2006, pp.131-132). I recognise there are certain aspects of my research question left unresolved by my analysis. I discuss these below (Chapter 4).

2.1.10. Reflexivity and Counter-Transference

I am not a twin and I have not suffered the loss of a sibling. I have no relationship with Timothy Knatchbull or any of the other people he writes about in his book. However, there are aspects of my life, which have connections with my research topic. I reflect below upon the extent to which these connections may have influenced my approach to my research data or interfered with the research process (Mays & Pope, 2007, p.51).

I was born and grew up in Northern Ireland during the Troubles. I turned 18 the summer of the Mountbatten Bomb. I remember going to work at my summer job the morning after the bomb and a general atmosphere of stunned silence. My birth family was part of the minority nationalist community. I recall the Sun’s headline that day: “Those Murdering Bastards”. The following month, I left my hometown and did not return to live in Ireland again, in due course settling and working in London.
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Although I am not a twin, my younger sibling and I are (what some people call) “Irish twins”, that is, siblings born within a year of each other. My “Irish twin” and I have continued to enjoy a very close and mutually supportive relationship. My experience of this sibling bond is that it both transcends and is deeper than personality or character. This is notwithstanding that (as I now understand), within 6-8 weeks of my birth, my mother will have had two babies in mind, one within and one without the womb. It follows that the concepts of the twin bond and the sibling bond, with sibling relationships enduring longer than parental relationships and providing valuable containment and emotional resources, though potentially interfering with the maternal bond, are concepts which I readily accept, based on my own life experience. Further, like Timothy Knatchbull, I know something of the experience of growing up in a house “heaving with family” (pp.59,63). Still further, although I have not suffered the loss of a sibling, I have had the experience of a sibling recently falling seriously ill. For as long as I can remember, I have been aware of lost child siblings in previous and current generations of my extended family.

Reflecting upon how some or all of the above facts may have affected my responses to the book and my approach to my research question generally, I have regard to the depth of meaning I attach to my relationship with my “Irish twin” and how it may predispose me to conceive of loss of a twin in childhood as deeply traumatic and intensely painful. My experience of grief and turmoil when my other sibling recently fell seriously ill, has given rise to a good deal of thinking about siblings identifying with each other and experiencing each other as psychiatrically part of themselves. So far as concerns the geographical and political context of the book, my immersion in the book and in-depth analysis of it have caused me to remember and, to some extent, work through and attribute meaning to my own experience of growing up during the Troubles.

Framed in terms of my counter-transference responses, reading and re-reading the book has been a very emotional experience, with certain chapters frequently moving me to tears. I have often worked at my analysis of the book through and despite my tears. It may be that on account of its subject-matter (familial and political) I have a heightened sensitivity to it. However, I also understand my deeply emotional response as a counter-transference indication of the extent and depth of Timothy’s own emotional suffering.

I have wondered if the empathy for Timothy and his family evoked in me by the book might be a compensatory reaction borne out of guilt about originating from that part of the community on whose behalf the IRA purportedly acted when their members detonated the Mountbatten bomb. I have also wondered if my empathy for Timothy might be an expression of the twin transference (Lewin,2014), meaning that at some level I have over-identified with Timothy, or idealised him, and the result has been a kind of twin-like psychic fusion or symbiosis, with the consequential loss of my analytic and observational function. If this were the case, I might accept unquestioningly Timothy’s account in his book as a total account of his and his family’s reaction to the loss. In that event, I might not investigate or comment upon gaps in the story he tells, or other questionable aspects of the narrative, which might cast him or his family in a less than positive light, but which might be relevant to my research question. As appears in my final chapter, I do make certain critical observations and ask certain critical
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questions regarding the book. So, for instance, I comment upon whether, given Timothy’s description of his family as “intensely close” (p.18) and everything they went through, it might have been difficult for him openly to criticise his mother, or father, or grandfather in his book. The fact that I have noticed and questioned apparent omissions from the book indicates that I have retained sufficient psychological separateness from Timothy, notwithstanding my considerable empathy for him and his suffering. However, I do not engage in speculative hypotheses or interpretations. I have endeavoured to ground all my interpretations in my research data. My aim has been to treat Timothy and his family with respect.

On balance, I think my familiarity with the Troubles is more likely to be helpful than unhelpful for the purpose of my case study. I think the same about my experience of being an “Irish twin”, growing up in a big family, having recently supported a sibling through a life-threatening illness, and my awareness of lost siblings in my extended family. All of these considerations help me to empathise deeply with the author’s suffering and losses and to respond emotionally and with an open heart to what he has written. The author’s bravery in writing about the emotional journey he has made deserves the respect of an open-hearted response (2.2 below). I am assisted by my points of contact with his story to get alongside Timothy emotionally, and open myself to imagining experiencing the feelings he experienced. This emotional sensitivity and heightened awareness on my part need to be counter-balanced by an analytic approach. Use of the systematic and transparent research method of thematic analysis, together with an openness to discussion of my findings with colleagues and peers, have been critical in helping me to maintain this balance. My psychoanalytic training and practice have also helped me to maintain an analytic stance and avoid being carried away into sentimentality, flights of fancy or other “possible wild leaps of imagination” (cf. Piontelli,1989,p.416). It is possible that I also have been helped in maintaining a balanced response by the fact that I am not English, and so may be less likely to be influenced by attitudes of deference or its opposite (class antagonism), which might have operated, had I been born and brought up in England and undertaken the task of analysing the biography of an author with aristocratic connections.

Within the context of providing disclosure of my professional background and orientation, I undertook two trainings at WPF Therapy with a combined duration of 10 years. The first training was in once-weekly psychodynamic psychotherapy and the second in three-times-weekly psychoanalytic psychotherapy. This second training is grounded in the object relations tradition of psychoanalysis, drawing on theoretical thinking from Freud to the present-day. With respect to my professional experience, I have been in full-time private practice in the City of London for 7 years and I am a BPC registrant. My practice is long-term work. In terms of my theoretical orientation, while this is continuously evolving and developing, I work from an object relations perspective on human development and emotional functioning and within the theoretical framework of Freud, Klein, Fairbairn and Winnicott. When I am working with a patient who has suffered a traumatic collision with the external world, I am seeking with him to understand the particular meaning of the traumatic event for him, having regard to his internal world. I have his earliest relationships particularly in mind in assessing the internal resources available to him and the extent and nature of recovery that might be possible for him. The transference and countertransference are essential and extremely valuable tools to help me understand the dynamics of my patient’s internal object world.
2.2. Ethics

My data set is a published text. The act of publishing indicates prima facie that the author’s motivation was for his text to be read, probably by as many people as possible. I have referred earlier (2.1.4.5) to the author’s express motivation to help others through sharing his story. The fact that Timothy intentionally publicised his story does not avoid the need for thinking about the ethical considerations in play when the subject of a text is analysed so closely without the cloak of anonymity. Hollway and Jefferson suggest three principles for analysing psychosocial subjects (2013, pp.92-94).

The first of these is the requirement of honesty, defined as “approaching the data openly and even-handedly, in a spirit of enquiry not advocacy, deploying a theoretical framework which [is] laid out and justified, making only such judgements as [can] be supported by the evidence, and not ignoring evidence when it suit[s] [the researcher].” (2013, p.92). I regard this principle as sound and I have sought to follow it in my work.

The second principle is the requirement of sympathy, defined as a willingness to share and feel the other’s feelings, to “put ourselves alongside them, attempting to use what self-knowledge we [possess], and the difficulties we [are] familiar with, to assist us to understand their ‘inconsistencies, confusions, and anxieties’” (2013, p.93, following Hollway & Jefferson, 1998, p.406). I suggest above that my personal points of contact with the subject-matter of the book have heightened my sensitivity to it (2.1.10). I have also explained how I have found sharing the author’s feelings (as I understand my emotional responses to the book) unavoidable (2.1.10) and informative, giving me important insights into the author’s subjective, emotional experience. Where the book has moved me to tears, it has felt entirely appropriate that it should. This story deserves tears.

The third principle is that respect should be given to the subject, that is, respect “in the sense of ‘to pay attention to: to observe carefully’” (2013, p.93). Hollway and Jefferson regard researchers’ “duty to respect” in this sense as “perhaps their primary ethical responsibility” (ibid.). It includes “[noticing] things the [subjects] would prefer to remain unnoticed”, “what normally is overlooked”, “what might be too painful to notice” (2013, p.94). My psychoanalytic training and experience prime me to approach the data with these considerations in mind.

There is broad consensus about the ethical issues of patient consent and confidentiality regarding the use of clinical material for research purposes (Gabbard, 2000; McLeod, 2010; Thomas-Attila, 2015). These considerations do not apply in the same way to a published biography. There is no pre-existing therapy relationship to consider. I have thought about how the author (and close family members who feature in his book) might feel, if they were to read my thesis. My research study involves using the author’s story of his and his family’s suffering for professional purposes (to obtain a doctoral qualification), as well as for the larger purpose of providing resources for practitioners. I have considered the possibility that the author and his family might object to my research on that basis, judging my work exploitative, or even offensive, especially having regard to my origins. In light of that possibility, I have considered whether to notify the author of my work and explain my research motivation. Ethical considerations of fairness and beneficence/non-maleficence come to mind. I have thought about whether these values might require me, before submitting my thesis, to provide the author with a draft of my thesis and invite his comments or, at least, to alert him to my research and provide him with my abstract.
On reflection, and after discussion with my supervisor, although I think it would be courteous to advise the author of my research in advance of submission of my thesis, I do not regard it ethically necessary or appropriate. There are good practical reasons, which tell against inviting the author to comment on my draft thesis before submission. My analysis confines itself strictly to the book as my data set. I have chosen not to interview the author or any other adult surviving twins for the purposes of what would have been a very different kind of research project. The inclusion of any detailed response by the author to my draft thesis would involve an extension of my research data beyond its original scope. If I were to revise my analysis to take account of the author’s remarks, the author might seek to review those revisions and comment further. The result could be an extended dialogue between us, which might significantly delay completion and submission of my work.

It remains an important consideration whether my findings and interpretations might be experienced by Timothy and his family as harmful. Hollway and Jefferson refer to the psychoanalytic concept of recognition: “every person needs recognition from another who is independent of his or her own omnipotent wishes, which include desires to be seen in an unequivocally good light” (2013, p.94). So long as the other is honest and communicates her recognition of the subject “in a spirit of sympathy and respect”, it is “more likely to be acknowledged” (ibid.). I have kept this concept of “true recognition” in mind (ibid.). I have also kept in mind Freud’s remarks in his Introduction to his case study of Dr. Schreber’s book (1911, pp.9-11), where he supports his decision to publish his case study by reference to Dr. Schreber’s expressed determination to publish his book, despite others’ objections. Equally, Timothy writes about how he feared that he “might do more harm than good” by returning to Ireland (p.xii). He records others’ misgivings about his decision to publish and their misunderstanding of his motives. He writes, “To them I can only say that no offence is intended” (p.xiii). I echo those words and affirm that my work has been undertaken with the main aim of adding to the resources available to assist psychotherapists, in their healing work with surviving twins. In this aim, I agree with the author that “it is the healing that counts” (p.xii).
Chapter 3
Results

3.1. Introduction and Synopsis

3.1.1. Introduction

The front cover of the book carries a photograph\(^{85}\) of Nicholas and Timothy, two blonde-haired 7-year-old boys, each wearing a yellow lifejacket and seated in a modest-looking boat, both looking in the same direction away from the camera, against a background of sea, mountain and sky. The full title of the book is “From a Clear Blue Sky: Surviving the Mountbatten Bomb”.

The title refers to Bank Holiday Monday, 27\(^{\text{th}}\) August 1979, which was a sunny and warm day with near-cloudless skies (pp.3,56,69)\(^{86}\). At 11.45 in the morning of that day, the IRA\(^{87}\) detonated a bomb (“the bomb”) hidden under the cabin of a small fishing boat (“the boat”), belonging to the boys’ maternal grandfather, Earl Mountbatten of Burma. The boat had not long left the harbour of Mullaghmore, a small coastal village in County Sligo, where Earl Mountbatten kept a holiday home, Classiebawn Castle (“the Castle”)\(^{88}\).

Four of the seven people in the boat were killed: Earl Mountbatten, who had been at the helm (p.3); Lady Brabourne, the boys’ paternal grandmother; Paul Maxwell, a schoolboy who had a pocket-money job helping with the boat; and Nicholas. Timothy’s parents and Timothy were seriously injured, but survived (p.4).

[The reader of what follows may be assisted by the Family Tree, Listing of People and Places, and Timeline in Appendices 1-3 below.]

---

\(^{85}\) Taken by their father, copyright owned by Philip Knatchbull.

\(^{86}\) All page references (unless stated otherwise) are references to pages in the book.

\(^{87}\) Irish Republican Army

\(^{88}\) The Castle was built on land confiscated following suppression of the Irish Rebellion of 1641. It was ultimately inherited by Timothy’s maternal grandmother, Edwina, and then by Earl Mountbatten, her widower. During Edwina’s childhood, the family had used the Castle as a shooting-lodge until the first “Troubles”, when her father, “sensing the turning tide”, closed it up (p.31). The first “Troubles” led to Britain’s withdrawal in 1921 from 26 of Ireland’s 32 counties, the remaining 6 becoming Northern Ireland. The second “Troubles” began in 1969. The IRA ran a campaign of violence aimed at British withdrawal from Northern Ireland (p.339). Peace was brokered in 1998 under the Good Friday Agreement (p.238) and, as at the date of writing, that peace has held.
3.1.2. Scheme of the book

The book is composed of three Parts, together with a Preface, Epilogue, Appendix of Further Information, Notes, and Bibliography.

Part One is titled “Family”. The first Chapter of this Part is titled “Twins”. Timothy gives an account of his life with Nicholas and how their relationship worked, as between the two of them and within the family (pp.7-16). Next, Timothy introduces the reader to his family and to the Castle. He describes the rhythm and feel of summer holidays there, with his grandfather at the centre of it all (p.31) and in charge (pp.32,58). This Part concludes with Timothy’s account of events during the summer of 1979 and on 27th August 1979 itself.

Part Two is titled “The Sound of the Bomb” and covers a period of roughly 23 years from the bomb up until Timothy’s decision to “return to Ireland and finally address what had been holding me back for so long” (p.241). Much of the information contained in this Part about what happened immediately after the bomb is the product of his investigations, the trajectory of which is described in Part Three of the book. This third Part is titled “Return to Sligo” and is an account of the author’s visits to Ireland over 2003-2004 and of the impact upon him of undertaking this physical and emotional “journey” (pp.xii,249).

3.1.3. Synopsis

Timothy’s parents met during World War II when they were both serving under Earl Mountbatten in Ceylon (now Sri Lanka). Timothy’s father’s older brother was executed in 1941, after an escape attempt while a prisoner-of-war, with the result that Timothy’s father inherited the Brabourne title and farming estate (p.8). Timothy was the last and youngest of his parents’ 7 children. When Nicholas and he were born89, their oldest brother, Norton, was 17. Between Norton and the twins, there were Michael-John (“Joe”) (14), Joanna (9), Amanda (7) and Philip (2). The family home was in Kent, but the parents kept a house in London and would spend some days there each week, pursuing their respective career and charity interests (p.8). Helen Bowden (“Nanny”) was their “doting” family nanny and she lived with the family for 26 years, from shortly after Norton’s birth until the twins went to boarding school aged 9, by which time she was 81 (ibid.). For the first few years of the twins’ lives, she slept in their bedroom (p.9). After she left the family to live nearby, the twins regularly visited her, carrying out small chores for her, and bringing her presents (p.166). She died, aged 93, 5 years after Nicholas was killed (p.356).

Timothy stresses his shared identity with Nicholas and their heart-to-heart connection (p.7). As toddlers, he had a “flash of fear .. if they would every sort us out” when the gold bracelet Nicholas wore (to distinguish him) broke (p.8). He remembers walking into a mirror because he thought he saw Nicholas on the other side (p.9).90 He writes that twin-ship was “central to our lives”, providing “fun

89 named Nicholas Timothy and Timothy Nicholas (p.7)
90 cf. 1.4.6 above; also Mitchell,2003,pp.210-211; Lewin,2014,pp.72,98.
when we wanted it, constant companionship and total empathy” (p.10). The boys “felt that the world was our oyster” (p.13). They were “each other’s closest friend, protector and partner”; “[i]n some ways” they were “married to each other” (ibid.).

The boys were months away from turning 15 when Nicholas was killed. By then, they formed a formidable and passionate intellectual pair.91 Timothy writes that “[t]he seams in our shared intellectual tapestry appeared faultless”, giving them “the sensation of amounting to more than the sum of our parts” (pp.13-14). Their competitiveness with each other inside and outside the classroom spurred them each on to even greater attainment (pp.15-16). They had been awarded jointly the top scholarship at Gordonstoun School and had completed their first year there when the family, together with other extended family, decamped as usual to the Castle for the holidays in 1979 (p.14). Timothy writes that his grandfather “was happier there ‘than anywhere else on earth’ and I felt the same” (p.37). It was “a place where normal life was suspended and dreams were played out, impossible to be regained in another time, another place” (ibid.). The family never returned to the Castle after the bomb.92

Other small fishing and pleasure boats out on the water that Bank Holiday Monday witnessed the explosion. They came to the rescue, picked up the living and the dead, and made for the harbour (pp.75-97). Nicholas’ body was recovered separately later that day (pp.346-351). Doctors and nurses who happened to be holidaying in Mullaghmore tended to the living on the harbour-side prior to their admission to Sligo Hospital (pp.86-97). Referring to his grandmother,93 Timothy writes:

I lay in the bed beside hers with wounds from head to toe. Surgical tubes led into my body. Opposite, my mother was connected to a machine that breathed for her; she was not expected to live. Her face was unrecognisable, held together by one hundred and seventeen stitches, twenty in each eye. In a nearby ward, lay my father, his legs twisted and broken and multiple wounds all over his body. Between the three survivors, we had three functioning eyes and no working eardrums (p.4).

Timothy did not know that Nicholas had died, until his sister, Joanna, told him 3 days later and after Nicholas’ body had left Sligo Hospital for England (pp.125-126).

Recovery was slow and painful for Timothy and his parents and they were not fit to attend the funerals of their dead. From their hospital beds, they watched together the live television broadcast of the State Funeral of Earl Mountbatten (pp.144-146). Family and friends gave accounts by letter of the private funeral service for Nicholas and Lady Brabourne (pp.146-151). Timothy improved sufficiently to leave Sligo Hospital 12 days after admission (p.154). His older siblings, especially his sisters, took responsibility for his physical care, first at the Castle and then at home in England (pp.155-157,162,166). Family friends had him to stay (pp.170-178). He spent October at home with his parents,

91 Enthused by a new subject, they would go into academic “overdrive” together, each “pass[ing] the intellectual ball to the other” (pp.13-14).
92 It was eventually sold on to a Dublin hotelier, Hugh Tunney (pp.159,247).
93 Lady Brabourne died from her injuries the following morning (pp.109,113,115,295).
where his siblings were frequent visitors, “keeping (him) happily amused” (pp.179-180). He returned to school in November with his brother, Philip, with whom he now enjoyed a “heightened bond” (pp.184-185,205). It was Philip who gave him his first razor and, shaving for the first time, “it felt good to be moving into a new stage of life” (p.192). He “had no trouble throwing myself at my work” (p.185) and felt “enormous relief” that “without Nick” he was still able to succeed academically (p.192). His exam results “delighted” his teachers (pp.192-193). A memorial service for the dead was held at St Paul’s Cathedral in December 1979. Timothy and his parents (still in wheelchairs) were among the congregation of 2000 (pp.195-196).

Seeking “a fresh start”, Timothy won a scholarship to a sixth form college in Wales, and later a place at Cambridge (pp.209,213,214). He graduated with a good degree (pp.213,214). Along the way, he made friendships (pp.214,220-222) and had girlfriends (pp.210,214). He also developed a “passion for flying”, obtaining his pilot’s licence (p.214). After graduating in the summer of 1987, Timothy made a short return trip to Ireland, travelling alone and without telling the family (pp.214-218). He began work in television production. In 1989, he met David Loftus (“David”), a year older and also a surviving identical twin, and they developed a “unique and lifelong friendship” (pp.220-222). In August 1991, Timothy made a second short trip to Ireland, with friends (pp.223-224). Sometime in 1995, Timothy began to have weekly psychotherapy sessions and he remained in therapy until June 1997 (pp.228-231). In the summer of 1996, he met Isabella, the woman who became his wife in August 1998, with David joining his brother, Philip, as best man (pp.232-238). By February 2001, Timothy and his wife had two children. Their births led to Timothy’s decision to embark upon his year of visits to Ireland, which resulted in his book (pp.238-241).

In August 2003, the visits began (p.245). Over the course of those visits, Timothy revisited the Castle several times; also Mullaghmore, its beach, harbour and the site out at sea where the bomb exploded; his rescuers (pp.249,257-258,368); his parents’ rescuers and the doctors and nurses who helped save them (pp.278-286); the doctors and nurses who looked after all three in Sligo Hospital, together with the hospital itself (pp.289-297,352); Paul Maxwell’s parents and Paul’s grave (pp.259-263,312-313,363-364); former household staff at the Castle (pp.264,271-273); the boat-builder (pp.266,310); the Garda sergeant responsible at the time and the detectives called in after the bomb (pp.311-312,317-321); members of the lifeboat crew who recovered Nicholas’ body from the sea (pp.345-352); and the (now retired) State Pathologist who had carried out Nicholas’ post mortem examination (pp.353-358).

In his Epilogue the author writes that, after his trips to Ireland were “complete”, he “found a surge of new energy”, moving out of London and later adding to his family (p.375).

3.2. Introduction to and Summary of Themes

My analysis led to the following themes and sub-themes:

94 pp.245-248,250-254,275-277, 364-368, 370-373
95 pp.249,255-258,266-270,277, 364-368
3.2.1. **Trauma**
- inexpressible unthinkable catastrophic shock;
- overwhelming emotional onslaught; experience of devastation and disintegration;
- no containment; absence of and search for containment;
- dissociation; denial and disavowal; dead twin fantasy;
- trauma endures.

3.2.2. **Loss**
- Loss of twin as loved object;
- Lost pre-trauma world and existence; lost parents, family and their protective function;
- Lost sense of safety and natural order;
- Lost identity; lost part of self; internalised deadness;

3.2.3. **Lone twin identity**
- Aloneness and withdrawal;
- Coping self;
- Emotional constriction and restricted living;
- Sense of self as lesser and weak.

3.2.4. **Mourning**
- Active mourning; crying; memory as time travel;
- Reunion; separation;
- Need for containing external objects;
- Rediscovery of containing internal objects.

3.2.5. **Guilt**
- Survivor guilt;
- Guilt about having abandoned twin to death;
- Neglected duties to the dead.

3.2.6. **Integration**
- Mourning as an integrative process;
- Creating a narrative;
- Reconstruction of identity.
3.3. Trauma

3.3.1. Inexpressible Unthinkable Catastrophic Shock

I have found that loss of a twin in childhood is a profound shock for the surviving twin. The sense of complete catastrophe is not capable of being put into words or thought about.

His sister recalls breaking the news to Timothy and seeing “complete shock; complete desperation; just a flash as though it was the worst thing that could ever have happened to you, which of course it was” (p.294). 6 months later, Timothy wakes early, “shaken to the core” by a nightmare in which Nicholas was dead: “… was it just a nightmare? I came close to panic as I tried and failed to sort out nightmare from reality. Slowly the truth spread over me like a cold dawn.” (p.205; cf. p.55). “Unexpectedly”, a few weeks earlier, the boys had talked about “how one of us would feel if the other died” (ibid.). Timothy continues, “I looked into his eyes and was lost for words; so was he” (p.55).

3.3.2. Overwhelming Emotion; Devastation; Disintegration

Shock, horror, sadness, loneliness, confusion, disorientation, intense survival anxieties and survival guilt, all combine to overwhelm the psyche. I have found that the surviving twin is helpless under this onslaught. The experience is of devastation and fragmentation.

The first words of the book are, “We all have a car crash in our lives. To date I have had one; it happened to be a bomb” (p.xi). Timothy writes that he was “devastated” by his twin’s death in the bomb (p.xi). The account of the explosion is one of utter devastation.96 I note Timothy’s use of the word “splinter/s” when he writes about the impact on his psyche of finally working through his losses 24 years later. Writing to his rescuers after the birth of his daughter, he says that it “has been like pulling a big splinter of grief and emotion out of me, and the tears and relief have been enormous in so doing” (p.240). Returning home after the first visit of his year of visits, he writes, “I felt I had worked loose some splinters which had lain deeply embedded in my psyche for years” (p.249). I interpret that the psychic impact of the loss of Nicholas was to cause Timothy’s mind to fragment, to make a crash-scene of it.

On hearing from his sister that Nicholas was dead, Timothy writes, “until that moment I had had no inkling of the truth” (p.125). He continues, “There was a pause. .. I did not move, I could not collapse. I stared at her .. My vision blurred and the only noise I could hear was my crying and my breath coming in spasms” (p.125). After his sister left, “[e]ach time my tears faded, I would start to try to think” (p.125), but he “could manage a short bout of quiet concentration and then the air would leave my

96 The bomb makes “matchwood” (p.348) out of the “small fishing boat” (p.3). A witness, close by, “saw the boat go up in pieces in the air” and “in a second [it] had disappeared”, leaving “very small pieces of wood floating on the water” (p.69). Others nearby recalled, “The boat wasn’t there, the debris was floating on the sea” (p.75); “There was a puff of smoke and a large bang and a shower of little bits of timber. Then the boat was gone” (p.80); “a cloud of smoke” and “[w]hen the smoke cleared (rather quickly) there was a scattering of debris elongated over the water” (p.85); “There was a lot of debris, pieces of wood .. I was looking for a boat but the boat had disintegrated and all that remained were bits of wood and splinters” (p.79).
lungs very slowly", and he “would hide my face” in case anyone “could see me crying” (ibid.). Among his “confused and racing thoughts”, Timothy felt “utter sadness for Nick, and fear for myself, that I would not know how to lead my life without him” (pp.125-126). He “had a sensation that the wrong twin was dead” (p.126), and then “a flash of relief” and “an irrepresible flash of luck”, but “this seemed selfish and greedy” and he “did not tell a soul about this”: “How could I be feeling this when I had just learned Nick was dead?” (ibid.) Overwhelmed by “the awful feelings of loneliness, grief and fear”, “[p]hysically, mentally and emotionally exhausted, I lay and realised I would never again hear Nick say “Goodnight” and “God Bless” to me from the next door bed. I was on my own” (ibid.).

In 1999, Timothy and his wife were watching a televised documentary about the bomb when, “without any warning” a photograph of Nicholas’ body being lifted ashore came on-screen (p.350). He writes: “my world caved in” (ibid.). He “stopped and rewound the tape, unable to believe what I had just seen” (ibid.) He continues, “After the shock subsided, I fell to pieces and sobbed my eyes out” (ibid.). I interpret that, 20 years later, the shock and pain of losing Nicholas that overwhelmed the child could still overwhelm the man and lead to an inner experience of collapse and fragmentation.

### 3.3.3. No Containment

The one person to whom the surviving twin would have turned naturally for emotional containment is the twin who has died. In his absence, the survivor turns to his parents. I have found that parents and older siblings, even when their own inner resources are substantially depleted, may provide vital support, comfort and reassurance to the survivor, but they cannot replace the lost co-twin as confidant and emotional container. There is not the same level of trust.

Among the “gift[s]” of twin-ship (p.14), Timothy prioritises “total empathy” (p.10). They were each “so completely” on each other’s “wavelength” (p.214), as if they shared one mind (pp.13-14). Further, “If one of us were in difficulty, the other would immediately help. Likewise we shared any worries.” (p.10). He remembers that, “when we were seven years old, Nick often lay awake and talked of his concerns about the school year ahead .. I wanted to go to sleep but instead I lay awake and listened to his worries.” (ibid.). I am put in mind of “the kind twins” observed by Piontelli (1989,pp.420-424). The boys were still sharing a bedroom when Nicholas died.

Upon learning of Nicholas’ death, there was a desperate turning by Timothy towards his parents: he “was longing to be reunited with my parents” (p.126). He writes to his mother, “I can’t tell you how much I am looking forward to seeing you” (p.129). “When alone”, he “desperately wanted to be with” her (ibid.). Finally permitted to go in his wheelchair to see his father, “being close to him made me feel reassured that life would go on with some normality” (p.129). Being together with his parents in the same ward brought him comfort, despite their “incapacitated” state (pp.149,374). He writes of the tender kisses they would give each other (pp.135,145,154). His “favourite” time of the day was its end, when he “could move over to my parents’ beds, which were now drawn together, and lie down with them”, where they would remain “huddled together” until lights out (p.154). I interpret that all three

---

97 Cf. the child Timothy who, when first told of Nicholas’ death, wanted to “cry my eyes out” (p.125)
were soothed by the physical proximity of each other98, but that all three were deeply shocked and physically and mentally reeling from the bomb and Nicholas’ death99.

Norton’s arrival in the evening of the explosion left Timothy feeling “very reassured to know he was around” (p.111). By the next day, all his siblings were there, which “fundamentally altered my state of mind, making me feel safe and secure” (p.119). Upon discharge from hospital 12 days later, Timothy felt a “warm, secure glow”, “sat in the heavily armoured car cosseted between my sisters and feeling very cared for” (p.155). He “needed a great deal of mothering” and his mother “was clearly unable to do that” (p.162), though sometimes he “longed for her” (pp.162,177). His sisters provided substitute “mothering” and necessary physical care (p.162). Amanda washed him “as she had done when Nick and I had been tiny tots” (p.157). Timothy writes, “For weeks I depended on my sisters in this way” (ibid.). He “felt secure and content” in the company of his older adult siblings (p.155 and pp.111,117,157), but he did not confide in them. He kept his tears and fears to himself (p.xi and see 3.5.1 to 3.5.2 below.)

### 3.3.4. Dissociation; Denial; Disavowal; Dead Twin Fantasy

I have found that the psyche, damaged and depleted by the severe shock of the trauma and the intense emotional pain of loss, uses mechanisms of dissociation, denial and disavowal to protect the survivor from further emotional suffering. The child is unready to process the loss. It is unbelievable. It is known and not known. A belief in the dead twin’s survival somehow and somewhere persists, and that the survivor continues to share his life with him.

Timothy, watching his grandfather’s state funeral on the television, “felt like a detached spectator watching a distant ceremony that just happened to include my loved ones. It was as if something inside had snapped and disconnected from reality” (p.145). He was “dry-eyed” because he was “emotionally numb” (ibid.). During the hospital service for Nicholas, there was a “gulf .. between what I was feeling and what I viscerally knew I needed to feel” (p.149). His emotions were “flat and muted” (ibid.). Returning by convoy to London, he felt “very cut off from the convoy, from my father, from Nick, from our past and from normality” (p.161). At Nicholas’ grave 2 weeks later, “I felt as though I had arrived at a station but the train had left. I wanted to feel pain but was hit by numbness” (p.167). At his grandfather’s grave, “I was physically present, but emotionally absent” (p.182).

I have found that the trauma of losing Nicholas interfered with Timothy’s “capacity to apprehend the real” (1.4.2 above). As noted in 3.3.2, on first learning of Nicholas’ death, Timothy had the “sensation” there had been a mistake and “the wrong twin was dead” (p.126). The “story” had an “underlying flaw”, going against a “basic truth” of their twin-ship: “physically Nick was more robust than me so if one of us were going to die it would be me, not him” (ibid.). A few months later, on what would have been the twins’ joint 15th birthday, each time Timothy opened a birthday card, “it seemed there was an error as the cards were addressed ‘Darling Timmy’ instead of ‘Darling Nicky and Timmy’” (p.189). I have found that the loss of Nicholas brought substantially altered Timothy’s relationship with reality.

---

98 Timothy writes (p.149), “My emotions were flat and muted. But I did not worry; I had my parents and that mattered more to me than anything.”
Timothy “had never seen [Nicholas] dying or dead” (p.355). He writes that, had he seen his body or coffin, or attended his funeral, he “might .. have accepted his death more quickly” (p.175). Arriving at his grave a week after the funeral, “my child’s mind hung in blank incomprehension. I had wondered if he really was in that grave at all” (pp.355-356). He recalls “trying to imagine what he looked like, inside the coffin” (p.167): “.. had he really died? Had his funeral truly taken place? Was his coffin genuinely in that grave? It all seemed so unlikely” (ibid.). He was “hopelessly out of my depth” (ibid.). “[W]ithout any first-hand proof, his death seemed little more than hearsay” (p.180). He had the “absurd” “idea” that “perhaps for some unfathomable reason everyone had conspired to make me think he was dead. I told my family this, adding that I knew it was rubbish” (ibid.). Timothy writes, “it was a useful metaphor to show how unreal his death seemed” (ibid.).

Timothy felt Nicholas “could walk into the room at any moment” (ibid.). His mother recorded in her diary that Timothy felt “he must put his things tidy – as he [Nicholas] did”; “that he dreams about him; and “sometimes expects to find him upstairs when going to bed” (p.180). Timothy felt Nicholas was “merely absent” and that he was “still somehow sharing my life with him while he remained out of sight” (p.175). So the salmon Timothy caught, while convalescing after the bomb, was something he “felt I simply had to land”, “for myself” and, among others, “for Nick” (p.172). A school-friend gave him a radio-controlled model airplane, which he managed to finish building and fly, because it was “a dream which Nick and I had shared” (p.204). He doubted his ability to finish the plane but persevered, “when I reminded myself that Nick would undoubtedly have completed the job” (ibid.). Both boys had been “set on” going to Cambridge. Timothy became “very focused on reaching the university; it was the last milestone on which we had jointly planned and I very much wanted to accomplish our goal” (my emphasis) (pp.212-213).

3.3.5. Trauma endures

I have found that the trauma continues to exist - raw, unprocessed, terrifying and frozen in time - in a ‘no-go’ area of the survivor’s unconscious, emerging in nightmares, hyper-sensitivity and flashbacks. The prospect of contact with the trauma and the associated emotions is of itself terrifying.

---

100 Timothy’s mother also had not seen her dying or dead son nor attended his funeral. She also had “difficulty in accepting Nick was really dead” (p.175). Asked by Nanny if she had remembered flowers for his grave on what would have been his 15th birthday, she “hadn’t thought of this as to me he isn’t there but all around us” (p.189).
101 It was only at the very end of his year of mourning, seeing the pathologist’s photographs of Nicholas’ body, that Timothy “knew for sure” that “his wonderful, unique life force had gone forever” (p.356).
102 Norris McWhirter, (whose identical twin had also been killed by the IRA), said to Timothy, “the only plan is to double rather than half one’s aspiration for the future” (p.191). The address at the St. Paul’s memorial service included the statement that “A part of [Nicholas’] spirit, I am sure, lives on in his brother Timothy” (p.196).
103 cf. 1.4.1 above.
104 cf. the rescuers’ traumatised responses. One said that the smell of diesel “for years afterwards” “would bring the whole memory back” (p.282). Another, when interviewed by Timothy, “responded as if I had thrown a switch inside him” (p.283): “it was as if an electric charge passed into him” and “he looked shocked, horrified, lost almost, as if he was seeing it again”, “a man possessed by the scene inside his head” (pp.283-284). For him, the experience “will be in our minds for the rest of our days” (p.284). Nicholas’ “lifeless face” had stayed “ever since”
The trauma of the bomb was bound up inevitably with the trauma of Timothy’s loss of Nicholas. The night before his 15th birthday, Timothy awoke “very frightened” after a nightmare in which he “heard the explosion and then the sound of water and pieces of boat raining into the sea” (p.189). A few months later, he awoke “shaken to the core” by a nightmare that Nicholas was dead (3.3.1 above). Hearing the voice of one of his rescuers at a family event, he had an “extraordinary sensation” and was “transfixed” (p.183). ¹⁰⁵ A year later, a fast-moving train overhead as he walked under a railway bridge “took me completely by surprise, terrifying me” (p.229). ¹⁰⁶ He experienced “flashing lights” “for some time” (p.144) and, for 24 years, the smell of diesel gave him “flashbacks to being in [my rescuers’] boat, freezing cold and covered in diesel” (pp.364,282).

For some 20 years, Timothy experienced auditory flashbacks to “the sound of the bomb” (pp.229-230). ¹⁰⁷ Though he “could not predict or control it”, he worked out that “subconsciously” he was “connecting electrical circuitry with detonation” (ibid.). The sound would be triggered by the ‘click’ in his car’s electrics before his car-phone would ring; opening the fridge and the light coming on; or turning on or off a light. Timothy’s understanding was that “subconsciously” he “must have been connecting the click with a radio signal, and hence with the bomb, which was almost certainly detonated by radio control” (ibid.). I interpret this symptom as indicative of the continued existence of the trauma of the loss of Nicholas in an encapsulated area of Timothy’s mind, connection with which was feared to be emotionally explosive. This interpretation finds support in Timothy’s account of meeting the men who recovered Nicholas’ body from the sea. He writes (my emphasis) that “the unknown detail was horrendous”, but he was “soothed” by “the known detail”, “feeling as if a device that had the potential to blow up in my mind had been defused” (p.351) (my emphasis). In his chapter titled “The Sound of the Bomb”, Timothy writes about his psychotherapy sessions and how he “slowly learned to see connections and recognise processes .. that I had overlooked before” (p.231). His therapy “was doing me good” (p.231) and “to my surprize, I noticed that I was hearing the bomb less and less” (ibid.). I interpret that, through his therapy, making connections in his mind to the traumatic events of the past (and to people) had become less dangerous.

The rawness of his traumatic loss, despite the passage of time, is vividly conveyed by Timothy’s account of the “maelstrom” inside him, “unleashed” by his visits to Ireland in 2003-2004, which left him “incapable of touching business or personal matters other than the sole, all-invading issue of the bomb” (p.364).

with one of the men who recovered his body (p.345). Another “for weeks had nightmares from which he would wake screaming and crying” (p.348).

¹⁰⁵ He “felt the hair on the back of my neck sticking up [and] the whole world seemed to stand still” (ibid.). “A powerful, distant memory came back” of hearing the same voice “in the boat, after I was pulled from the water following the explosion” (p.183).

¹⁰⁶ He was left “screaming in fear” and “walked on shaking like a leaf” (p.229).

¹⁰⁷ Timothy writes that he found the sound “eerie”, but also “reassuring”, since it “proved I was feeling something” (p.230). My interpretation is that, to the contrary, it provided unconscious reassurance that he was not feeling anything.
3.4. Loss

3.4.1. Lost Twin as Loved Object

I have found that intense emotional suffering attributable to loss of and separation from a deeply-loved object is experienced by the child whose twin dies.

Timothy’s visits to Ireland in 2003-2004 allowed him to “reconnect” to “feelings which I had briefly felt but which I had not been able to resolve as a child” (p.xii). With respect to those “briefly felt” feelings, I have referred to his shock, bewilderment, terror, loneliness and sadness.108 This sub-theme refers specifically to the intense pain of being without and missing his beloved brother. Watching his grandfather’s televised funeral service in a state of numbness109, Timothy “felt a crack open inside me” and knew “some latent emotion was beginning to stir” (p.145): “a horrible feeling of separation came over me and at last tears came to my eyes” (ibid.) After the hospital service for Nicholas, he felt “strange” and “horribly absent from my home, my siblings, and most of all from Nick” (p.149).110 Discharged from hospital and alone in the Castle bedroom he had shared with Nicholas, finally having “the solitude I was looking for”, spotting a favourite game they loved to play, Timothy thought “I would never play with him again” (p.156). He writes, “Heaving sobs and bucketing tears, I missed him then more than I had ever believed possible” (ibid.). He continues, “Now I was feeling his death in a new way, as a pain, the pain which Nick and I had been unable to guess at, sitting in this room and looking into each other’s eyes not long before” (ibid.) (3.3.1 above). Returned to school, Timothy was “homesick with an extra twist”, instinctively looking to the desk beside him for Nicholas at the end of each class (p.185). Four years later, “terrified” of “failing” to get into Cambridge, “those were the hours when [he] most wished Nick was with me. The loneliness was almost overpowering” (p.213).

3.4.2. Lost Pre-Trauma World and Existence

I have found that death of a co-twin involves multiple losses for the survivor.111

The surviving twin loses his “childhood” and his “innocence” (p.255). Returned to the Castle, “as well as my scabs”112, Timothy was “shedding a good part of my previous existence” (p.157). Returned to London, he had moved “from the old, rural world of my childhood to the new urban one of my siblings” (p.162). They had all “moved up a generation” and he “felt grown-up and free” (p.157). Before the bomb, his understanding was that of “an innocent fourteen-year-old” who “did not ask difficult questions” (p.367).113 Now Timothy had knowledge that he and his family were murder targets

108 3.3.1 and 3.3.2
109 3.3.4
110 A family friend commented shortly before Timothy left hospital that he was “now beginning to feel .. so badly” the separation from Nicholas (p.154).
111 Cf. 1.4.3 above
112 which his body was shedding “from the dozens of small tears in my skin ... like a tree losing leaves in autumn” (p.157)
113 The children had been only “dimly aware” of the everyday realities of the Troubles (p.41). Their response to the arrival of detectives on rota duty at the Castle had been to play at setting up check-points in the Castle
114 His childhood and innocence had been violated. Joanna, arriving after the bomb at the Castle, “a place of happiness throughout her life”, had “sadly” thought, “Well, that’s buggered this place for ever” (pp.116-117). Their 11-year-old cousin, India, later wrote, “Part of my childhood had been raped” (p.120).

The survivor loses his parents as they were before the loss. Timothy’s parents’ absence was “sad and strange” (p.157). They were broken-hearted over the loss of Nicholas. Inevitably, Timothy’s presence was a sad reminder of Nicholas’ absence and was sometimes eclipsed by that absence. Timothy’s father wrote from hospital (my emphasis), “it nearly breaks our hearts to see only Timothy left” (p.142). Similarly, when Timothy telephoned “and gave my parents a blow-by-blow account” after landing a salmon while staying with family friends a few weeks after the bomb, his mother’s response was that “Nick must have arranged it” (p.173). The loss of Nicholas placed Timothy’s mother under immense emotional strain. Grief limited her availability to Timothy. However, her journal for the grounds (pp.39-40). Amanda remembers feeling “uncomfortable” about the history of English injustices in Ireland, “as if there had been an unseen barrier to us truly integrating into village life” (p.276). The family’s isolation and lack of contact with the locals made them vulnerable: “we may not have lived in an ivory tower, but in our granite castle behind an estate wall and crested gates we were divided socially and physically from the community” (p.266).

Violent death and danger affecting family members in wartime was no longer in history books (pp.26-27).

The theme of violation and desecration of childhood and innocence resonates elsewhere. There was a 13-year-old boy in one of the rescuers’ boats. Although the rescuers sought to “shelter” him by sending him “down into the cabin” (p.85), later that evening he was “pale, shaking and in tears” (p.98). Timothy writes about one of the doctors in the aftermath of the bomb watching a small child playing in a pool of my grandfather’s blood that had collected in the sand” (pp.96,279).

Timothy returned to England in the care of his siblings while his parents remained in Sligo hospital until they were well enough to travel (3.1.3)

117 Being told of Nicholas’ death was “the worst moment in my life” (p.127). His father’s response had been “I was wounded in the war and could be positive about it and get better but this I cannot face” (p.112). (I interpret this statement to refer also to the emotional wound of the loss of his older brother who was executed during the war.) Timothy’s father’s “brain could not accept it”; over the next few days, he “was still asking about Nick and suffering afresh each time someone told him he was dead, saying through his tears, ‘Poor little Nicky’” (pp.116-117). This was a man whom Timothy had never previously seen cry (p.4).

118 Timothy writes that, when he returned to school and his parents received his school report, he and they were “relieved that I could do well without Nick at my side”, but were “desperately sad” that “Nick was not at my side doing well” (p.193).

In the ambulance carrying Timothy and his father to hospital after the explosion, Timothy’s father asked the nurse, “Where is my son?” (p.96). Timothy replied, “I’m here, Dad, I’m ok” (p.97). His father whispered, “But I have another son... Has he been killed?” (ibid.)

120 Timothy writes that later, when his mother was “inclined to recall an achievement by one of her children and automatically attribute it to Nick”, he “felt comfortable to correct her gently” (p.212).

Returning to London after the bomb, she recorded in her journal her “dread” (p.174) of going into the twins’ bedroom. Referring to Timothy and Philip coming home from school for the Christmas holidays, she writes, “Our two darling boys arrived. (Oh! For the third!)” (p.194). Referring to Nicholas on New Year’s Eve, she writes, “What pleasure is there in welcoming a New Year of which he is not a part?” (p.202). She continues, “Perhaps I should make more effort to be jolly (I am at times but tears at others) as well as cheerful” (ibid.). Timothy’s mother acknowledged the “miracle” of his and his father’s survival, “but for which life would be intolerable”, but it was no compensation for Nicholas (p.202).

122 She writes in her diary, “I went up to Joe’s room to try to find some clothes Tim wanted in Nick’s school trunk – but found it impossible physically and emotionally” (p.186).
weeks and months after the bomb records her sorrow for what he was enduring and her compassion towards him (pp.174,179,180,185). Less than a week after the bomb, still gravely injured, she dictates a letter: “My heart bleeds especially for little Timmy” (p.131).

Timothy’s parents responded differently to the loss over time. In his “Words with Nick” written 24 years after the bomb, Timothy tells Nicholas, “Mum’s ok – she never really stops thinking about you” and “Dad’s psyche is so different, he talks about you and I can tell it’s the hardest thing in his life.” (p.373). Timothy’s father “rarely spoke about” Nicholas or any of his earlier significant losses (p.208). Timothy and his mother found “talking about Nick comforting”: “it did not matter how many times she spoke about Nick”, since he was “happy to hear her thoughts each time and share her memories” (pp.211,206 and pp.132,208,222).

I have found that, after the bomb, Timothy and his siblings became parenting children, understanding their role to look after their parents, “incapacitated” by their physical injuries and their continued psychological suffering over Nicholas (pp.157,374,202). Timothy’s siblings “paid a price for what they endured in Ireland” (p.374; and pp.152,246). Afterwards, they “rebuilt their lives”, though “that is their story, not mine” (pp.374-375). I interpret that Timothy’s siblings each in different ways were significantly affected and changed by “what they endured in Ireland” (ibid.).

I have found that the loss of the Castle and the family summers spent there were very painful for Timothy. Recalling their “sudden” and “final” departure less than a fortnight after the bomb, in language evocative of his loss of Nicholas in the water, Timothy “had the impression of being sucked down a whirlpool, wrenched from the places and people we loved. There was no ceremony and time only for a few snatched goodbyes” (p.159). I interpret Timothy’s loss of the Castle as signifying

---

123 Cf. 1.4.4 above.
124 Cf. Timothy writes in his Epilogue that he “found my parents largely unchanged by the bomb; they were the same strong, caring people” (p.374).
125 Equally, Timothy’s oldest brother found “reminders of absent family” “upsetting” (p.211).
126 Timothy writes that, before the bomb, “my parents had often found themselves at loggerheads with Philip which they put down to his ‘troublesome schoolboy period’” (p.153). He continues, “[n]ow they found he had ‘become a most gentle man overnight’” (ibid.). This is the same Philip who, returning to school a couple of weeks after the bomb, “finds concentration difficult” and is “distressed .. to find all traces of Nicky .. gone ..” (p.168). Timothy quotes from the diary of a Castle employee, written on the evening of the bomb, that when a picture of Nicholas came on the screen during the television news that night, “[i]t nearly killed Philip” (p.104). When his siblings visited him in hospital the day after the bomb, it was Philip who, Timothy remarked, was “plainly disturbed” (p.117). While his other siblings sat down and chatted, Philip “paced quietly back and forth” (ibid.). Philip was supposed to have been out in the boat with the twins the day of the bomb, but his grandfather had refused to let him come with them (p.61).
127 Timothy and his mother felt keenly the loss of Ireland and their Irish friends, and were alone in the family in wanting to return: “Ireland was a bereavement I felt I would somehow undo one day, by returning and learning how to enjoy the place again” (p.208).
128 Timothy “never contemplated that our visits to [the Castle] were at an end” (ibid.). Leaving by car 2 days later, saying “We’ll be back”, he was “shocked” when his siblings “chorus[ed] .. we would not” (p.159). Timothy writes, “They told me we would never be allowed back and even if we were it would never be the same happy place” (ibid.).
everything he lost with Nicholas’ death – the entirety of his pre-trauma world including his pre-trauma inner world (pp.29,248).\textsuperscript{129}

3.4.3. Lost Sense of Safety and Natural Order\textsuperscript{130}

Critical to the survivor’s post-trauma world is the loss of the sense of safety involved in the parents and family functioning as a protective shield.\textsuperscript{131} After the bomb, responsibility for the family’s security is passed over to the State and becomes a military operation (pp.116,120,133). For decades afterwards, the family felt vulnerable and at risk of further attack.\textsuperscript{132}

Closely linked to the loss of the protective shield of the family, there is the lost sense of the natural and predictable order of things and lost reliability of continuity in being.\textsuperscript{133} For Timothy and his siblings “[t]he world had been turned upside-down; now we were looking after our parents” (p.157). This reversal of familial roles was one of many unnatural reversals.\textsuperscript{134} The most vivid illustration of the disorder and upheaval wrought in Timothy’s external and internal worlds is his account of visiting Nicholas’ grave for the first time. When he last visited the village graveyard near the family home, it had been “a beautiful summer’s evening” and he and Nicholas had been fishing with their father (p.166). They had “all” walked “to a corner of the graveyard filled by generations of Knatchbulls” (pp.166-167). Two empty plots remained. Timothy’s father “explained that he and our mother would be buried there” (p.167). Timothy asked, “Then what will happen?” ‘That’s for you to worry about’, my father said, chuckling” (ibid.). “[N]ow the place looked very different” (ibid.). He continues, “Gone was the neat area of undisturbed grass and in its place were two monstrous piles of raw brown earth, topped by grass squares and the remains of flowers” (ibid.).

3.4.4. Lost Identity; Lost Part of Self; Internalised Deadness

This sub-theme refers to the loss of the surviving twin’s pre-trauma personality and identity. There is identity confusion.\textsuperscript{135} Timothy’s twin-ship had been central to his identity, not only for himself (p.10),

\textsuperscript{129} One of the nurses remarked, seeing off the family from the hospital by helicopter, that it was “the end of an era” (p.160). Decades later, remembering the family summers spent at the Castle, Johanna described them as “the promised land”, adding “I know we can never go there. Even if we could it would not be the same” (p.368).

\textsuperscript{130} Cf. 1.4.2 above.

\textsuperscript{131} Timothy devotes a chapter of his book to a close investigation of how the Garda (or guards) failed to guard him and the family (pp.309-321).


\textsuperscript{133} On the morning of the bomb, Nicholas was practising his golf swing next to the Castle when one of the balls he hit crashed into some trees. He said to Philip, “It doesn’t matter, I’ll find it later” (p.63). Nicholas’ death in the bomb meant that “later” could no longer be relied upon; its content had been rendered wholly uncertain.

\textsuperscript{134} His first thought, being told of Nicholas’ death, had been that “the wrong twin was dead”, because “it went against a basic truth” that he was the weaker twin (3.3.4). Returning to school, at the end of class he “gathered my books and instinctively looked to the desk beside me for Nick”, only to suffer his absence afresh (p.185). His 15th birthday was “the only day I felt nothing but sadness from start to end” (p.189). Opening presents was “horrible”; opening cards, he felt “there was an error” as they were addressed to him only; and he “cut a cake all on my own” (p.189).

\textsuperscript{135} The telegram from the Dublin ambassador informing the London Foreign Office about the bomb misidentified Timothy as the dead twin (p.99). At the Castle, a detective told the waiting family that “one of the twins” was missing, but was unable to identify which (p.101). Carried ashore after the bomb and lying “wrapped in a sheet”
but for others. I have found that survivorship replaces twin-ship as the surviving twin’s defining identity (p.113).

I have found that the survivor does not feel whole; there is a hole in his life. The experience is of psychic amputation. My interpretation is that, just as following amputation of a limb, the amputee can have the sensation of a ‘ghost’ or ‘phantom’ limb in place of the amputated limb, the dead twin haunts the psyche of the surviving twin. The loss is experienced as loss of part of the self. Referring to his “numbness” at Nicholas’ graveside shortly after his death, Timothy reproduces an extract from a text by another surviving identical twin (referred to in 3.5.1 below), who suggests that twins share an undifferentiated part of themselves, and that part “will die in the surviving twin”, that there will be “an actual deadening of some fraction of the living organism” (p.167). The result is that there is a “partial death” of the surviving twin (ibid.); cf. Bion’s account of how he died after witnessing the traumatic death of Sweeting near the end of the First World War (discussed in Coles, 2011, p.34).

3.5. Lone and Lesser Survivor Identity

3.5.1. Aloneness and Withdrawal

I have found that the survivor, fearing for his survival without his twin, withdraws. This increases his experience of aloneness and vulnerability.

on the floor of the Pier Head Hotel, Timothy was misidentified to Paul Maxwell’s father as Paul, causing the father a “devastating blow” when “he realised it was me” (pp.91,92). Hearing of Nicholas’ death 3 days later, Timothy “had the sensation that the wrong twin was dead” (p.126). However, “confusing[ly]”, he also felt “relief” that he, Timothy, was alive (ibid.).

On the morning of the bomb, his grandfather met him entering the dining room. He “stopped and with one hand lifted my chin. He saw my mole and now knew which twin he was greeting. Leaning down he kissed me and said, ‘Morning Timmy’” (pp.60-61). Timothy continues, “All my life, family and friends had looked for that mole, proof as it was of my identity. That was the last time.” (p.61). Timothy’s father writes from his hospital bed to a family friend about how, when their eldest was 17, he and his wife “started our last child, which turned out to be darling Nicholas and Timothy. Our marvellous identical twin sons” (p.142).

Timothy’s introduces himself in his preface as, firstly, “a boy”, and secondly, one of “the only survivors” (p.xi). As children, the twins had “felt the world was our oyster” (p.11), even to the extent of feeling on occasions “at a considerable advantage over” their father (p.9). Now the newspapers captioned photographs of Timothy with “Sad Tim”. One of Timothy’s motivations for leaving Gordonstoun, “where I would always be thought of as One of the Twins” was to seek “a fresh start, untainted by sad reminders or sympathy” (p.209).

Timothy writes about his discovery in the late 80’s of a research study regarding surviving twins, with some survivors having “a sense of never feeling quite whole again” (p.219). Following graduation, he “had an uneasy feeling about the hole in my life left by Nick’s death” (p.214). Having left the university he and Nicholas had both hoped to attend, he had “arrived at the last crossroads which Nick and I had been able to see in the road then ahead of us” (p.213).

Timothy quotes Norris McWhirter describing his twin’s death as “not a bereavement, an amputation” (pp.190-191). I refer in 3.5.3 below to Timothy’s first trip back to the site of the explosion since the bomb, and how “appalled” he was by his “unnatural numbness”: “I had heard of a man whose arm was severed by machinery and who looked down and picked it up, registering what was happening but without feeling any pain” (pp.216-217). I interpret a connection between the brutally severed limb and the brutally severed twin. See also 1.4.3 above.
In his wedding speech, Timothy told his guests that he had spent the previous 19 years “feeling strangely alone” (p.236). I have found that the surviving twin seeks solitude.\footnote{Cf. Pollock writes about how de Quincey, after his favourite older sister died when he was seven, withdrew into books and “sought the most silent and sequestered nooks in the grounds about the house, or in the neighbouring fields” (Pollock,1978,p450).} When told of Nicholas’ death, Timothy had “wanted to curl up in my bed alone and cry until I fell asleep” (p.294).\footnote{Cf. Pollock writes about how de Quincey, after his favourite older sister died when he was seven, withdrew into books and “sought the most silent and sequestered nooks in the grounds about the house, or in the neighbouring fields” (Pollock,1978,p450).} His “fear” was “for myself, that I would not know how to lead my life without him” (pp.125-126).\footnote{Cf. Pollock writes about how de Quincey, after his favourite older sister died when he was seven, withdrew into books and “sought the most silent and sequestered nooks in the grounds about the house, or in the neighbouring fields” (Pollock,1978,p450).} When told of Nicholas’ death, Timothy had “wanted to curl up in my bed alone and cry until I fell asleep” (p.294).\footnote{Cf. Pollock writes about how de Quincey, after his favourite older sister died when he was seven, withdrew into books and “sought the most silent and sequestered nooks in the grounds about the house, or in the neighbouring fields” (Pollock,1978,p450).} Discharged from hospital, he went for a walk with his siblings. Feeling tired, but “not wanting to seem weak”, he “quickly said no” when they offered to accompany him back to the Castle (p.155). “Alone for the first time since the bomb”, he “started to think I might collapse” and felt “really frightened” (ibid.).\footnote{Cf. Pollock writes about how de Quincey, after his favourite older sister died when he was seven, withdrew into books and “sought the most silent and sequestered nooks in the grounds about the house, or in the neighbouring fields” (Pollock,1978,p450).} Entering with his sister the bedroom he had shared with Nicholas, he “steadied” himself, remarking that he had “tried to hide my frailty on his walk, and now he was “doing the same with my emotions” (p.156). He “gave no hint of what I was feeling inside” (p.155). Instead, he “shut the door and had the solitude I was looking for” (p.156).\footnote{Cf. Pollock writes about how de Quincey, after his favourite older sister died when he was seven, withdrew into books and “sought the most silent and sequestered nooks in the grounds about the house, or in the neighbouring fields” (Pollock,1978,p450).} I interpret that the surviving twin “shuts the door” on his emotional self (see further 3.5.3 below).

### 3.5.2. Adaptive or Coping Self

I have found that the survivor lives out of a “coping” self.\footnote{Cf. Pollock writes about how de Quincey, after his favourite older sister died when he was seven, withdrew into books and “sought the most silent and sequestered nooks in the grounds about the house, or in the neighbouring fields” (Pollock,1978,p450).} Timothy’s “coping” self first emerged in hospital. Try as his parents did to hide their tears, they could not (p.136).\footnote{Cf. Pollock writes about how de Quincey, after his favourite older sister died when he was seven, withdrew into books and “sought the most silent and sequestered nooks in the grounds about the house, or in the neighbouring fields” (Pollock,1978,p450).} Timothy “wanted to ease their pain but had no way of doing so apart from being happy around them” (p.136).\footnote{Cf. Pollock writes about how de Quincey, after his favourite older sister died when he was seven, withdrew into books and “sought the most silent and sequestered nooks in the grounds about the house, or in the neighbouring fields” (Pollock,1978,p450).} “Over a period of months” after the bomb, Timothy “pieced together a daily routine without my twin” and “was pleased to demonstrate to my parents that I was able to cope” (p.xi).\footnote{Cf. Pollock writes about how de Quincey, after his favourite older sister died when he was seven, withdrew into books and “sought the most silent and sequestered nooks in the grounds about the house, or in the neighbouring fields” (Pollock,1978,p450).} The surviving twin understands that his bereaved parents need him to cope. Timothy “avoided crying in front of my parents because I did not want them to worry about me” (p.154).\footnote{Cf. Pollock writes about how de Quincey, after his favourite older sister died when he was seven, withdrew into books and “sought the most silent and sequestered nooks in the grounds about the house, or in the neighbouring fields” (Pollock,1978,p450).}

1.4.4 above.
wrote to him in hospital, “I know how good and brave you are being and an inspiration to us all” (p.129).  

The Sligo Coroner advised Timothy that there was “a great responsibility” on him “to help your parents through this terrible year” (p.5). He urged him “to be an example to the civilized community and to the oncoming generations”. This admonition needs to be understood in the particular context of Earl Mountbatten’s fame and royal connections. This meant that Timothy’s “coping self” was under the public gaze on an international stage. I interpret that the family was accustomed to maintaining their composure in public, whatever the mental strain, so that putting a brave face on it was a family trait, a matter of family honour, and a badge of belonging to civilised society. Timothy writes that, after the Whitehall ceremony 4 years after the bomb, “[a]s usual under the glare of publicity and the might of the state, the day left me with a customary sense of disconnect between the show we made for the public and the emotional turmoil underneath” (p.211).

3.5.3. Emotional Constriction and Restricted Living

This sub-theme refers to the process of dissociation (3.3.4) becoming part of the surviving twin’s identity, so that the survivor becomes emotionally constricted. The survivor fears powerful emotion breaking through and, when it does, it is experienced as shameful. The survivor lives a restricted and inhibited life.

Upon first observing his “emotional numbness” in hospital (3.3.4), “[i]t felt unnatural” and, “deep down”, Timothy “knew it was wrong”, but it was also “convenient as it allowed me to sail through the day and comfort my parents” (p.145). He was aware of “the gulf that existed between what I was feeling and what I viscerally knew I needed to feel” (p.149). I interpret Timothy’s “passion for flying” (p.214) as a metaphor for the distance he kept from his “visceral” emotions. Visiting Ireland 9 years

150 A couple of days later she wrote to her husband regarding Timothy, “I hear he is being quite marvellous in keeping his pecker up” (p.131). Around the same time, his father wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury that Timothy “is recovering very fast and I know will make a marvellous life of his own” (p.142). Family friends with whom Timothy stayed a few weeks later were quick to reassure his parents that “he is absolutely all right” and “not damaged” (pp.173-174).
151 When his oldest brother, Norton, had asked the anaesthetist, Tony Heenan, “How will Tim ever live? How will he cope?”?, the reply was that “it was not me he was concerned about but my parents ‘because young minds get over things; older ones find it more difficult’” (p.131).
152 The family was on public display, from the memorial service at St. Paul’s Cathedral (pp.194-197) to the unveiling by the Queen of his grandfather’s statue in Whitehall 4 years later (p.211). They lived out the aftermath of the bomb as representatives of the state.
153 Timothy writes about his parents’ “utter determination” at the end of the St. Paul’s service, despite “three broken legs and bodies still riddled with bomb injuries” to get out of their wheelchairs and walk down the cathedral’s “magnificent” steps, photographers “snapping .. like fury” (p.197). Next day, the pictures were “plastered across newspapers” (ibid.). Timothy’s mother remembers feeling “very frightened” at the time (ibid.). Her thought was, “I don’t think I’m going to make it but I have to” (ibid.). Asked by Paul Maxwell if during his time in the Navy, he had ever felt frightened, Timothy’s grandfather had replied, “Yes but you bloody well don’t show it” (p.259). Timothy remembers he and Nicholas being tearful on their return to school after saying goodbye to their mother, and their grandmother “command[ing]” them, “Don’t look back, boys” (p.12). A family friend, writing to Timothy’s parents after Nicholas’ funeral, had remarked with respect to the surviving siblings, “Needless to say it was a terrible day for them but they really were in complete control” and “you need have no fears about them not being able to cope” (pp.141,152).
after the bomb, he felt “as if I was floating on a magic carpet above an emotional landscape that would turn to dust if I set foot in it” and that he was “landing behind some form of invisible barrier, a sort of emotional Iron Curtain” (pp.215-216 and p.263).\(^{154}\) Standing on the cliff top overlooking where the bomb had exploded, all he could “detect was a cold, raw numbness” (ibid.). He writes, “I had heard of a man whose arm was severed by machinery and who looked down and picked it up, registering what was happening but without feeling any pain” (pp.216-217). He was “appalled” at the numbness he was experiencing (p.216).\(^{155}\) He “knew inside me there was a pain that had not yet hit me, and I knew when it did it would be overpowering”; he “dreaded” it (p.217).

On the same visit to Ireland, Timothy had spotted his father’s old ghillie in the distance: “Part of me wanted to run over and shake him by the hand .. But I knew I would break down” (p.216).\(^{156}\) Writing about those occasions when emotion did break through, Timothy uses the language of breakdown and shame. Watching his grandfather’s televised obituary in hospital, he writes, “destroyed by the ending, I broke down” (p.138). Saying good-bye to his father before returning to school after the bomb, Timothy “wanted to show I was strong and ready for the big step ahead, and to hide my doubt, fear and loneliness” (p.185), but “[s]uddenly I lost control and burst into tears in front of his mortified employees” (ibid.). Arriving at St. Paul’s Cathedral 2 months later, “steeled” and “sure I was going to keep my composure under the public gaze”, “I broke down suddenly. It was all too much and I had nowhere to turn and no hanky to cry into” (p.195). 10 years later, a journalist interviewing Timothy observed that, when talking of Nicholas, “how carefully he controls his voice”, his “look of concentrated passion, and his hand presses his chest as though his heart is in imminent danger of leaping out” (p.220).\(^{157}\) 6 years after that, at the end of a weekend with his parents in Ireland when they were about to leave for the airport, “I unexpectedly broke down and wept. It was perhaps the first time my father had seen me cry since 1979” (p.227).\(^{158}\) I interpret that Timothy felt unmanned by those occasions when emotion overwhelmed him. He writes that, after the incident at St. Paul’s, “From that day I carried a handkerchief in my pocket wherever I went” (p.195).

3.5.4. Lesser and Weak

I have found that the survivor’s sense of himself, reflecting his divided, depleted, mutilated and deadened inner world, is of internal lack and as a reduced and lesser version of who he was before the loss.

After the bomb, there was a reality to Timothy’s physical weakness and his fears for survival without Nicholas (3.5.1).\(^{159}\) Timothy’s later academic and career success showed he “could do well without Nick

\(^{154}\) He flew “along the coast spotting the beaches and islands, bays and by-ways of my childhood” (p.217).

\(^{155}\) The next day, walking along the beach and looking at the Castle, he “was feeling the same unnatural numbness that I had felt the day before” (p.217).

\(^{156}\) He reversed the car, “driving away with a lump in my throat” (p.216).

\(^{157}\) Timothy writes that, a few years earlier, he had come across a note Nicholas had written to him which “was enough to make my heart miss a beat” and “made me cry at length” (p.211).

\(^{158}\) Finally meeting his rescuers 24 years after the bomb, he writes that he “choked on emotion and sat for a few moments in silence feeling foolish” (p.257).

\(^{159}\) Recognising that “without Nick it was going to be a very different experience”, he “did not feel up to "returning to school (p.178). A later planned return was postponed because he was still “far too weak” (p.179).
by my side” (p.193). However, his visit to Ireland in his mid-twenties (3.5.3) had also shown that, though he regarded himself as “strong and bold” and “a man on my own” (p.215), something was holding him back from fully participating in his life. By his early thirties, he had been “so often complimented for being so ‘strong’” that he “sometimes wondered if I had a screw loose and had turned into a psychopath” (p.230). He “felt terribly sad and lonely” when he was alone, and “knew this was unhealthy and abnormal” (p.231). However, marrying his wife, he “felt a transition occurring” (p.236). In “marriage and fatherhood” he found a “new level of emotional security”. However, he still had “mental and emotional wounds which refused to go away” (p.175). I “suffered less” (p.175). I knew this children were ever to “suffer bereavement which leaves nothing over for other purposes or other interests” (p.358).

3.6. Mourning

I have found that the psychic impact of the traumatic loss in childhood endures until the loss has been fully and actively mourned. Mourning enables the survivor to disidentify from the dead twin and rekindle the living twin as a good internal object.

3.6.1. Active Mourning; Crying; Memory as time travel

Timothy writes that the kind of “deep and active mourning” he undertook as an adult was “largely unavailable to me as a boy” (p.364). It involved “grapp[ing] with the trauma in close-up and in slow motion and from every angle .. until the box of unresolved grief unlock[ed]” (p.358). He writes that, “for me”, this kind of mourning “provided more than therapy; it was liberation” (ibid.). I have found that active mourning requires time, attention and knowledge. Meeting the men who had recovered Nicholas’ body, Timothy “wanted to know, deeply and achingly”, “first-hand and in detail”,

There are powerful resonances with the response of Tom, separated from his conjoined twin, Peter, observed and movingly written about by Magagna and Dominguez (2009).

160 Timothy writes, “I knew she understood”, when his therapist asked him at the end of his therapy in 1997, “there’s still something holding you back, isn’t there?” (p.228).

161 John Maxwell, father of Paul, told Timothy that he did not cry again for 18 years after the day of the bomb: “I figured I would have to be strong particularly for my two daughters ..” (p.262).

162 Despite his “longing to find a soulmate”, he was “single with a number of broken relationships behind me, some of them long-lasting” (p.232). He writes that, “over the years, one after another I had brought my relationships to an end” (ibid.).

163 “until then my deepest bond had been with Nick; now it was with Isabella” (p.236)

164 He “needed to exorcise the remaining unresolved grief that lingered from Nick” and “go back to Ireland and explore everything that had lain dormant in my psyche for so long” (pp.239,241).

165 Cf. 1.4.2 above.

166 Timothy writes that, “[h]ad I spent more time actively mourning, then I would have healed more quickly and suffered less” (p.175). If his children were ever to “suffer bereavement when still young”, he would “urge them, once they are ready, actively to mourn, if it is what they want” (p.358).

167 Timothy writes that for much of his year of visits to Ireland, he was “incapable of touching business or personal matters other than the sole, all-invading issue of the bomb” (p.364). Freud writes about the need for “an exclusive devotion to mourning which leaves nothing over for other purposes or other interests” (1917,p.244).

168 cf. 1.4.2 above: “One cannot grieve what one does not know” (Reeves,1973,p.26).
“what had happened to Nick immediately after the bomb” (p.346).\textsuperscript{169} The gathering of information in order to know the “truth”, however “upsetting”, was critical (p.279).

I have found that mourning the lost twin is deeply emotional: Timothy “reconnected to feelings which I had briefly felt but which I had not been able to resolve as a child” (pp.xi-xii). He needed to cry all his unwept tears.\textsuperscript{170} Referring to how Tony Heenan, the hospital anaesthetist, had helped Norton, to “pour out his feelings”, admonishing the other siblings, “I don’t want to see any stiff upper lips around here”, Timothy had not experienced “a complete letting-go of my pent-up emotions as a way of venting what was building up inside me and which was later to surface chronically” (pp.132-133).\textsuperscript{171} The extent of Timothy’s weeping over the course of his year of visits, dominates Part 3 of the book.\textsuperscript{172}

I have found that Timothy used memory as time travel to form a new relationship with Time. The bomb stopped Time for Timothy.\textsuperscript{173} In Lacanian terms, an “epistemological rupture” occurred which froze Space and Time (Davoine et al.,2004,p.88). With the recovery of memory, wormholes in Time were opened up.\textsuperscript{174} Returning to Ireland, and anticipating seeing the Castle before it came into view, “suddenly .. I was looking at it as I had as a child” (p.246). Visiting his rescuers’ home, “what hit me immediately was the delicious smell of the .. turf .. on the fire”, which “transported me magically back to boyhood”; he “picked up a piece and turned it over and over before dropping it into the embers, transfigured it into that .. magazine .. page .. the .. book .. I .. had .. always .. plucked .. out .. from .. the .. shelf .. to .. slip .. into .. view .. of .. the .. memories .. of .. my .. childhood” (p.351).

\textsuperscript{169} Having heard the detail, he “felt soothed to have gathered it up” (p.351 and see p.282). Timothy also refers to his ignorance about the political situation and history of English rule in Ireland, and about the ambivalence felt towards the family by the local community (p.276).

\textsuperscript{170} Towards the end of his book, Timothy reproduces the inscription from Milton’s Lycidas on the gravestone of Paul Maxwell, which ends: “He must not float upon his watery bier/Unwept, and welter to the parching wind/Without the meed of some melodious tear” (p.363). (In fact, John Maxwell told Timothy that he did not cry for another 18 years after the day of the bomb (p.262)). In his letter to his rescuers, written after his daughter’s birth, Timothy writes that one of his “greatest frustrations” is “how rarely I am able to cry the deep cry I need to” (p.240). He continues, “And some people mistake the tears for pain, when of course they’re not, they’re the pain coming out”, telling them that writing his letter to them had been like “pulling a big splinter of grief and emotion out of me, and the tears and relief have been enormous in so doing” (ibid.). His “waterfall” of tears and writing his letter had been “very therapeutic” (p.241).

\textsuperscript{171} Timothy remarks that the “resilience” shown by his siblings would have been “augmented” by “such brief episodes of release”, “without which they may have cracked” (p.133). Although his family encouraged him “to talk and cry as much as possible” (p.156), he was “unsure to what extent I should let it out, or how.” He “would have needed more than permission and encouragement”; he “would have needed example and practice” (p.175). When he cried, his family “cuddled and soothed” him, which he “liked”, but had “the unfortunate consequence of quickly drying up my tears which were the best tonic of all” (p.156 and p.125).

\textsuperscript{172} On his first visit to Ireland, the effect of approaching the Castle and seeing it coming into view was that Timothy needed to pull in at the side of the road where, “[s]louched on a stone pillar beside a gate”, he “suddenly dissolved into tears” (p.246). Having driven to meet with his rescuers, he was unable to get out of the car and “suddenly [he] was crying” (p.249). Instead, he drove to the beach where “my tears came in a silent, constant stream”, and he sat alone for half an hour “the beach a channel for my tears” (ibid.).

\textsuperscript{173} Timothy writes that Paul Maxwell asked him the time a minute or so before the bomb exploded (pp.3, 67). He remembers that, back then, “time seemed strangely irrelevant” (p.67). When he was told of the bomb, Peter Nicholson, the butler at the Castle stopped the kitchen clock (p.90).

\textsuperscript{174} Walking on the Mullaghmore strand on the 24th anniversary of the bomb, he felt as if the other people there “didn’t exist .. They were in one dimension and I was in another” (p.255).
mesmerised by the effect” (p.258). Putting out to sea in his rescuers’ boat, “the stones of the harbour wall, the colour of the water, translucent green, and .. the salty, boaty smells”, had left him feeling “nothing had changed” and he would soon see the family’s boat “and be with Grandpa, Granny, Paul, Nick, Mum and Dad again” (p.257). However, revisiting Mullaghmore at the end of his year of mourning, the thought that, “I might turn around and see my brothers and sisters as children at any moment” “never entered my head”: “I simply thought, ‘What a beautiful spot’” (p.277).

### 3.6.2. Reunion; Separation

I have found that mourning enables the survivor to relate to his lost twin in a new way. The dead twin is faced and separated from and the pre-loss living twin is re-found and re-established in the psyche as a good internal object.  

Timothy closes his book with a chapter titled “Words with Nick”, containing an account of “an hour that was the hardest and best, perhaps, of any hour in my life” (p.370). It was an hour he spent “alone” in the Castle one stormy autumnal night (pp.370-371). He lit a fire and “the smells, sounds, feel and atmosphere of boyhood” of the room told him, “I had arrived as close to 1979 as to make almost no difference” (ibid.). He put on the record-player a “Hot Hits” pop record he had listened to in 1979: “As the music played I closed my eyes and a connection to childhood opened. … The Castle was cocooned in the storm and I was cocooned in mine” (ibid.). As the music “poured” over him, he “convulsed .. into the type of crying I had not done since a tiny child”, his “eyes dripped with tears” and his “breathing became staggered” (p.372). He writes, “The Castle was empty but its rooms were charged and its passageways open” (ibid.).

Timothy calls “Nicky?” “for the first time since 1979” (p.372). He says, “I can’t believe you’re alive. I knew you were alive” (p.372). He says, “Show me your hand .. Does it hurt? .. Come here, I want to hug you .. You haven’t changed a bit .. What happened to you in the water? .. How long have you got? .. Do you come here often?” (pp.372-373). After telling him several times “before you go” that he loves him and misses him, and that “you’re more vivid today than any time in the last twenty-four years”, he ends his “monologue”, “I won’t see you again, will I? Will I? Nick?” (p.373). Timothy writes, “Slowly I recovered my state of mind” (ibid.). He felt “light and easy”; “finally” he “had said goodbye to Nick and let him go” (ibid.).

I interpret Timothy’s “Words with Nick” as their reunion, with Nicholas coming “alive” in Timothy’s psyche so that he might say “the goodbyes [he] had missed” (p.6). In order for psychic separation to be

---

175 One of the boat’s lifejackets, recovered from the sea, made him remember “Arran jumpers and cream crackers and Bovril and the cabin” of the boat (p.284). Handling the few parts of the boat that had survived the explosion, he let his “feelings rise and fall with the memories that flooded back” (pp.253-254).

176 Cf. 1.4.6

177 Cf. Thomas de Quincy’s account of the death of his sister, reproduced and commented upon by Pollock (1978). Elizabeth was 2 years older and was his best-loved sister. On stealing into her room where her dead body lay, he fell into a trance. “A solemn wind began to blow” and the child had what Pollock describes as “an intense spiritual experience and felt grief intensely” (1978,p450). De Quincey refers to the long interval of time which passed “during this wandering or suspension of my perfect mind” until “slowly I recovered my self-possession” (ibid.).
effected, there needed first to be psychic reunion. Timothy’s Words with Nick “proved to be the turning point in my trips to Ireland” (p.373). The following month, he met with the men who recovered his brother’s body from the sea, and was able to “look into [their] eyes” and “see” what they had seen (3.7.3 below). A few months later in February 2004, he saw the photographs of Nicholas’ dead body, “looked into his eyes” and “stared”, realising “he wasn’t in” “his physical remains” (p.356). Later in his hotel bathroom, “squeezing toothpaste onto my brush”, he “looked into the mirror and saw my face for the first time since seeing Nicky in the photographs” (p.358). He writes, “We were still identical and I broke down utterly” (ibid.). I interpret that it is the living Nicholas that he sees in his own reflection in the mirror, and it is the reality of his death that causes him to break down.

3.6.3. Containing External Objects

This sub-theme refers to the surviving twin’s need for containing external objects to accompany and support him as he actively mourns his lost twin.

Timothy’s year of visits “allowed me to undergo a vital process which had escaped me as a boy: the letting go of my continued emotional attachment to Nicholas” (p.xii). It was “at times a horrible and painful process”, through which he “pitched” himself “back into an intensely frightening episode of my life”, but it was how he “entered a new stage of healing” (p.xi). I refer in 3.5.1 above to how, for “more than twenty years” after the bomb, Timothy withdrew, kept his “mental and emotional wounds” to himself, and felt “strangely alone”. In striking contrast, when he “finally decided to try to heal myself”, Timothy’s first “conclusion” was “I could not do this alone” (p.xi).

By then, Timothy had behind him his close friendship with David; his relationship with his therapist; and his marriage. Marriage was a “crucial” emotional container. I interpret that the containment Timothy had found in his therapy and marriage enabled him also to find containment in the rescuers, doctors, nurses and bystanders – all strangers to him before the bomb - who agreed to be

178 The yearning for reunion of separated lovers and the state of reunion as a life-giving and life-enhancing state is a running theme in the book (pp.134-135). Timothy yearned for reunion with Nicholas, just as his parents yearned to be reunited and “were pining for each other” in hospital (p.163 and pp.122,131,135,168), and just as his grandmother had sought to be reunited with her husband (p.375). The address at the St. Paul’s memorial service spoke of how “we have lost part of ourselves with all of them, but one day we shall find it again” (p.196).
179 From the start, Timothy was “frightened” he “might do more harm than good” (p.xii). On the first night of his first visit, he awoke, feeling “uneasy” and “something I had never before felt in Sligo: fear, as if someone might be coming to get me” (p.245). Walking into the Castle, he “felt that I had dived in at the deep end and that I needed to go back outside to acclimatise” (p.247). Arriving at his rescuers’ house, he “found myself unable to get out of the car” because it was “too much” (p.249). On his second visit, entering the harbour to meet with them, he felt like he was “wearing lead-lined boots about to jump off the Atlantic Shelf” and “stopped and heaved” (p.257). Later that day, on his way back to London, he “felt each stage of the journey as like an air-locked decompression chamber, as if I was a diver coming up from a great depth” (ibid.).
180 Timothy confided in David and no-one else when he fell in love with the woman who became his wife (p.234).
181 (pp.228,231, and see also pp.239-340 and 364)
182 Six months into his therapy, Timothy was “feeling good about life” and, although sceptical, he had started “to feel differently, more confident, more optimistic, more energetic” (pp.231-232). He felt “as if springtime had arrived in my life, late but welcome” (p.232). It was at this point in his life that Timothy met his wife.
183 Timothy writes that it was “crucial” before even contemplating his return to Ireland that he “had found a new level of emotional security” “in marriage and fatherhood” (p.241).
interviewed and to relive with him his and their memories of the bomb and its aftermath. In their respective ways, these people provided Timothy with genuine warmth and kindness, unobtrusive support, and delicate attunement and responsiveness to his emotional state.

### 3.6.4. Containing Internal Objects

This sub-theme refers to the surviving twin’s rediscovery, through the work of mourning, of the “pre-trauma” containing internal objects and, in some cases, their strengthening by the newly-discovered containing external objects.

Faced with the prospect of seeing photographs of Nicholas’ dead body at the end of his year of visits, Timothy would have “declined”, but for “the chance to come face to face one last time” pp.355-356. Seeing the first photo, he began to feel distressed, but that abated and he said “very quietly”, “That’s the jumper Nanny knitted” (p.356). Timothy writes, “She had been like a second mother” (ibid.). He “hadn’t thought of that jumper since I last saw Nicky” (ibid.). He “just had not expected to have Nanny there with me” (p.356). Moving his eyes to Nicholas’ face, Timothy “looked into his eyes”, but (he writes) “I didn’t break down, scream, hurl the pack of photographs at the wall and throw myself on the floor” (ibid.). Instead, he “felt gentle and still” (ibid.). I interpret that it was the rediscovery of this good internal object - the maternal containment Nanny had provided to him - that eased Timothy’s distress and enabled him to feel contained, peaceful and calm.

I interpret that the development of his relationship with his “rescuer parents”, Dick and Elizabeth, helped Timothy to strengthen his internal objects representing his natural parents. These internal objects and the protective function they represented were substantially weakened by the trauma.

---

184 There is a very powerful and moving image in Timothy’s account of being brought ashore after the bomb, which may be understood as anticipating (or a metaphor for) the containment that would become available to him 24 years later (cf. 3.3.3). Timothy writes that, when his rescuers ran their boat onto the beach, “people stepped forward and, lifting the entire wooden deck from the bottom of the boat, carried me up to the Pier Head Hotel” (p.90).

185 Timothy writes about the development of his relationship with his rescuers, Dick and Elizabeth Wood-Martin (pp.256-258). These were the people that he was “unable to get out of the car” to meet on his first visit (3.6.1). On his next visit, he writes, “I choked on emotion and sat for a few moments in silence, feeling foolish” (p.257). After they had talked “for more than two hours” about other matters, Dick said “he was going out in his boat that afternoon and asked if I would like to go with him” (ibid.). Dick “went ahead .. to prepare”, leaving Timothy to follow (ibid.). Entering the harbour alone, Timothy was sick with terror (see 3.6.1). He continues, “I crumpled as quietly as I could. We put out to sea and I sat on the roof and wept” (ibid.). When they reached the site of the explosion, Timothy came down from the roof and talked to Dick “in earnest” about their memories of that day (ibid.). He “returned to Mullaghmore as soon as I could” (p.258) and, meeting up with them a second time, he writes, “I shook Dick’s hand long and hard and kissed Elizabeth on both cheeks, big smackers of kisses, and she and he reciprocated equally warmly” (ibid.).

186 As youngsters, “Nick and I sat in rare silence to watch films such as Dumbo and Bambi from Nanny’s knee and my mother’s lap” (p.19). It was Nanny to whom they “ran screaming .. with skinned knees” (p.9). She reminded Timothy’s mother about flowers for Nicholas’ grave on his birthday (p.189). It can be inferred that Nanny remembered things and was in touch with reality.

187 "it had completely gone from my mind" - but now he “looked at that lovingly knitted little V-neck, whose individual strands of wool were so clearly caught by .. the camera”, and what "jolted" him was “the sudden reminder” of Nanny and her grief for Nicholas (p.356).

188 see footnote 158 above
After the birth of his first child, Timothy wrote to his rescuers to thank them for “the gift of continued life you gave me in 1979” (p.240). The year after his father died, Timothy took his mother to meet Elizabeth and Dick (pp.367-368). His “favourite moment” was at the end of their visit. His mother had shaken hands with Elizabeth, but when Timothy kissed Elizabeth goodbye, “my mother returned and gave her a kiss as well”. Timothy “suddenly saw a flash of tenderness between these two resilient women. Both were mothers: one had saved the child of the other” (p.368).

I interpret that the development of the “deep bond of affection and respect” between Timothy and Tony Heenan, the hospital anaesthetist, had a similar strengthening impact with respect to Timothy’s internal objects representing both his father and his grandfather (pp.290 and 368-369). Explaining his decision to return to Ireland, Timothy realised “as I went forward in life as a father”, he “wanted to be emotionally strong for the family I was starting” (p.239). Dr. Heenan, described by one of his nursing staff, “could be cross at times” but was not frightening because “he was too fatherly for that; we were his babies really. We used to call him ‘Daddy Bear’” (p.289). Dr. Heenan “ran a tight ship”; had a “great brain”; and was “in charge” (ibid.). These qualities of Dr. Heenan resonate with qualities in Timothy’s father and grandfather.189

Towards the end of his visits, Timothy was leaving Ireland “feeling .. love”, especially with respect to Dr. Heenan, and his personal and medical ethos of kindness and compassion (pp.295,369). He writes, “my heart sings” because “Heenan defeated McMahon”190 and I am the proof” (p.369). His “moral vacuum” had been “defeated” (p.368). He had “failed to turn me to hatred” (p.369). Timothy now had “a far greater understanding of the situation in which [he] had been immersed”, and “accepted” that, if he had been born and educated as Thomas McMahon had been, “my life might well have turned out the way “ his did (p.367). He writes, “In this respect I felt ultimately inalienable even from him” (ibid.). I interpret that, through Timothy’s successful mourning, not only had the good (containing, creative and loving) object been firmly re-established, but the bad (murderous and terrifying) object had been transformed.

189 Timothy’s father and grandfather emerge as two strong paternal objects in Timothy’s life before the bomb. There is a telling image of Timothy, in the car on the way to the boat on the day of the bomb, first on the lap of his father in the front passenger seat, “quietly fuming at the indignity of it”; and later seated “very uncomfortably”, “the handbrake beneath me”, between his father and grandfather (who was driving), Timothy’s father was a validating presence for Timothy growing up (p.9), openly affectionate to his wife and children (p.96), a model of “calm endurance and physical courage” (p.279). However, his father suffered the loss of his father and elder brother as a young man, and also several heart attacks. Perhaps on account of this, this man was very deeply affected by his traumatic losses in the bomb (p.208). Timothy’s grandfather emerges as independent-minded, tenacious, well-organised (p.58), a keeper and recorder of memories and teller of stories (p.200), with a particular capacity for leadership, including moral leadership, and bravery (pp.27-28). The presence of these qualities and capacities may also be noted in Timothy.

190 Thomas McMahon, who planted the bomb.
3.7. Guilt

I have found that it is only after he has fully mourned his twin, resulting in their psychological separation\textsuperscript{191}, that the survivor is able to confront his guilt.\textsuperscript{192}

3.7.1. Survivor Guilt

This sub-theme expresses the thought that the living twin’s survival has been at the expense of the dead twin and that there has been a wrongful substitution: “it should have been me”. I have found that the survivor experiences guilt and joy in his survival, which joy gives rise to further guilt and shame. This painful conflict of emotions is resolved through the work of mourning.

When Timothy was first told of Nicholas’ death, he had the “sensation that the wrong twin was dead” because “physically Nick was more robust than me so if one of us were going to die it would be me, not him” (p.126).\textsuperscript{193} Timothy had been in the water for “about a minute”, his rescuers estimated (p.81), when he was spotted.\textsuperscript{194} They did not search for other survivors.\textsuperscript{195} None of the other rescuers spotted Nicholas in the water (pp.75-92).\textsuperscript{196} There was relief for Timothy in the Pathologist’s explanation that Timothy’s visibility and Nicholas’ lack of visibility to rescuers may have been due to “the heads-I-lived, tails-I-died chance that I had just inhaled when the bomb blew up”, whereas “possibly Nicholas had just breathed out giving him less buoyancy and resulting in his body not coming to the surface” (p.354).

I interpret that Timothy experienced shame and guilt about his relief in being alive. When he learned of Nicholas’ death, Timothy was deeply sad and scared, but there was also “relief” (p.126).\textsuperscript{197} He felt

\textsuperscript{191} 3.6.2 and cf. 1.4.5 above.

\textsuperscript{192} Timothy makes his “Words with Nick” the last chapter of his book (chapter 28). This makes sense for presentation purposes. However, in chronological terms, his night at the Castle in October 2003 preceded his meetings with the lifeboat men (who recovered Nicholas’ body) and the (retired) State Pathologist (who examined Nicholas’ body) in, respectively, November 2003 and February 2004. These meetings are related in chapter 26.

\textsuperscript{193} This idea of wrongful substitution may also have been influential with Philip. Timothy draws attention in his book to the extent to which Philip, out of all his brothers and sisters, was noticeably disturbed by Nicholas’ death (see 3.4.2). Philip would have been in the boat with the twins on the day of the bomb, but for the fact his grandfather had refused to let him come because he hadn’t done enough schoolwork over the summer (p.61).

\textsuperscript{194} When Timothy was first spotted, his head was mistaken for “a football”. He was “buried in the water”, “bobbing up and disappearing slightly and coming up again”, his nose and mouth never breaking the surface (p.80).

\textsuperscript{195} After ‘haul[ing]’ him into the boat, his rescuers “looked around, saw the other survivors were being looked after, and headed for the harbour” (p.81).

\textsuperscript{196} Within minutes of the explosion, Nicholas, his parents and grandmother had been rescued. Rescuers had also retrieved the body of Earl Mountbatten, who had been “floating higher” than the others, his jacket possibly providing buoyancy (p.76). They had also retrieved the body of Paul Maxwell and the family dog, even though they were both “deep in the water” (p.85). Once the rescue boats were landed, “[p]eople were saying, ‘Is that everybody?’”, but “[t]he guards did not know” (p.92). Brian Best “asked how many were missing”, but “nobody knew” (ibid.). He then asked Timothy’s father to tell him who was on the boat “and that was when I realised we were missing one. It was Nick.” (ibid.). “Someone suggested that boats should go back out and look for Nick”, which they did, but they returned “empty-handed” (ibid.).

\textsuperscript{197} He continues, “I was alive and it felt good, very good .. I had my life, my limbs, my hearing and one perfect eye .. an active, normal life ahead of me” (ibid.).
lucky, but was “shocked” at how “selfish and greedy” this seemed: “How could I be feeling this when I had just learned Nick was dead?” (ibid.). He “did not tell a soul about this” (ibid.). I interpret that Timothy experienced shame and guilt about his relief in being alive. Returning 24 years to the day to where he had been landed ashore after the bomb, Timothy writes how he had had “some dim inner suspicion” that “wrapped up” in “the unintelligible sick-making horror of the destruction”, was a piece of “joyous-get-up-and-sing news”: he had received “the greatest lottery win ever accorded to any human, the chance to live again” (p.256). On this later occasion, he experienced the same “violently opposing emotions” – “extreme grief” with respect to Nicholas and that “this spot was the place of my lottery win” (p.256), but he also felt “a pulse-quickening sensation of being rocket-propelled, which made me look up, and feel in awe” (ibid.). He felt “the incredible lightness of being”, “inspired by simply being alive” (ibid.). He “had a rush of excitement and hope” (ibid.). I interpret it as a product of his mourning that on this later occasion Timothy was able to experience, not only unqualified gratitude for his survival, but an intense experience of being and feeling alive.

3.7.2. Guilt about Abandonment

I have found that the surviving twin experiences guilt for having failed the dead twin by abandoning him to death.

In his “Words with Nick” 24 years after the bomb, Timothy refers to his semi-conscious attempts to get out of the boat after he had been rescued. He says, “Maybe my subconscious was trying to tell them the only way it knew how, that I didn’t want to be separated from you, if they wanted to take me they must also be sure they had you” (p.372). Timothy writes that “for years [he] had been unable entirely to rid [his] mind of the agonising thought that perhaps if Nick had been pulled quickly into a boat he might have lived” (p.357). Meeting with the State Pathologist, Timothy “asked if Nick might have survived if he had been lifted into the boat alongside me” (ibid.). The pathologist’s opinion that the degree of head injury suffered by Nick meant that he would not have survived meant that “a nagging doubt evaporated after decades in my mind: Nick had not been left to die in the water” (ibid.). Timothy “felt huge relief pass through me”. He “later realised that there had existed in my mind .. a feeling that

198 Timothy’s sense of his good luck was a “confusing impulse” that “occasionally streaked through” him (p.126).
199 He had a sudden memory of when he was a toddler and had seen his brother Norton drive away “and disappear from sight” (p.256). He had “thought about following him” but “did not do so”, though he “wondered what lay beyond” (ibid.). Now, he was feeling “a similar tingling sense of being at the edge of something” (ibid.).
200 Timothy was unconscious when his rescuers spotted him “trying to swim” but not “moving anywhere” (p.80). Once in the boat, he was “mak[ing] a noise .. like barking” and was “disoriented and moving around” (p.81). Thinking he was trying to “clamber out” of the boat, Dick shouted to him to “lie down” (p.82). He “shrunk into an inner core”, “too weak to help myself” (ibid.). “Desperately cold and shivering violently” (ibid.), he made several attempts to speak, but receiving what felt like an angry response, he “felt ashamed” and went silent (ibid.).
201 Press reports had stated that Nicholas and his grandfather “had been knocked unconscious by the bomb and, unable to save themselves, had drowned” (p.357). Timothy’s RNLI lifeboat training at his sixth-form college in Wales, together with “students from a Beach Rescue Unit, and a Cliff Rescue Team”, might be interpreted as an enactment of the search and rescue he was unable to undertake with respect to Nicholas (p.210); cf. the separated conjoined twin, Peter, who, after his twin, Tom, died, “was looking for Tom all the time” (2009,p58). There are several references to the rescuers’ sense of failure and inadequacy. Timothy’s rescuers were concerned about the engine of their boat, which was “sick” (pp.80-82). Other rescuers were “regretful” about their “inadequate boat” (p.283), feeling in hindsight that they were “very badly equipped and you look back and feel that you stumbled” (ibid.).
I had somehow abandoned Nick in this final duty. That trace of unreasoned and unreasonable emotion now disappeared” (ibid.).

3.7.3. Neglected Duties to the Dead

I have found that the surviving twin suffers deeply painful regret if he does not have the opportunity to be as intimate with his twin in death as he had been in life. This sub-theme refers to the lost opportunity to see and care for his twin’s dead body and participate fully and meaningfully in the customary rituals and ceremonies to mark his passing. It includes the loss of the chance to “say goodbye” (to part from each other consciously and expressly) and the chance to give the dead twin a proper “send-off”.

“A big part” of the “regret which had lingered after Nick’s death” was that Timothy “had not had any conscious experience of the moment when we were parted” (p.363).202 He had felt “aching pain” “at never having had a last look at Nicky” (p.355). He had “never seen him dying or dead” (ibid.). Meeting the lifeboat men, who had recovered Nicholas’ body, Timothy “felt a huge relief to look into Sean’s eyes as he told me how they had found Nick’s body, and handed it over to the ambulance” (p.351). “He had tears in his eyes when he told me how he felt, looking at Nicky’s body”, and “he cared deeply” (ibid.). The thought of Nicholas “little body in the water, uncared for, while I was being looked after 20 miles away” had been deeply distressing (p.293).203 The lifeboat men had done him “a great service” in performing the “grim task” of recovery and for describing it to him “with such clarity”, because “[It] helps me get close to Nick, close to his death, close to that time when we parted without a good-bye” (pp.351-352). The “details” “were known to someone, and until now that someone had not been me”, but “now that I had gathered in the detail, its power had gone away” (p.350). At last, he had “a sense of being there” (p.350).

Timothy never had the chance to hold Nicholas’ dead body, lovingly to tend to it and care for it.204 He had felt “unbalanced” “by not being able to look at his wounds and be as intimate with his body in

---

202 Landed on the shore, Timothy was “about a quarter conscious” and “looked a mess”, “like [he] might have been dead pretty soon” (pp.90, 92). In the ambulance, Timothy fainted and asked for Nicholas (pp.96-97). He has no recollection of this, nor his arrival at the hospital where the doctors felt he might not survive (p.107). Admitted to Intensive Care, Timothy writes that he “was not even capable of missing [Nicholas] then I suppose, being in and out of consciousness” (pp.292-293). After being operated upon, he woke up “feeling very drugged”, “just want[ing] to close my eyes and sleep” (p.110). The next day, he asked his siblings what had happened and they said “something vague about a problem on the boat”. He asked about his grandparents and Paul Maxwell and about Nicholas. His siblings said they were all “in the hospital” (p.118). Although he was “suspicious there was something they were not telling me”, “concussion, anaesthesia and sedation made it impossible .. to think clearly or work out what was going on” (ibid.). Further, the arrival of his brothers and sisters had made him feel “safe and secure” (p.119). That night, Timothy was “anxious, “confused” and “miserable” - “as if in a nightmare” - and the following night he became very distressed (pp.119,121). On the Thursday morning, the bodies of the dead left the hospital for England (p.123). That night, Timothy learned for the first time that there had been a bomb and that Nicholas was dead (p.125).

203 He writes, “oh my God how it makes me cry today to think of his little body in the water, uncared for, while I was being looked after 20 miles away, my life’s path diverging from his irrevocably but without my knowledge .. it is impossible, impossible, impossible”.

204 Reproducing in his book another identical twin’s account of holding, embracing and kissing his brother’s dead body, Timothy writes, “I wished I could have had such a moment with Nick” (pp.352-353).
death as I had been in life” (p.357).\textsuperscript{205} Having seen the Pathologist’s photographs of Nicholas’ body, he felt “more balanced in this respect” and “felt another wound has been healed” (ibid.). He was “pleased” that “at least one member of the family had seen [Nicholas’] sweet face and diminutive body in their last appearance” (p.357).\textsuperscript{206} He “later realised” that “a feeling” had persisted in his mind “that I had somehow abandoned Nick in this final duty” (p.357).

Nicholas’ funeral took place while “my parents and I lay helplessly in our hospital beds in Ireland” (p.4). During the hospital service held simultaneously, Timothy “felt strangely and horribly absent from my home, my siblings, and most of all from Nick” (p.149). His inability to share in Nicholas’ farewell with family and friends was a further loss.\textsuperscript{207} I interpret that Timothy deeply regretted that he could not perform this final duty to Nicholas of taking his rightful place as chief mourner at his obsequies.\textsuperscript{208}

I interpret Timothy’s writing of his book as part of his mourning process and one of the ways in which he discharges his regrets about his neglected duties to Nicholas. He writes, with an unmistakeable tone of indignation, after returning to the hospital and reading the medical records, “I now learn that everyone was able to see [Nicholas] depart on live TV and yet I didn’t know he was going” (p.293). He continues, “I didn’t even know he was dead. .. I resent not having been componsentis enough .. to have seen my Nicky off and that’s what I’m doing now” (ibid.).

3.8. Integration

3.8.1. Mourning as an Integrative Process

I have found that working through the traumatic loss enables the dead twin to be released from an entombed part of the psyche and the living twin to be re-established as a good internal object. The past is integrated with the present.\textsuperscript{209}

\textsuperscript{205} During one of his visits, Timothy was given a lifejacket found floating on the sea after the attack which he recognised as belonging to his grandfather’s boat (p.284). Returning home with it and, on impulse, deciding to wash it, “I had a strange but therapeutic feeling that I was washing down human skin” (p.285).

\textsuperscript{206} Timothy writes, “I wish someone he knew and loved had been there to take him to hospital and then home. I wish I could have done that” (p.366). John Maxwell, father of Paul, regretted not accompanying his son’s body to the hospital morgue: “To this day I feel I should have gone with him” (p.261).

\textsuperscript{207} Timothy writes that the St Paul’s memorial service was “particularly important” because he felt he had “shared some form of farewell with my family and friends” (pp.196-197). The service left him feeling “uplifted” and “powerfully energized” (p.196). On one of his last visits to Ireland, Timothy and his sister, Amanda, participated in a farewell “ritual” at the cliff edge overlooking the site of the explosion. They each threw out to sea a stone from Amanda’s home in England. Before Timothy threw his, he said, ‘When Nick and I used to go to sleep, I said to him, “Goodnight Nick.” “Night Tim; sleep well.” “Sleep well; god bless.”’ (p.277).

\textsuperscript{208} Timothy was “immensely pleased” to discover “much later” that one of their school-friends, who lived in Ireland, had “packed his bag and sat in the car until his parents drove him, uninvited” and overnight to the funeral church in England (p.150). He “had penetrated the brouhaha .. and made it almost to [Nicholas’] side” (p.151). Unable to get inside the church, he listened to the service on speakers. Timothy writes: “I felt desperately sad that he did not have a seat at the front of the church because I know that is what Nick would have wanted” (p.151).

\textsuperscript{209} When Timothy first writes to his rescuers, he says that “small steps like this one are vital in the ongoing process of integrating the past into a fulfilled and happy present” (p.239).
Timothy writes about how, “over the years”, he had allowed himself “to gain the impression that Nick’s spirit was somehow trapped at [the Castle]” (p.364). Consistent with this understanding is Timothy’s “one and only episode of fury at the IRA” when IRA protesters occupied the Castle (pp.206-207). Timothy’s feeling was that “the IRA wanted to add insult to injury” (p.206), as if the IRA had desecrated Nicholas’ tomb.

If the Castle signified Nicholas’ tomb, it was a tomb in which he and Timothy were encapsulated (Coles, 2011, pp.29-31). Both Timothy and the Castle were haunted by Nicholas. Timothy recognised his need to “exorcise” his “unresolved grief” for Nicholas (p.239). His first visits back to the Castle left him feeling “as if I was aboard the Mary Celeste”, expecting his “grandfather would walk in at any moment”, and at the beach that he was “going to stumble upon one of my childhood family picnics” (pp.248-249). The Castle was a “mausoleum”, “shuttered, dusty, damp and cold” (pp.250-251). His return is resonant of the opening of a tomb, but it is “something .. like a sweet fragrance” that is “locked up in it” (p.248). The effect was “ghostly” (p.251). However, by the end of his year of visits, these ghosts had been “laid to rest as ancestors” (Loewald, 1980, p.249; 3.6.1 above). The Castle is now a living thing of flesh and blood: its “sights, sounds, smells, feels and tastes” were “hardwired” into his and his siblings’ heads; it “was in our DNA” (p.277).

### 3.8.2. Creating a Narrative

I have found that the creation of a narrative about the loss assists the mourning process and the process of integration. Timothy explains how, “[b]y returning to Ireland and piecing together the story”, he “reconnected to feelings” and “found a sense of inner peace that I had lost the day Nicholas was killed” (p.xi). With each new piece of information, “another piece of the jigsaw fell into place” (p.258). Thus, “pieces” (“reconnected” or “piec[ed] together”) became “peace”.

I interpret that the survivor is assisted in creating his narrative by the rediscovery of good creative and integrating objects. I refer in 3.6.4 above to Timothy’s rediscovery of Nanny, his “second mother” as a good object, when he sees her “lovingly knitted little V-neck”, the camera “so clearly” catching the “individual strands of wool” (p.356). Timothy writes about how, in the course of writing his book, he would “weave” what witnesses had seen and heard “into the chronology that was emerging”, clarity being provided by “the cross-section of accounts” (p.282). He also tells us about a tree Nanny had

---

210 Hearing all this on the radio during his mid-morning break at school, Timothy “swore and kicked, venting my anger in private” (p.206). He “calmed” himself “down”, but on his way back to class, “midway down a flight of stairs I was hit by another blinding rage and found myself talking aloud and swearing” (ibid.). He “sat in classes seething” until he heard later that day that the siege had ended (ibid.).

211 Leaving the Castle for the last time after the bomb, Timothy “suddenly” “felt as if I were leaving something vital behind but I did not know what” (p.158). At the end of his first trip back to the Castle 9 years after the bomb, he “had a sense that one day I would return and that there was something there, which I needed to go back for, though I had no idea what it was” (p.218 and see p. 277). At the end of this visit, Timothy made a ghostly sighting of a “figure” behind him, as he walked up the driveway to the Castle, that “seemed to have disappeared into thin air” when he turned the bend (pp.217-218).

212 Writing of his first visit to the Castle for many years, I interpret that Timothy connects “the inner peace [he] had lost there” and his wish to “piece together a clear picture of the place and events” (p.245).
grown from grapefruit seedlings he and Nicholas had given her, and how he wrote his book “close to .. [its] fruit-laden branches” (p.166).\(^{213}\) I interpret that Nanny was a creative, integrating and containing object for Timothy.\(^ {214}\)

### 3.8.3. Reconstruction of Identity

This refers to how successful mourning and integration of the trauma results in a new sense of vitality, wholeness, sufficiency, and safety for the survivor. There is a freeing-up of mental space for new growth. A new surviving twin identity is constructed.

Timothy explains how his year of visits to Ireland allowed him to find “a sense of inner peace” lost when Nicholas died (p.xi). The “shadows of my past were lifting” (p.365); “symptoms started to fade” (p.xi); “old wounds” were “healed” (p.xiii). He writes that his visits “washed away regret which had lingered after Nicholas’ death” (p.363). Having “dispelled the regret”, “linked to that came a release from a fear” (p.364). The fear was of a “sudden, unspecified separation” (ibid.). Now he was “losing my anxiety .. about possible future separations” (ibid.). He was “freeing myself mentally”, the “negative, awful grip on my psyche” of the bomb having “withered by my coming here and confronting it all” (ibid.) He was able, as never before, to be a “hands-on Daddy” to his children (p.365) and “found it easier to live in the moment” (p.364). He “found a new surge of energy” (p.375). He regards himself “now as never before at liberty to be unconcerned with self, and therefore to be of use to others” (ibid.).

---

\(^ {213}\) After the bomb, Timothy “felt tears coming” as he visited Nanny, watered the grapefruit plant and “went next door to wind the clock” (p.166). By the time Timothy came to write his book, one seedling had “thrived and grew into a tree”. He writes, “I wrote much of this book close to its fruit-laden branches” (ibid.).

\(^ {214}\) She was also a healing one. It was to her the twins would run “screaming” “with skinned knees” (p.9). Timothy writes of the “healing” effected through his visits. I note how Timothy involved his parents and siblings in his visits to Ireland, some of them revisiting Mullaghmore for the first time since the bomb and saying their own goodbyes (pp.277, 367, 368).
Chapter 4
Discussion and Conclusions

4.1. Introduction

4.1.1. Research Project Revisited

Freud wrote, “Everywhere I go I find that a poet has been there before me” (1925a,p.60). Heaney’s “Mid-Term Break” (1966) was my literary introduction to the subject of sibling loss (Appendix 4). Heaney was 14 and away at school when his younger brother was knocked down and killed by a car. The focus is on the parents – “In the porch I met my father crying” and “my mother held my hand/in hers and coughed out angry tearless sighs”- and the dead child – “He lay in the four-foot box as in his cot”. The surviving sibling narrator is a silent and seemingly detached observer. An infant sibling is mentioned in passing: “The baby cooed and laughed and rocked the pram/When I came in”.

When I began work with A, I had in mind Heaney’s poem and the baby in the pram. I wondered how that baby might have responded to the changes in the family-home described by Heaney; what kinds of responses his cooing and laughter might have elicited; and how those responses might have affected his later capacity for spontaneity and joyful living. I went in search of resources in the psychoanalytic literature. The case studies I found seemed partial accounts of the phenomenon, written in advocacy of, rather than in order to explore, a particular theoretical hypothesis. Further, there seemed to be a pronounced tendency to think in terms of sibling hatred and rivalry, as opposed to sibling love and collaboration. There was also a marked contrast in tone between the psychoanalytic literature and the biographical and psycho-social writing on sibling loss, where the emphasis was much more on the experience of loss and grief. What I felt was missing from the literature was a psychoanalytic case study, providing a close-up, in-depth, exploration of the individual experience of the long-term impact of sibling loss in childhood. I began my research project. Over its lifetime, my project has undergone two modifications. My subject is now twin loss in childhood (rather than sibling loss) and my data set is a published biographical account of twin loss (rather than clinical material). My overall aim remains to provide a resource for practitioners working with this particular patient group.

In this chapter, I discuss my findings and how they relate to each other. I conclude that they support a broad theoretical framework for working with childhood twin loss in the consulting room. I identify below the central coordinates of this framework.

I have referred earlier to the acute suffering experienced by bereaved parents. It is a delicate exercise to explore the extent to which the suffering of bereaved parents may add to the suffering experienced by a bereaved twin. In this chapter, I have sought to discuss the implications of my findings with appropriate sensitivity for the feelings of the author and his wider family.
4.1.2. Areas of Discussion

The discussion which follows covers three main areas:

- Theoretical implications (4.2)
- Clinical implications (4.3);
- Research implications (4.4);

4.2. Theoretical implications

4.2.1. Twin Loss as Trauma

My findings are consistent with the existing literature\(^{215}\) in conceptualising loss of a twin as a trauma. The trauma consists of the overwhelming and chronic emotional suffering attributable to the loss of the relationship with the twin.

This starting-point has important theoretical and clinical implications. I discuss these below. First, there are two important and related questions to consider: (i) how is my analysis (that twin loss is a traumatic loss with particular psychic characteristics and sequelae) affected by the very particular circumstances in which Timothy lost Nicholas; and (ii) how can it be determined whether what was traumatic for Timothy was the loss of his brother or his own involvement in a life-threatening event.

As to the first question, this focuses upon the particular circumstances of Nicholas’ death. He was not only violently murdered. The bomb which killed him was planted and detonated by members of a paramilitary organisation, who had targeted the family as representatives of a political status quo which it sought to overturn, and whose deaths (they knew) would obtain maximum publicity for their cause (p.4).

I refer in 1.4.2 above to the existing literature which recognises that the actual circumstances of the death (its suddenness, unexpectedness and whether the death was particularly gruesome or horrible) will affect the psychic impact of the loss for the survivor. I refer also in 3.5.2 above to the public nature of the trauma suffered by Timothy. This meant that there was widespread recognition of his loss.\(^{216}\) Although this publicity may have had some advantages - Timothy records how writing letters to well-wishers was a welcome distraction in the weeks after the bomb (pp.163-164) – he also records how the very public memorial events which he attended left him “with a customary sense of disconnect between the show we made for the public and the emotional turmoil beneath” (p.211).

It can be inferred readily that the extremely violent nature of Nicholas’ death will have aggravated the shock, horror, loss of a sense of safety, and emotional suffering which Timothy experienced (3.3.1-3.3.3, 3.4.3), and that the public nature of his loss (involving the demand to put on a good “show” at public events) will have intensified the urge to hide and avoid contact with his emotional self, thereby

\(^{215}\) 1.4.1 above.
\(^{216}\) See 4.4.1 below.
further impeding the natural mourning process (3.5.1-3.5.3). However, although I regard the particular circumstances in which Timothy lost Nicholas as aggravating factors in my analysis of the interplay between the relevant facts and the relevant theory, I do not rely upon those circumstances for my findings regarding the impact of twin loss in the survivor’s internal world. Just as Timothy’s focus is the personal meaning for him of the loss itself, similarly, my findings support current psychoanalytic thinking that the external circumstances may be relevant as factors contributing to the traumatic impact, but it is the loss itself, as it is experienced in the survivor’s internal world, which is the essential trauma. It is a recognised limitation of case studies that they are not generalizable (2.1.8 above). It is how theory plays out with the particular facts of any one case study that is the aim of case study research. The loss and recovery of the internal good twin object are key findings of mine, and they do not depend on the particular circumstances of Nicholas’ death.

Next, I examine the difficult and intriguing question regarding whether what was traumatic for Timothy was the life-threatening experience of himself being a victim of the bomb, or the loss of Nicholas.

As a matter of strict causation, the bomb may be said to be the primary traumatic agent: if there had been no bomb, Nicholas would not have been killed. A further perspective might be that Timothy was involved in one traumatic event (the bomb), which caused a further traumatic event (the loss of Nicholas). My findings confirm that the fact that Timothy was a victim of the bomb rendered the loss of Nicholas even more traumatic for him. I have in mind Timothy’s prolonged experience of survivor guilt related to the question whether his rescue from the water had been at Nicholas’ expense, and the deep regrets he suffered because his own bomb injuries and incapacitated state meant that he was deprived of the experience of caring for his dying or dead twin and of making his own farewell. However, although the two traumatic events of the bomb and the loss are connected in these respects, Timothy is clear in the book that it was the loss of Nicholas in the bomb that “devastated” him. His return to Ireland 24 years later was not prompted by his own involvement in the bomb: he needed to return on account of “the vital process which had escaped me as a boy: the letting go of my continued emotional attachment to Nicholas” (pp.xi-xii). It was this that had left him with “a legacy of mental and emotional wounds which refused to go way” (p.xi). Through his visits to Ireland he “entered a new stage of healing” and was able to recover the “sense of inner peace that [he] had lost the day Nicholas was killed” (ibid.).

Even though Timothy was an intended victim of a deadly and terrifying event, which seriously injured his parents and himself and killed his twin and grandparents, the implications of my findings are that what caused him the greatest suffering and had the deepest impact was the loss of his relationship with his brother, rather than the exposure to an extremely serious threat to his own life. My findings suggest that, if both boys had survived the bomb, notwithstanding the deaths of other family members and the injuries sustained by Timothy and his parents, Timothy would have recovered psychologically because, in that event, Timothy would still have had the twin relationship as a source of emotional containment and protection. As indicated by my findings, what rendered the loss of Nicholas traumatic was the loss of that containing relationship.

---

217 “I went to engage in a human process, not a political one. I went to understand my twin’s death.” (p.xii).
There is additional good evidence to support my analysis that the trauma of losing his twin affected Timothy more deeply and more severely than his own involvement in the bomb. In the immediate aftermath of the bomb, but understanding that Nicholas had also survived and was also receiving treatment in the hospital, Timothy was “sore, restless, anxious, confused, miserable”, but the arrival of his siblings “fundamentally altered” his state of mind, making him feel “safe and secure”. My findings show how any sense of safety was lost when Timothy learned shortly afterwards that Nicholas was dead: he feared for his survival. I have referred above to Timothy’s own sense that it was the loss of Nicholas and the different psychological meanings that loss held for him which led to his enduring and chronic state of inner woundedness, unhealed for over 20 years (pp.xi,133). When Timothy comments, “post-traumatic stress counselling was virtually unheard of in the England of 1979”, he does so with reference to the impact on him of losing Nicholas (p.232).

Timothy’s book is a book about the Mountbatten bomb, but it is above all a book about his survival without his twin. It is about the “sense of inner peace [he] lost the day Nicholas was killed” (p.xi) and about how he needed to return to Ireland to “discover what had happened to him”, “to make .. sense of it”, “to grieve for him” and “say goodbye” (pp.xi-xii). His purpose in returning was “to understand my twin’s death” (p.xii). He tells Dr. Heenan about “my need to revisit the circumstances of [Nicholas’] death in order to find peace” (p.295). It is Nicholas and the loss of Nicholas, which were his motivation to return to Ireland and to write the book, together with his wish to “share my story with others who have suffered trauma or grief” (p.xii). My findings confirm that the loss of Nicholas and the rediscovery of him through the work of mourning are the two pivotal events of the book. The shape and content of the book reflect this. The boys’ twin-ship and all their lively interactions, starting with their synchronic heartbeats, begin the book; then Nicholas disappears from clear sight; gradually he comes back into sight and is re-found as a living and loved object. The book begins with the twins’ conception (p.7); it ends with the words on Nicholas’ headstone (p.375).

Further support for my analysis may be found in what Timothy tells us about his romantic relationships before he met his wife. He writes that, by then, he had “a number of broken relationships behind me, some of them long-lasting”, and that, “over the years, one after another I had brought my relationships to an end” (p.232). This unbroken pattern of ending relationships suggests that something from the past was being repeated. I interpret that Timothy was unconsciously repeating the trauma of the premature ending of his relationship with Nicholas. Un-mourned traumatic loss is liable to be repeated. After entering therapy and beginning the process of mourning his traumatic losses, Timothy ceases unconsciously to repeat the trauma which he suffered when his twin died. He meets and marries his wife.

My findings open up a larger discussion about what do we really mean when we speak of trauma and what is the relationship between trauma and loss. Garland writes, “A traumatic event is a breakdown in containment, and vice versa” (Garland,2002,p.108). My findings suggest that what makes loss of a twin in childhood traumatic is the loss itself, especially when that loss is sudden, unexpected and violent. We could define the loss as the loss of the particularity of the relationship with the dead twin including the containment that particular relationship offered. To put it more simply, we could define the loss as the loss of the loved object, or even the loss of love. Containment is lost because the loved object is lost. It was the sudden and premature rupture of his deep emotional attachment to his twin which overwhelmed Timothy and which his mind was simply unable to process.
In adopting the concept of trauma from medicine and surgery, psychoanalysis initially focused on the ideas of a violent bodily shock, a wound, and “disruptive consequences affecting the whole organisation” (Garland, 2002, p.155). With Freud’s “Mourning and Melancholia” (1917) there was a shift in focus from the traumatic power of shocking external events to trauma as a consequence of separation from a person who has been lost. My findings follow Freud in focusing upon the loss of the loved object and the shattering impact of the shock of that loss. Temple points out that Freud’s paper was the inspiration for the study of traumatic loss in children (2002, p.156). He draws attention to the letter written by Bowlby, Miller and Winnicott (1939) warning that the trauma of separating young children from their mothers by evacuation might be as great a danger to the children as remaining in the cities during bombing (2002, p.156). My findings imply that loss of the loved other is more traumatic for a child than exposure to a shocking and violent event which threatens his own life.

4.2.2. Post-Traumatic Identification with Dead Twin

The surviving twin’s unconscious internalisation of the dead twin is one of my key findings. My understanding of the unconscious motivations underlying this internalisation is informed by Garland’s concept of “post-traumatic identification” (2002). My findings support an analysis that identification with the dead twin protects against guilt and the full experience of separation and loss. To put it another way, it allows the surviving twin to avoid the process of mourning. In the meantime (until the reality of the loss can be faced and mourned), the surviving twin feels haunted, and leads an emotionally restricted, inhibited, half-life.

Timothy’s understanding was that part of him died when Nicholas died (3.4.4). His account of life after Nicholas up until he entered therapy in 1996 is sparse and uneventful. Although he writes that he was “getting on with my life” (p.219), that life comes across as colourless and lacking in joy. Apart from a reference to “occasional mood swings” (p.228) and how he felt “terribly sad and lonely” when he was “alone and peaceful”, no clear picture of what Timothy was like as a young adult emerges (p.231). The years from 1980 to 1996 take up only 2 of the book’s 28 chapters and only 24 of the book’s 375 pages. In the first of these chapters Timothy remarks on the ghostly figure he spotted near the Castle on his first trip back, and the “strange numbness” he felt. Continuing this sense of detachment, he begins the second of these chapters by referring to himself in the third person through a newspaper article which described him as “last heard of studying economics at Cambridge University” (p.219). He writes that he was “pleased to have disappeared off the media radar” (ibid.). There is a sense that Timothy himself “disappeared” during these intervening years. He writes that his emotions were “seized up” (p.224). He made further trips to Ireland as a “first tentative step towards reconnecting with the unresolved emotions with which I left Ireland as a boy” (ibid.), but “unexpectedly broke down and wept” at the end of one of these trips, which he could not explain (p.227).

---

218 There is some liveliness when he writes about meeting David, “someone who totally understood what it felt like to have one’s twin killed” (p.220). He had been “too young and too traumatised” when he had met Norris McWhirter (ibid.). Through his developing friendship with David, whose twin died in adulthood, Timothy was able to explore what it might have been like for himself and Nicholas, if Nicholas had lived, and they had come to live more separate lives as a matter of natural development.
It is the lack of any real sense of Timothy in these chapters which is telling. A Cambridge-educated young man working in television in London, with means and (he tells us) no difficulty attracting women, ought to be having the time of his life. However, there is no sense of anything approaching *joie de vivre* in these chapters. They are dominated by the loss of Nicholas and a sense of Timothy as alone with his deep sadness. He writes that “sometimes” he was “so miserable that even speaking on the phone or going to the shops was difficult” (p.228).\(^{219}\) When he confided in a friend, he felt pitied (ibid.) and this seems to have reinforced a fortress mentality.

Everything changes – including the pace of the book and the portrait of Timothy that emerges from the book – after Timothy enters therapy. It is not only that shortly afterwards he becomes a husband and then a father. He also gains a voice, as indicated by his wedding speech and his letter to his rescuers after the birth of his daughter. There is a new urgency and strength of purpose. He further becomes flesh and blood through his account of his visits to Ireland, the people he meets there and what he discovers and experiences. With his second visit, an aura of excitement enters the book. Timothy writes about feeling “a burst of pleasure”, letting out “a whoop of joy”, experiencing “a spine-tingling sensation” and “the thrill of endless possibilities” (p.252). Sensory images flood the book as his visits continue and his mourning of Nicholas gathers pace (3.6.1). Freud explains how, in mourning, “the existence of the lost object is psychically prolonged”, while “bit by bit” and in an “extraordinarily painful”, “piecemeal” fashion, the mourner “is persuaded by the sum of the narcissistic satisfactions it derives from being alive to sever its attachment to the object that has been abolished” (1917, pp.245,255). I interpret Timothy’s remembering and mourning his loss of Nicholas through his visits as the process by which he begins to dis-identify from the dead Nicholas and rediscover the living Nicholas. Timothy writes about his sense that Nicholas was “somehow trapped” in the Castle, but that he came to realise that it was his mind which was haunted (p.364). He writes, “Through my return trips I was freeing myself mentally” (ibid.).

I interpret Timothy’s “Words with Nick” in the Castle near the end of his year of visits as a particularly clear illustration of this sequence of remembering (or mourning) the past; psychic dis-identification from the dead object; recovery of the lost good object; and looking towards the future. Timothy had prepared the setting (the drawing room of the Castle) to evoke the “smells, sounds, feel and atmosphere of boyhood” (p.371). The effect was to open “a connection to childhood” (ibid.). Remembering the happy times spent in that room with Nicholas, he “convulsed” into the kind of crying he had not done “since a tiny child”. He writes, “I said ‘Nicky?’ .. for the first time since 1979”. It was only after “summon[ing] from a place far within” all the memories which meant he “had arrived as close to 1979 as to make almost no difference”, that Timothy was now able to begin an imagined dialogue with Nicholas as a separate living object (p.371). In the course of this imagined dialogue, Nicholas is restored as the living (good) internal object whom Timothy wants to “hug” and “squeeze” (p.372). Timothy says, “*I can’t believe you’re alive. I knew you were alive.*” The painful fact of permanent separation is faced and accepted. Timothy says, “*I won’t see you again, will I? Will I? Nick?*” (p.372). Nicholas is a loved and missed object: “*I love you, love you, miss you*” (ibid.). Despite the pain endured by Timothy on account of their loving attachment to each other, Timothy affirms that loving

\(^{219}\) I note the extent to which desolation features as a feeling state in some of the rescuers. So, for example, Timothy describes one of the rescuers he visited as looking “desolate” after telling her story (p.282).
attachment. He says, “I’d choose to come back again as a twin, if I could have you again” (ibid.). The dialogue/monologue has meant that “Finally I had said goodbye to Nick and let him go” (ibid.). The weight of the internalised dead twin is lifted. Timothy feels “light and easy” and “ready to roll” (ibid.). Freud writes that it is only “when the work of mourning is completed [that] the ego becomes free and uninhibited again” (1917,p.245). It is only after the psychological separation effected through his “Words with Nick” that Timothy is able to face his guilt regarding both his duties to the dead and his survival. Timothy makes his “Words with Nick” the last chapter of his book (chapter 28) and this makes sense for presentation purposes. However, in chronological terms, his night at the Castle in October 2003 preceded his meetings with Nicholas’ rescuers and the (retired) State Pathologist (who examined Nicholas’ dead body) in, respectively, November 2003 and February 2004. These meetings are related in chapter 26. Timothy explains how, through the eyes and words of the men who recovered Nicholas’ body and through viewing the pathologist’s photos of his remains, Timothy’s “feeling that [he had somehow abandoned Nick in this final duty] of seeing “his sweet face and diminutive body in their last appearance” “disappeared” (p.357). Asking the question and hearing from the pathologist that Nicholas’ injuries were not survivable, the thought “decades in my mind” that Nicholas had “been left to die in the water” “evaporated” (ibid.). Timothy writes, “I felt huge relief pass through me” (ibid.). I link my findings and the above analysis regarding identification with the dead object with Garland’s concept of post-traumatic identification (2002).220 Freud, writing about mourning, observes how love cannot be given up after the loved person has died: reality demands withdrawal of love from this object that no longer exists, but continuing devotedness to the dead object can be so intense that “a turning away from reality takes place and a clinging to the object through the medium of a hallucinatory wishful psychosis” (1917,p.244). Garland, writing about trauma, observes that for the trauma victim experiencing terror and confusion, “the immediate resort is to turn back to and connect with the body of the primary object (as non-human primates can do so readily)” (Garland,2002,p.213). However, the victim of traumatic loss has the problem that the primary object’s nature has “changed fundamentally”: the good object has failed to prevent the trauma from happening and has turned bad (ibid.,pp.212-214). In such a case, how are the demand for continuing devotedness to the lost object and for safety to be satisfied? Garland suggests that, in that event, “the safest way of relating to the primary object is one that involves clinging to it through being it, rather than being at a mental distance from it” (ibid.,p.213).221 Identification provides the least worst solution for the trauma victim unwilling to give up his attachment to the lost object and yet in search of safety. Being “at a mental distance from” the object would involve the full painful experience of separation: identification protects against this. Further, identification allows the ego to share in the properties of the object. As my findings indicate, where the object is dead, this means sharing in the property of numbness to pain and the property of deadness itself, thereby helping the ego avoid “the mental pain of guilt that would have to be endured if it were to continue with its independence and liveliness” (ibid.,p.214).

Garland suggests that what needs to happen is for the survivor to find “[s]ome new way of relating to this lost good object, and some way of dealing with this very present bad object” (ibid.). She suggests that dis-identification from the bad (dead) object can only be achieved through mourning the loss of the relationship with the good (living) object (ibid.). She continues, “This means that the distance between the ego and its object can once again be tolerated, triangular space (Britton,1998) established, and the relationship begin to be formulated mentally, or symbolised” (ibid.).

I understand Timothy’s unconscious identification with his dead brother as indicative of an arrested mourning process. Whether it may also be regarded as indicative of melancholia, as that concept is defined by Freud (1917), is debatable. For Freud, the distinguishing feature of melancholia - absent in mourning - is “insistent communicativeness” of the melancholic’s sense of his own moral worthlessness (1917, pp.246-27). Timothy’s presentation, as it emerges from the book, seems very different from this. Far from persistent self-disclosure, Timothy is persistently reticent and, although his sense of himself is as lesser and weaker without his twin, he is capable of achievement in many areas of life (3.5). Nor is there any evidence of self-punishment or self-vilification as described by Freud (1917, pp.245).

On the other hand, Brenman’s understanding of Freud’s concept of melancholia as a “negation of the awareness of the loss of a good object as opposed to the sadness of a mourner” (2006, pp.25,103) resonates with the book’s depiction of Timothy as lonely and lost and not really knowing why (p.231). Further, I’ve referred above to Timothy’s sparse account of the 17 years following Nicholas’s death. Our knowledge of this period of Timothy’s life is limited. We do not know if he experienced depressive episodes during these years. Freud’s thesis is that the melancholic unconsciously identifies with the lost object so that he might express his hatred of and sadism towards the object for abandoning him: he attacks the lost object through his own self-excoriation and self-denigration (1917, p.245-248). My findings do not support an analysis along these lines. However, Brenman’s understanding of Freud’s melancholic as separated from “the goodness in others and themselves” (and therefore from “access to help and hope”) strongly resonates with my findings (2006, pp.25-26). To the extent then, that Timothy may be regarded as having suffered from melancholia, I consider that condition to reflect the denudation of his internal world resulting from loss of the internal good object, rather than guilt relating to unconscious feelings of hatred towards the lost object for abandoning him or unconscious rivalry.

4.2.3. Reformulation of Post-Trauma Object World

My findings indicate that the post-trauma world of the surviving twin is the scene of a disaster involving multiple external and internal losses. There is the loss of the day-to-day relationship with his living twin, together with all the advantages and consolations that went with being part of that mutually supportive and protective couple, which felt greater than the sum of its parts. There is the loss of identity. Innocence is lost, along with the experience of feeling carefree and optimistic, the experience of joie de vivre. There is the loss of the parents as they were before they lost their child, and of the family as it was before then. There is the loss of family life and of the past: past experiences are felt irretrievable and gone forever. The sense of natural order and the expectation of continued going-on-being are also lost. The sense of the parents and the family as a protective shield are lost. There is the loss of the twin as a good internal object. The survivor’s inner sense of safety and security...
is lost. Critically, there is the loss of psychic integrity or wholeness ('peace of mind') in the survivor, for his internal world is now depleted (by the loss of the good object and all the other related losses), split, mutilated, and haunted by the dead twin object. The survivor loses belief in himself. There is a painful loss of self-esteem and self-confidence.

The survivor needs to reformulate his post-trauma inner world in order to recover from these losses. My findings show that the availability of good external objects to help him remember and mourn is critical. I have found that Timothy’s encounters during his year of visits with the people involved in the rescue and care of himself, his parents and Nicholas’ dead body, helped him to rediscover and reconfigure his internal good objects and thereby rebuild his inner resources. He re-finds his grandfather through his visits to the Castle: a note on a record sleeve was “so him” (p.252 and see also p.248). He re-finds his grandmother too, another person to whom he had been unable to say good-bye (p.292). Through his meetings with the people who handled his brother’s body and his “Words with Nick” Timothy rediscovers his dead twin as a loved and missed object. He also rediscovers Nanny, his “second mother”, through the “lovingly knitted little V-neck” in which Nicholas had been killed (p.356). What “knocked [him] sideways” when he saw the photograph of Nicholas’ dead body was “the knitting of Nanny” with “all the individual strands of wool... so clearly caught by the .. photographer’s camera” (ibid.). He “just had not expected to have Nanny there with me” when undertaking this task which he had dreaded (ibid.). My findings indicate that Timothy’s rediscovery of Nanny as a creative and integrative object may have assisted him in reconfiguring his inner object world and in writing his book. His rediscovery of her as a present, reliable, containing and loving object will have helped him to develop a new capacity for self-containment. I have also referred in my findings to the moving encounter between Timothy’s mother and Elizabeth, one of Timothy’s rescuers, together with Timothy’s observations on this meeting, which suggest that the representation of his mother in Timothy’s internal world was strengthened by this new relationship with Elizabeth (p.368). I have also referred to Dr. Heenan and the bond of friendship quickly forged between the two. There seems to have been a strong identification with him. Timothy writes in his journal after a meeting with Dr. Heenan in November 2003 about his love for him: He has wit, humour, and above all, compassion. He cares.” (p.369). He writes that his “sense” was “that Thomas McMahon’s moral vacuum had been defeated” because he had “failed to turn me to hatred” (ibid.). He continues, “... my heart sings because on August 27th 1979 Heenan defeated McMahon and I am the proof” (ibid.). I interpret that Timothy internalised Dr. Heenan as a good object, strong enough – together with the fact of Timothy’s own survival - to overcome the bad object, McMahon, representing murder and death.

Timothy writes about the “liberation” he experienced at the close of his year of visits (p.358). He “found a surge of new energy” (p.375). The sense of gratitude and self-belief are especially striking: “I am now as never before at liberty to be unconcerned with self, and therefore to be of use to others. What more could anyone want?” (p.xiii). I link Timothy’s self-renewal and rebuilding of his internal resources through rediscovery and reformulation of his good objects with Garland’s thesis that post-trauma “the entire object world has to be reformulated” and that “recognition” of the loss of “the whole of the pre-trauma world and existence” must lie “at the centre of the work” with traumatised patients (2002,p.214). This “daunting task” (ibid.) is the work of mourning, through which the mourner rebuilds “a memory to the past creative aspects of the relationship” with the lost object, which in turn allows “new relationships, with people and work” to be rebuilt; the mourner “allows new experiences to nourish him and he mates with them.” (Brenman,2006,p.30)).
4.2.4. Does Twin-ship mean Developmental Deficit?

My investigation into the nature of twin loss and its impact on the survivor has necessarily involved an examination of what is lost when the twin relationship is lost. The findings I have arrived at concerning the nature of Timothy’s relationship with his twin lead me to question Lewin’s thesis (2014) that twins experience a developmental deficit related to the strength of the twin bond (see 1.3.3 above).

Lewin proposes that twins’ use of each other as a primary object interferes with each twin’s relationship with the mother, because they can turn to each other for comfort in the mother’s absence (2014, pp.49, 66-67). Her thesis is that twins are able to use twin-ship as a retreat from development, to avoid the developmental tasks of learning how to manage the frustration and sadness involved in their mother’s absence. Consequently, they need never experience fully the loss of the mother, and so need never develop the capacity to mourn. (2014, pp.14, 55, 76). She proposes that twins’ use of each other as a primary object means that each twin internalises an immature twin container, leading to disturbed rather than restful states, and interfering with development (2014, pp.49, 176).

Although I acknowledge that my findings are based on only one case, I do not recognise the dynamics described by Lewin and summarised in the previous paragraph. My understanding of the relationship between Timothy and Nicholas is that they each were good for the other in that they were each good containing and protective objects with respect to each other. Indeed, my findings show that what makes twin loss traumatic is the loss of the good (containing and protective) external and internal primary object represented by the lost twin. Timothy’s loss of Nicholas was traumatic, not because the twins were inadequate containers for each other, but because they were effective containers for each other from quite a young age.\(^\text{222}\)

Further, my findings indicate that the boys’ strong attachment to each other was not exclusive of or hostile to other external objects inside or outside the family. Timothy writes about how, after the bomb, “Philip may not have been a twin but I had just as many laughs with him and enjoyed the heightened bond we now shared” (p.194). In particular, there was a strong mutual attachment between the twins and their mother, with them missing her and her missing them when they went away to school (pp.11-12). It is relevant, I suggest, that by the time of their birth, the twins’ mother was an experienced mother, with a loving husband (p.122) and many older children who not only helped her care for the twins (p.157), but who will have had their own love to give to these two “babies” of the family. This was a close and supportive family (p.287). Also, this was a particularly caring mother who from her hospital bed in intensive care, practically immobile and unable to speak, managed to communicate to the family her concern that “they were all sleeping with someone else – no one on their own” (p.137) (and see 3.4.2 above). In addition, this was a pragmatic mother. Mothering was shared with Nanny, keenly illustrated by Timothy’s memory of both twins watching “films such as Dumbo and Bambi from Nanny’s knee and my mother’s lap” (p.19). This was not a household with a revolving door of au pairs changing every year. Timothy writes that Nanny had “joined our family” shortly after the first child was born, and “lived with us and looked after all seven

\(^{222}\) Timothy remembers that, as young as seven, when Nicholas feared returning to school with a new strict teacher, “I wanted to go to sleep, but instead I lay awake and listened to his worries” (p.10).
children in turn”, retiring only when the twins went to boarding school (p.8). She was very available to the twins, sleeping with them in their bedroom for the first few years of their lives, and she was the one they would run to with skinned knees (p.9). There is also the twins’ attachment to Philip, their next oldest brother and “leader of our little triumvirate” (p.8) (2.1.10) and the close and enduring friendships they made at school (pp.15,150-151,153,179).

My findings lead me to conclude that, although twins may become the main containing objects for each other in their respective internal worlds, they are also able to internalise other containing objects, including containing maternal objects. My findings suggest that whether the twin bond will interfere with the maternal bond, and whether twins will offer to each other a mature or immature container, will depend on a range of factors – the kind of mother and mother-substitute available, the presence of older siblings and the personalities of the twins themselves. This is a question which lies outside the scope of my research project.  

It is interesting to think about Lewin’s thesis as illustrative of the traditional caution with which psychoanalysis regards strong horizontal attachments, in contrast with strong vertical attachments. Twin-ship is the most extreme case of a close sibling attachment. The emphasis in the literature is less upon the benefits of twin-ship but rather upon how it displaces the primacy of the mother-infant bond. An alternative perspective is that the experience of a loving and empathic twin-ship helps twins to develop a deep capacity for loving another wholeheartedly, together with related capacities of commitment, empathy and emotional expressiveness and sensitivity (cf. Magagna et al. 2009). Timothy writes about the importance of his capacity for empathic listening in his quest to win his wife (pp.233-234). He also writes about his capacity for deep love and devotedness in their relationship (ibid. and p.236). I note Timothy’s consideration for others’ feelings. In his wedding speech, he spoke of his thoughts about how his wife’s sister “must feel as she sees Isabella marry today” (p.236). He goes on to say that their sisterhood was more like a twinhood “and that’s a relationship I understand more than most” (ibid.). I interpret that Timothy’s experience of a loving relationship with Nicholas, far from involving any kind of psychic retreat away from relating with others, was significant in developing his capacity to respond sensitively to others’ emotional states.

223 A further related question which lies outside the scope of my research project is the impact on Timothy and his twin-ship with Nicholas of having experienced an upbringing within the tradition of the English aristocracy. This upbringing carried with it social status (on account of the family’s connections with the Royal Family; glamour (on account of Timothy’s father’s award-winning career as a film producer); material privileges (e.g., holidays in the family’s second home in the Bahamas); together with other privileges which contemporary psychoanalysis would regard as questionable (a live-in nanny and boarding from the age of 9). Coles (2015) writes about “the shadow of the second mother” and the damaging impact she may have on the bond between mother and child. Schaverien (2015) writes about boarding school syndrome and the impact on personality development of the loss of home and family at an early age. Both writers suggest that nannies and boarding school can each impact on the capacity to trust and form intimate relationships in adulthood. I lack sufficient research material in order to arrive at findings on these questions so far as they concern Timothy. However, as noted above, such evidence as exists supports an inference that the mothering Timothy received from both his mother and Nanny contributed to his emotional and creative development. Regarding boarding school, I suggest that the fact Timothy and Nicholas experienced the inevitable deprivations of boarding school together is likely to have lessened their distress at being away from home and strengthened further the bond between them (see 1.3.1 above, esp, Sheerin (1991) and Engel (1974)).
4.2.5. Guilt

Timothy does not use the word “guilt” to describe his feeling state. Instead, he generally speaks in terms of “regret”. He also speaks of forgiveness. He writes how in the years after the bomb he “felt the need to forgive” but he “found [him]self with more questions than answers” (p.xiii). One of those questions was “Whom should I forgive?” (ibid.). Other people suffer from guilt.224 When he first hears of Nicholas’ death, he writes of his shock and confusion upon experiencing relief at his own survival, but he does not go on to say he felt guilty about this. Similarly, when he writes about learning 24 years later that Nicholas’ injuries were not survivable, he says that “a nagging doubt” that Nicholas had been left to die in the water “evaporated” and he felt a “huge relief”. He does not say that he had previously felt guilty about leaving Nicholas to die in the water. Nor does he comment further, when he refers in his account of Thomas McMahon’s trial to the likelihood that Nicholas was in the cabin of the boat, and so took the full force of the bomb hidden underneath his feet, while he, Timothy, was seated on top of the cabin. Despite Timothy’s non-use of the word “guilt”, I conclude that my findings support the existing literature regarding the prevalence of unconscious survival guilt, especially where twins are involved in the same life-threatening event (1.4.5). My findings may be said to add to this literature in supporting a thesis that the surviving twin, who has not been able to see or care for his dying or dead twin, may carry an additional burden of guilt (or regret) for having abandoned his twin by failing in this final duty. I regard this additional burden of guilt as another aspect of survival guilt. A comparison may be made with the guilt and anguish suffered by the soldier whose special comrade has been killed and who is deprived of the opportunity to pay his respects or prepare the body for shipment home (Shay,1994,pp.63-67).

The existing literature regarding twin and sibling loss has a strong focus on unconscious guilt attributable to unconscious sibling rivalry and murderousness. Indeed Klein (1940) stated that “the death of a sibling, however shattering for other reasons, is to some extent a victory and gives rise to triumph and therefore all the more to guilt”. Might Timothy’s “nagging doubt” that Nicholas was left to die in the water reflect unconscious guilt for having triumphed in the ultimate competition - that for survival? There is certainly plenty of evidence that the boys were competitive with each other. (Shortly before the bomb exploded, Timothy remarks upon how he and Nicholas were each “hovering close to the helm” in case their grandfather chose to hand over the helm to one of them (p.67).) Timothy stresses that the twins used their competitiveness, so that they each performed at their optimum level and, together, surpassed everyone else. I referred at the outset to their mutual dread that, if disaster were to befall them, one would survive and the other would not. Timothy says that they also feared surpassing each other at school: it was a relief when they were jointly awarded the scholarship to Gordonstoun. I note, however, that in their summer exams before the disaster, Timothy’s marks were marginally better than Nicholas’. It is interesting to consider what kind of evidence in the book might support an interpretation of unconscious guilt derived from unconscious sibling rivalry and hatred. Such an interpretation might be

224 Timothy writes that John Maxwell, “with two children from his second marriage”, “started to feel a great guilt about the attention he was giving to his son, Robbie,” who “seemed to be supplanting Paul in his mind” (p.262). It was two years after the birth of his second child, a son, that Timothy began his year of visits to Ireland (p.241).
plausible if there were evidence of other relationships (whether with his other siblings, peers, colleagues, friends, or spouse) marked by envy or rivalry. On the contrary, the book records what seems to be Timothy’s gift for friendship and his capacity for benign relating generally. His “unique and lifelong friendship” with David is a good example of this (p.222). The close, open, empathic relationship these two surviving twins formed together is indicative of the capacity for relationship they each derived from twinning. I regard Timothy’s capacity for relationship and sense of gratitude as strongly indicative of the loving and openly affectionate relationship he enjoyed with Nicholas, as described in detail in his book. My findings indicate that the twins had a strong model for such a relationship in the loving and openly affectionate relationship of their parents.

Timothy’s father remarks in the hospital (my emphasis), “it nearly breaks our hearts to see only Timothy left” (p.142). This remark suggests that, in the immediate aftermath of the bomb, Timothy’s identical appearance to his dead brother was deeply upsetting to his parents. However, his mother also regarded his survival as “a miracle” (p.202). Timothy is likely to have been affected by his parents’ conflicting emotions, however much they tried to conceal them. Crehan (2004), writing about sibling loss, focuses on the parents and their unconscious guilt about having failed to protect their dead child. She suggests that parental guilt may be projected on to the surviving sibling, particularly where there is parental silence about the death, or where there is an unconscious communication from the parents that the surviving sibling is not grieving enough. There might be some hint of this in Timothy’s mother’s journals, where she expresses her bafflement that Timothy continued to sleep in the twins’ bedroom (pp.174,192). The position regarding parental or family silence about the death is not straightforward. My findings show that Timothy’s mother was happy to talk about Nicholas, whereas his father was less so, and his oldest brother was not (3.4.2). The early capture, trial and imprisonment of one of Nicholas’ murderers meant that the guilty had been formally identified and found guilty. It may be that this limited the extent of unconscious guilt available for projection into family members.

Crehan (2004) also argues that it is the loss of the parents, especially the mother, as container, which is critical. Timothy describes his parents at the time as “incapacitated” (p.374). They were not only reeling from the shocking murder of their son, but also had life-threatening injuries. My findings show that Timothy derived considerable comfort from physical proximity to his injured parents in hospital, but that comfort was not enough to prevent his loss of Nicholas from having a traumatic impact. It is difficult to imagine what could have prevented that outcome in these particular circumstances.

4.2.6. Anger

I single out for detailed exploration the near-absence of anger and aggression in Timothy’s response to his twin’s death, as recorded in his book. I expected to find considerable anger, given the terrible wrong that had been committed, so I discuss below this apparent gap in my findings and the uncertainties to which it gives rise.

Although a muted tone f disgust may just be discernible when Timothy writes about “the men who were later to replace the IRA’s Armalite rifles with Armani suits” (p.342 and see p.xiii), the book
records only three occasions when Timothy actually expresses anger (3.4.2 and 3.7.3 above). The first of these is what he describes as his “one and only episode of fury at the IRA” (p.206). This occurred 18 months after the bomb when he learned during his mid-morning break at school that the IRA had occupied the Castle as a protest. He writes, “I swore and kicked, venting my anger in private” (ibid.). Having “calmed myself down”, he made to return to class, “but midway down a flight of stairs I was hit by another blinding rage and found myself talking aloud and swearing” (ibid.). He sat in class “seething”, relaxing only when he learned the “siege” had ended “quickly and peacefully” (ibid.) 18 years later, while at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, Timothy attended a lecture given by Martin McGuinness (pp.341-342). Timothy writes that, “disgusted” by the conduct of the presiding academic at the lecture, which had the tone of an IRA fundraising event, he went to see the Dean (p.342). He writes, “I put a photograph of Nick on his desk”, and played a recording of the event, after which the Dean agreed there had been a “cock-up” (ibid.). There is a third flash of anger when, 24 years after the bomb and after viewing Nicholas’ hospital records, he writes,

I now learn that everyone was able to see him depart on live TV and yet I didn’t know he was going. I didn’t even know he was dead. I remember the days and nights in that ward and I resent not having been composes enough not to have seen my Nicky off. And that’s what I’m doing now. (p.293).

The above text extracts suggest that Timothy was angry with the IRA for having killed his brother and for having left him so incapacitated that he was deprived of a farewell. The unanswered question is: what happened to that anger? It seems that Timothy’s parents were also angry, but again there are only a couple of occasions in the book where this is mentioned, and the same question arises. So, Timothy’s father had insisted from his hospital bed that he would attend the funerals in England, later telling Timothy “there had been an element of ‘fuck you’ in this as if in defiance of the attack” (p.132). Equally, Timothy’s mother wrote in her diary after visiting her father’s grave, on their return to England: “Nice, but John and I felt “Bloody IRA” (p.182).

A clue may be found in Timothy’s father’s response to learning of the triumphalism displayed by the two IRA men who appeared in the Special Criminal Court in Dublin a few days after the bomb and were charged with murder. He told Timothy 24 years later that, as he “lay in that hospital bed and thought about it”, he “decided the only thing I could do was cut [them] out of my life” (p.127). I speculate that “them” has been substituted for a swear word and interpret that Timothy’s father’s decision was to detach (or cut off) from any anger he could feel towards the IRA, and that Timothy and the rest of his family followed that lead. Timothy writes in his Epilogue that, “emerging from bandages and drugs in September 1979”, his “parents’ example guided me” (p.374). I have already referred to Timothy’s sense of himself as emotionally “numb” after the bomb (3.3.4). I note the detached tone of his account of Thomas McMahon’s trial (pp.298-308), which contrasts markedly with the deeply emotional tone of

---

225 I note that, following discharge from Sligo hospital, Timothy goes to convalesce with friends where he first catches a salmon and later shoots two grouse (pp.172,177). The landing of the salmon reads powerfully as a fight to the death (p.172). A possible inference is that Timothy found an immediate outlet for his anger and aggression towards his brother’s killers in these field sports.
the remainder of the book. There is one pointed remark with respect to McMahon’s accomplice which gives some hint of emotion underneath (p.306). Otherwise, Timothy writes about McMahon’s conviction that, “in a detached, clinical way I felt satisfied” (p.189). I infer that Timothy, either following his father’s model, or unconsciously seeking to avoid the experience of anger or aggression and the unconscious guilt that might have engendered (1.4.5), split off his anger. This may provide an additional explanation for the depressed, deadened existence he found himself leading in adulthood.

Yet this is a book where other people are angry and give vent to their anger. There is the IRA man, quoted by Timothy, who regards the IRA as “history’s vengeful children”, expressing “the stifled rage of our ancestors” (p.328). But there is anger closer to home. Dr. Brian Best felt “a huge surge of anger” when he spotted the toddler playing in the blood-stained pool of water (p.96 and see p.280). Philip was “furious” with the detective who could not identify which twin had died (p.101). Amanda and Norton expressed their fury towards an intrusive world press in the days after the bomb (pp.104 and 115). Timothy also records the widespread outrage, disgust and anger expressed in the “thousands” of letters from strangers received by the family (e.g., p.163 and see also pp.186,191,286-287). When McMahon was being reviewed for parole, his cousin wrote to the Times that this was “utterly contemptible” and that McMahon “should never be allowed out of the prison gates until he is driven out in a hearse” (p.225). Timothy writes that, at the time, “as normal” he “chose not to say anything”, but that later he wrote an article for the newspaper because he wanted “to offer a different view” (ibid.) In fact, his article offered the opposite viewpoint, suggesting that “at some point” McMahon should be released “to live out the autumn years of his life with his family, his children and grandchildren” (ibid.).

Of particular interest in this connection is Timothy’s account of Paul Maxwell’s father’s hyper-aroused, desperate, tormented, “berserk” state on the day of the bomb (p.91 and cf. Shay,1994,pp.77-99). Sitting in his garden half a mile away and hearing the bang of the bomb, John Maxwell felt “it’s got to be the boat” and drove “like mad” to the headland (p.81). Friends were persuaded to take him out to sea (p.87). Once they reached the site of the explosion, John was “beside himself” and they had to “restrain” him “from jumping into the water” (p.88). His “shouts of anguish” could be heard as they turned back (ibid.). Returned to the harbour, John was “running round .. looking for Paul”, and when the boat with Paul’s body was landed, he “rushed to the end of the harbour” (p.91). A witness described John “roaring like an animal”, “walking up and down the quay, sort of screaming” (ibid.). John told Timothy 24 years later that he had “suddenly got in a tremendous rage” and “completely lost it” (ibid.). He had shouted that the attackers were “cowards” and “that they were killing one of their own” and “I’m a fucking Irishman, these bastards” (ibid.).

I wonder if Timothy might have envied John Maxwell his berserk state, with its beast-like and god-like lack of restraint (cf. Shay,1992,pp.77-99). Timothy writes about how he felt bonded with John Maxwell and there are several points of identification (pp.260,262-263). Such envy would also be consistent with Timothy’s regret about his inability to search for, see and be with his dead twin (see 3.7.2 and 3.7.3 above). Perhaps Timothy felt the “responsibility .. to be an example to the civilised community”, as urged upon him by the Sligo coroner in 1979 (p.5), and not to betray any trace of angry emotion or vengefulness in public. Such a stance might be regarded as a version of Agger’s ‘good child’ (1.4.5). A further possibility is that Timothy defended himself against the experience of anger, to avoid opening the floodgates. I have read Timothy’s account of John Maxwell’s response to the loss of his
son in the bomb many times and, despite my best efforts, it still causes me to weep. The full experience of anger might have led Timothy to the full experience of loss. It might also have led him to other objects for his anger. In the book, Timothy investigates the security measures at the Castle and the decisions made regarding security (or the lack of it), which left his family vulnerable. He writes also about the likelihood that local people may have been “willing to turn a blind eye” (p.331) in the days leading up to the bomb. Throughout, there is no mention of any anger towards the people who might have been expected to, but who failed to, protect Nicholas and himself. These people may have included his grandfather and his parents. This is an area left unexplored by the book. With respect to this aspect of my research study, I accept the limitations of my research data and leave open and unresolved the question of Timothy’s anger towards his brother’s murderers or towards any of the other people involved in the security of the family.

Equally, I leave unresolved the question of Timothy’s possible anger towards Nicholas for having abandoned him to life alone. A hint of such anger may be inferred in Timothy’s “Words with Nicholas”, where he remarks, “You would have loved being a grown-up. But I’m glad you didn’t have to go through some of the shit” (p.373). I also leave unresolved the question of Timothy’s possible anger towards his family for not telling him about Nicholas’ death until it was too late for him to see his brother’s body. I infer from the book that Timothy attributes this loss wholly to his brother’s murderers.

4.3. Clinical Implications

My study is a study of a single case. It is also a study of a particular kind of twin loss. Timothy and Nicholas were caught up in a violent, murderous attack, which left one twin dead and the other seriously injured. It is not only that Timothy had the trauma of his own experience of the bomb and its aftermath to contend with, as well as the trauma of loss of his twin. It is also that they were both involved in the same life-threatening incident in which one survived and the other did not. There are further significant features. Both boys were 14 at the time of the loss. Further, Timothy is the youngest of his large family, with several older, adult siblings available at the time to provide practical and emotional support. My findings in this one particular case of loss of a twin lead me to the following practice-oriented conclusions for therapists working with adults who have lost a twin in childhood. Therapists working with child survivors will note with interest Timothy’s sense that he was much helped by staying with family friends, where he ate well, slept well and had small adventures which gave him a sense of mastery over his environment (p.170).

4.3.1. Trauma Survivor

The clear implication for psychotherapists working with surviving twins is that the extensive emotional suffering involved in this kind of traumatic childhood loss needs to be fully understood. The defences against experiencing this suffering, which have served the survivor to date, need to be respected. The

---

226 The author is critical of the “comfortable .. veil of ignorance” which the family had allowed to descend over what had happened in Ireland (ref.).
intensity of the terror of being overwhelmed by their suffering which persists at a deep level needs to be appreciated.

The running thread through my themes is the enormity of the loss and its explosive and devastating impact on the survivor’s psyche. Garland emphasises that “at the centre of the work” with traumatised patients “must lie the recognition of that sense of loss, one so great that it seems to include the whole of the pre-trauma world and existence” (2002, p.214). Guilt and regret are features of the phenomenon of twin loss survival, but it is the heartbreak – the emotional suffering involved in the premature rupture of a deep and identifying attachment (together with the defences employed to protect the psyche from being overwhelmed by such suffering) - which is at the heart of the book. The person who has suffered this kind of trauma (or heartbreak) needs to be met with genuineness, warmth and highly-sensitised attunement.

In particular, the therapist needs to be attuned to the survivor’s terror and sense of the world as a dangerous place. The emphasis needs to be on helping the patient to have an experience of safety. To begin with, and maybe for a long time, the therapist needs to be there to hold, or simply be with, her patient, until he begins to feel safe again. Timothy recounts how, landed on the beach and awaiting the ambulance, the boatbuilder came and spoke to him and when he made to go Timothy said “Don’t go”, but he went (p.90). Equally, there may be an understandable fear of dependency. It seems to have been important to Timothy, in making the decision to enter therapy, that his GP told him that, when he had therapy, “he had known when it was time to finish” (p.228).

4.3.2. Twins’ Shared Identity

In order the better to appreciate the existential crisis suffered by the survivor, the therapist needs to have a clear understanding of psychoanalytic theory regarding twins’ shared identity and their use of each other as a primary object. However, my findings imply that the therapist needs to guard against theoretical assumptions connecting twin-ship with developmental deficit and hostility towards external relationships.

4.3.3. New Good Object

The surviving twin, whose most significant internal object is a dead and absent object (his dead twin with whom he is identified), needs a therapist who is fully present and alive (in the sense of warmth and the careful attunement and adjustment mentioned earlier), and who is interested in trying to understand how the survivor is feeling and help them rediscover and reconnect with their good internal objects, in part through their experience of the therapist herself and in part through the process of remembering (cf. Magagna’s attuned approach to her adolescent anorexic female patient who was traumatised by separation from her twin [Lewin et al., 2009]). I have referred earlier to Tony Heenan and his importance to Timothy’s emotional recovery. I note that Timothy draws attention in particular to Dr. Heenan’s kindness (p.295) and how important it was for him to feel that “he cares” (p.369). I conclude that the therapist needs to care about and be willing to hear about her patient’s emotional suffering.

Timothy says very little about his therapist, Berenice. He had stopped his sessions with a previous therapist after some months, feeling he had “made little progress” (p.231). With Berenice, “the difference was marked” (ibid.). He adds, “she practised in a style which suited me better”. Timothy’s
short description of his sessions implies something about quietness, slowness and a sense of safety and reliability. His therapist seems to have succeeded in helping Timothy to avoid too much emotional arousal by letting him dictate the pace and thereby to find a thinking space. Timothy writes that he “slowly learned to see connections and recognise processes, conscious and subconscious, that I had overlooked before” (ibid.). He writes, “I knew she understood” (p.228). Timothy singles out for mention his therapist’s suggestion that he have “some quiet time” before his sessions. Adopting her suggestion, he fell into a routine of turning off the car radio and his telephone on his way to his sessions and on his way home stopping off at a petrol station for a snack while “turning on my mobile phone and reconnecting myself to my routine” (p.231). Later, walking on Mullaghmore beach 24 years to the day of the bomb, Timothy writes about how he “screened out the noise and activity around me and tuned myself to an inner frequency” (p.255). Possibly Timothy was helped by his therapy to develop this capacity to reconnect to memory and emotion.

The personality of Timothy’s therapist does not emerge from the book; she exists for the reader simply as a therapeutic function. This in itself is telling, I suggest, since it suggests an unobtrusive, facilitative and supportive presence. I suggest that Timothy was able to take away with him his experience of connectedness and caring containment by his therapist over the course of their relationship and use that experience to connect with new external containing objects and rediscover his lost containing objects. Timothy’s book gives us a privileged window into how, just as trauma can have an enduring impact, so too can a good therapy experience (cf. Guntrip,1975,p.145).

It may be argued that a model for working psychoanalytically with survivors of childhood sibling loss of careful attunement, a supportive, non-impinging therapeutic presence, and a focus upon collaborative meaning-making, is no more than what most therapists offer their patients as a matter of course. However, this would be a mistaken assumption. Practitioners familiar with current psychoanalytic thinking on twin loss and its emphasis on survivor guilt might readily conclude (as I mistakenly did before undertaking my research study) that the focus of clinical work with survivors of childhood sibling loss ought to be interpretation of guilt and anger towards the lost object. My findings suggest that this kind of approach will leave the patient who has lost a deeply-loved twin feeling misunderstood and alienated, at the mercy of and overwhelmed by his bad objects, rather than connected with his therapist and moving towards connectedness with his lost good objects.

4.3.4. Guilt, Anger and Destructiveness

To the extent that the survivor may feel persecuted by his dead twin object (for having abandoned him, for surviving the disaster, for going on living), I suggest that it is unhelpful for his therapist to interpret the survivor’s unconscious guilt. The result might be that the survivor feels doubly persecuted, by his dead twin and by his therapist, and judged and found wanting by both. In that event, the effect could be to strengthen, rather than weaken, the influence of the dead object. If anything, my analysis suggests that the survivor may be helped by express recognition that he is not

227 A contrast may be drawn with the first of Timothy’s visits to Ireland in his year of visits, when the stimuli of sights and sounds frequently overpowered him and he needed to take a step back (pp.246 - 249).
228 “Analysts are advised to be open to post-analytic improvements .. We must know about post-analytic developments if we are to assess the actual results of the primary analysis.”
guilty of his twin’s death (p.357). My findings point to the surviving twin’s need for a genuinely caring and kind listener, who will help the surviving twin to remember and reconnect with his lost twin and the relationship they enjoyed before the death and all his other lost good objects. This is not to say that existing theory pointing to the influence of unconscious survival guilt and sibling rivalry should be discounted, but rather that it should be reflected upon by the therapist in the context of the particular sibling relationship her patient experienced.  

Equally, my findings suggest that it depends on the personality of the patient whether or not and the extent to which they experience rage or anger on the basis of having been abandoned by their dead twin. The therapist needs to treat carefully theory, which would suggest feelings of abandonment and resulting rage against the lost object are inevitable sequelae of twin or sibling loss. Timothy comes across in his book as gentle, capable of being firm and direct, but calm and tranquil of spirit. These personality attributes may be connected with the influence of Nanny. I note how he writes that, after rediscovering Nanny in the pathologist’s office when looking at his photos of Nicholas, “I didn’t break down, scream, hurl the pack of photographs at the wall and throw myself on the floor. I felt gentle and still ..” (p.356). He describes himself as “philosophical” (p.189). I have referred earlier to Timothy’s consideration for others’ feelings. Meeting the butler, Peter, again, looking “lined and pained”, he “just wanted to give him a hug and cry” (p.264). Seeing his father being stretchered into the ambulance after the bomb, Timothy remembers smiling broadly and greeting him, “thinking I must do everything I could to lift his spirits and not betray how awful he looked” (p.96). He writes about reassuring his sister (that she had not done the wrong thing by leaving him alone after telling him Nicholas had died) and some of the rescuers (who felt that they had not done a good job) (pp.125,294,283). He also writes about how in hospital he felt “very reassured” by his siblings (p.111) and after he had been taken to see his father (p.129). This was a family who comforted and consoled each other. Timothy quotes from a letter from a family friend who came to help at the hospital which refers to Timothy’s mother as “always thinking of others first” (p.138). The continuing practical and emotional care Timothy experienced from all his siblings in the wake of the bomb is very strong evidence of the kind of upbringing they received both from their parents and from Nanny. I do not discount the possibility that anger and aggression were feared and repressed (as suggested by the authors noted in 1.4.5), but my analysis suggests that the extent to which these are features of the loss will depend on the personality of the survivor, the nature of his upbringing, and the particular relationship enjoyed with the dead sibling.

229 I referred earlier to another recently published account of sibling loss which I discovered after I submitted my thesis (Beard, 2017). This memoir tells the story of the death by drowning of Beard’s younger brother (aged 9 and also called Nicky), when he and the author (aged 11) were jumping waves on the Cornish coast and a rip current pulled the younger child out to sea and to his death. The memoir is the result of Beard’s investigation in middle-age of Nicky’s death after a lifetime of “looking away”. This book is full of anger and guilt. Beard is angry with his father for not saving his brother, his mother and boarding school for denial of the loss, and at his brother for his competitiveness. He feels guilty that he didn’t like his younger brother (who was more talented than him) and for goading his brother into the sea and not trying to save him when he got into difficulties. It would be an interesting future research project to undertake a psychoanalytic case study of Beard’s account and compare and contrast the findings with the findings in this case study.
4.3.5. Availability of Support

Although theory would suggest that bereaved parents struggle to make space in their minds for their bereaved children, my findings show that Timothy’s parents (and siblings) despite everything they endured, were able to empathise with Timothy’s loss and distress and were concerned about him. This suggests that the therapist needs to keep an open mind about the availability of parental and family support for the twin who is bereaved in childhood.

4.3.6. Telling the Story

My findings indicate the importance for the survivor, from the perspective of integrating the trauma of the loss, of telling his story and placing the loss of his twin within the narrative arc of that story. As my findings indicate, trauma fractures narrative. Things are torn apart. There is a chaotic mess. The trauma may be fenced off in the psyche, but all psychic roads lead to it, even if there are ‘no entry’ signs everywhere. The forsaken Castle visited by Timothy in 2003, with everything left in place – even the bottles on the drinks trolley (p.248) – just as it was when the family departed 24 years earlier, is a powerful metaphor for the ‘frozen-in-time’ quality of the trauma in Timothy’s psyche. Timothy writes that he felt as if he was “aboard the Marie Celeste” (ibid.). Analysis of my themes points to the enormity and enduring nature of the traumatic impact of loss of a twin. My findings show that the experience of traumatic loss lives on indefinitely – for decades even - in a split-off part of the survivor’s psyche, until and in so far as the loss is capable of being mourned and the trauma integrated into the survivor’s life.

The book stands as a kind of memorial or tribute to Nicholas - the “send-off” Timothy missed when he was lying, injured, in hospital and unaware of his brother’s death. It not only tells the story of Nicholas’ life. It tells the story of how much he was loved, especially by Timothy. The book also has the advantage of being a concrete thing, which is separate from Timothy, and which brings Nicholas back to life in its pages. Timothy has conducted a thorough investigation of his brother’s death. There is a sense of justice having been done.230 Not every surviving twin will have Timothy’s creative gifts, reflective nature and journalistic background. Not every surviving twin will even want to write about their loss.231 My findings would indicate, nonetheless, that by encouraging and helping the surviving twin to “piece together” (p.xi) his story, as Timothy did, the therapist can also help the surviving twin to “piece together” a new post-trauma internal world.

4.4. Research Implications

4.4.1. Future Research

My research has taken the form of one case study where the twins were identical boys who enjoyed a close and loving bond. Future research could adopt a comparative case study approach and investigate

---

230 It is the biographer’s quest to rescue his subject from the past: ‘all is not lost, your time will come again, justice may yet be done’ (Smith,2003).
231 John Maxwell also had therapy and his essay and poem written afterwards about his loss have been published (p.262).
other kinds of twin loss and sibling loss. This kind of theoretical sampling is very valuable. So, future case studies could investigate the impact of twin loss where the twins are non-identical or where the twin relationship is marked by open rivalry and envy.\textsuperscript{232} A further area for research might be the impact of loss of a twin where the twins are the oldest, rather than the youngest in the family. The fact that Timothy was the youngest of his large family meant that he was able to turn for practical help and company to his older siblings. The book records the extensive support they provided. Future research could investigate the impact of twin loss when the survivor does not have supportive older siblings willing to help him. A further distinguishing factor in Timothy’s case is that his loss of his twin made front-page news across the world. His status as griever was fully acknowledged, not least in the “thousands” of letters the family received. Future research could test the impact on the surviving twin in the more usual case where the loss is acknowledged less widely.

Future case studies might also investigate the impact of sibling loss where (i) the siblings are not twins, but are a “pair” or “couple” in the sense that they rely on each other similarly to twins\textsuperscript{233}: and (ii) the siblings are not twins and are not a twin-like sibling pair. It is an interesting question how much of the emotional suffering experienced by Timothy was attributable to the fact he and Nicholas were brothers, as distinct from twin brothers. Timothy refers in his Epilogue \textit{inter alia} to his siblings and the “price” they paid “for what they endured in Ireland” (p.374). He writes that they have their own stories to tell (pp.374-375). In this connection, I am struck by the use of language and metaphors very similar to those used by Timothy in Joanna Moorehead’s short account of the death of her youngest sister, Clare (Stamford,2011,pp.37-46).\textsuperscript{234} Joanna even writes, “And all this was happening under a cloudless, perfect sky” (ibid.,p.38). Very similar themes to those I have identified in my findings emerge in Joanna’s account. She writes that, immediately before the death, the 3 older siblings were “playing out the final hours of our childhood”. Afterwards, “nothing [would] ever be the same again . our idyllic family life [came] to an end”. Joanna needed “some evidence that Clare was really dead” and there was no “hard evidence”. She needed to “bury [the] grief very, very deep inside”, but “it never goes away”. In adulthood, she needed “to make an actual journey” as well as “a psychological journey” to the place of the accident. After completing her mourning, she has the sense that Clare is “still alive – in a way – inside of me” (Stamford,2011,pp.38-45). These comparisons are fascinating and suggest plentiful questions for further research in this area.

### 4.4.2. Use of Published Text

I acknowledge that my use of a published text, rather than clinical material, gives rise to the gaps in knowledge, unanswered questions and areas of uncertainty noted in 4.2.6 above. Future research into surviving twin loss could use primary data, though increasingly ethical considerations make the use of clinical material problematic.

\textsuperscript{232} Cf. Beard (2017).

\textsuperscript{233} I agree with Edward that symbiotic-like relationships between siblings are not confined to siblings who are twins (2012,pp8-10). I also agree with Mitchell that, although the literature would seem to regard twins as an exceptional case, they can equally well be regarded as extreme instances of conditions of siblinghood, and so have much to tell us with regard to sibling dynamics generally (2003,pp209,225).

\textsuperscript{234} Joanna was 9 and Clare 3 when Clare was killed by a car.
My experience of using a published biography for my research leads me to recommend other researchers to consider this approach to investigating a phenomenon which they are unable to investigate using clinical material. The process has been deeply satisfying and rewarding. I have been fortunate in having available to me the particular book which I have used. I consider it a rich resource of high literary quality, which manages a masterly combination of a portrayal of an emotional and poetic journey with an investigative report. The book does what Timothy advises his children to do, if they suffer a bereavement while young – it “grapple(s) with the trauma in close-up and slow motion and from every angle .. until the box of unresolved grief unlocks” (p.358). It follows that the quality of my research project owes a considerable debt to the quality of Timothy’s book. My intention has always been to seek to do it justice.
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Appendix 2

PEOPLE AND PLACES

(in alphabetical order)

Bowden, Helen ‘Nanny’  Nanny to all 7 Knatchbull children
Best, Dr. Brian  surgeon at Royal Victoria Hospital, Belfast, rescuer
Brabourne, Dowager Lady ‘Dodo’  mother of John Knatchbull, grandmother of his 7 children
Classiebawn Castle  Lord Mountbatten’s holiday home at Mullaghmore, Co. Sligo
Garda, the (An Garda Siochana)  police force of the Republic of Ireland
Heenan, Dr. Anthony (Tony)  anaesthetist, Sligo General Hospital
Hicks, Ashley  cousin of Knatchbulls, year younger than Nicholas and Timothy
Hicks, David  husband of Pamela, father of Edwina, Ashley, and India
Hicks, Edwina  cousin of Knatchbulls, same age as Philip Knatchbull
Hicks, India  cousin of Knatchbulls, 2 yrs younger than Nicholas and Timothy
Hicks, Lady Pamela  younger daughter of Lord Mountbatten of Burma, sister of Patricia, mother of Edwina, Ashley and India
Irish Republican Army (IRA)  any of several movements in the 20th and 21st centuries aimed at securing by violence an independent republic for all Ireland
Knatchbull, Lady Amanda  older sister of Nicholas and Timothy, aged 7 at their birth
Knatchbull, Amber  eldest daughter of Timothy and Isabella Knatchbull
Knatchbull, Isabella  wife of Timothy Knatchbull
Knatchbull, Lady Joanna  older sister of Nicholas and Timothy, aged 9 at their birth
Knatchbull, John, 7th Lord Brabourne  father of Nicholas and Timothy, husband of Patricia Knatchbull
Knatchbull, The Hon. Michael-John (Joe)  older brother of Nicholas and Timothy, aged 14 at their birth
Knatchbull, Milo  second child of Timothy and Isabella Knatchbull
Knatchbull, The Hon. Nicholas  twin brother of Timothy
Knatchbull, The Hon. Norton  eldest sibling of Nicholas and Timothy, aged 17 at their birth
Knatchbull, Patricia, Lady Brabourne  mother of Nicholas and Timothy, wife of John Knatchbull, elder daughter of Lord Mountbatten of Burma
Knatchbull, The Hon. Philip  brother closest in age to Nicholas and Timothy, 3 at their birth
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knatchbull, The Hon. Timothy</td>
<td>twin brother of Nicholas, author of ‘From a Clear, Blue Sky’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loftus, David</td>
<td>surviving twin, Timothy’s best man (with Philip) at his wedding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGirl, Francis</td>
<td>charged with Thomas McMahon; acquitted of murders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGuinness, Martin</td>
<td>former IRA commander, chief Sinn Fein negotiator in peace process that led to Good Friday Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMahon, Thomas</td>
<td>former IRA bombmaker, convicted of murder of Nicholas, Paul Maxwell, Dowager Lady Brabourne and Lord Mountbatten of Burma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McWhirter, Norris</td>
<td>surviving twin of Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McWhirter, Ross</td>
<td>murdered by IRA in 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell, John</td>
<td>father of Paul Maxwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell, Paul</td>
<td>15-year-old schoolboy employed by Lord Mountbatten to look after his boat at Mullaghmore in August 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountbatten of Burma, Lady Edwina</td>
<td>wife of Lord Louis Mountbatten of Burma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountbatten of Burma, Lord Louis</td>
<td>grandfather of Nicholas and Timothy, father of Patricia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullaghmore</td>
<td>small seaside village with small harbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholson, Peter</td>
<td>butler at Classiebawn Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinn Fein</td>
<td>political party aimed at securing independent republic for all Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunney, Hugh</td>
<td>occupier and owner of Classiebawn Castle after 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood-Martin, Elizabeth</td>
<td>wife of Richard, rescuer of Timothy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood-Martin, Richard (Dick)</td>
<td>husband of Elizabeth, rescuer of Timothy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 3

### TIME-LINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td>Irish Rebellion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1642-1645</td>
<td>Confiscation of land on which Classiebawn Castle later built; grant of land to Sir John Temple, Master of the Rolls in Ireland as reward for role in putting down Irish Rebellion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860-1874</td>
<td>Classiebawn Castle and harbour at Mullaghmore built, commissioned by 3rd Viscount Palmerston, descendant of Sir John Temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907-1916</td>
<td>Classiebawn Castle inherited by Evelyn Ashley, father of Edwina (later Lady Mountbatten of Burma), and occupied by Ashley family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-1950</td>
<td>Classiebawn Castle empty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Britain’s withdrawal from 26 of Ireland’s 32 counties, the remaining 6 becoming Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Louis Mountbatten marries Edwina Ashley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Edwina, Lady Mountbatten of Burma, inherits Classiebawn Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>John Knatchbull’s father, 5th Lord Brabourne, dies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 September 1943</td>
<td>John Knatchbull’s elder brother, Norton, 6th Lord Brabourne, executed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1946</td>
<td>John Knatchbull, 7th Lord Brabourne, marries Patricia Mountbatten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950s</td>
<td>Lord and Lady Mountbattens renovate Classiebawn Castle for use as holiday home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Lady Mountbatten dies; Lord Mountbatten inherits Classiebawn Castle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 November 1964</td>
<td>Birth of Nicholas Knatchbull and, 20 minutes later, Timothy Knatchbull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>‘Troubles’ start in Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 August 1979, evening</td>
<td>Bomb hidden under deck and close to cabin of Lord Mountbatten’s boat moored in harbour of Mullaghmore, Co Sligo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.45 am, 27 August 1979</td>
<td>Thomas McMahon and Francis McGirl stopped at routine car checkpoint at Granard, 86 miles from Mullaghmore; detained at Granard police station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date and Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.45 am, 27 August 1979</td>
<td>Bomb in Lord Mountbatten’s boat explodes out at sea, killing outright Nicholas Knatchbull, Paul Maxwell and Lord Mountbatten of Burma; minutes later dead and survivors pulled into rescuers’ small boats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.50 am, 27 August 1979</td>
<td>Thomas McMahon and Francis McGirl arrested at Granard police station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.40 pm, 27 August 1979</td>
<td>Dowager Lady Brabourne and Patricia Knatchbull (Lady Brabourne) admitted to Sligo General Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.55 pm, 27 August 1979</td>
<td>John Knatchbull (Lord Brabourne) and Timothy Knatchbull admitted to Sligo General Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30 pm, 27 August 1979</td>
<td>Nicholas Knatchbull’s body recovered from the sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 pm, 27 August 1979</td>
<td>Timothy Knatchbull operated upon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/28 August 1979</td>
<td>Norton, Joe, Joanna, Amanda, and Philip Knatchbull arrive at hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early morning 28 August 1979</td>
<td>Dowager Lady Brabourne dies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 August 1979</td>
<td>Funeral of Paul Maxwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 August 1979, morning</td>
<td>Bodies of Nicholas Knatchbull, Lord Mountbatten of Burma and Dowager Lady Brabourne leave Sligo General Hospital for England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 August 1979, evening</td>
<td>Joanna tells Timothy Knatchbull of Nicholas’s death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 August 1979</td>
<td>Her sister, Pamela Hicks, tells Patricia Knatchbull of Nicholas’s death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 August 1979</td>
<td>Thomas McMahon and Francis McGirl charged with murder in Special Criminal Court, Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 September 1979</td>
<td>Timothy visits his father, John Knatchbull, in his hospital bed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 September 1979</td>
<td>Patricia, John and Timothy Knatchbull share same hospital ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4 September 1979</td>
<td>Stitches removed from Timothy’s elbow, thigh and stomach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 September 1979</td>
<td>State funeral of Lord Mountbatten of Burma (televised)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 September 1979</td>
<td>Private funeral of Nicholas Knatchbull and Dowager Lady Brabourne in Kent; simultaneous religious service in Sligo Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 September 1979</td>
<td>Timothy Knatchbull discharged from hospital into care of sisters; return to Classiebawn Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 September 1979</td>
<td>Timothy Knatchbull leaves Classiebawn Castle and returns to family’s London home with remaining siblings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 September 1979</td>
<td>Timothy Knatchbull returns to family home in Kent; visits Nanny (Helen Bowden) and Nicholas’s grave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-30 September 1979</td>
<td>Timothy stays with family friends in Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 October 1979</td>
<td>John and Patrica Knatchbull return to family home in Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 October 1979</td>
<td>wedding of Norton and Penny Knatchbull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 October 1979</td>
<td>Timothy returns to Gordonstoun School, Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 November 1979</td>
<td>Timothy’s 15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; birthday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 November 1979</td>
<td>Thomas McMahon found guilty of murder at Dublin Central Criminal Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 November 1979</td>
<td>Timothy Knatchbull meets Norris McWhirter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 December 1979</td>
<td>St. Paul’s Memorial Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas 1979</td>
<td>Timothy begins to experience sound of bomb in his head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 1980</td>
<td>Operation on Timothy’s damaged right eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 April 1981</td>
<td>Occupation of Classiebawn Castle by protesters in support of IRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 1981</td>
<td>Whitehall ceremony of unveiling of statue of Lord Mountbatten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1981</td>
<td>Timothy leaves Gordonstoun for sixth form at Atlantic College (Wales); enrolls in RNLI lifeboat training and joins local RNLI lifeboat team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Reads Economics (later Social and Political Science) at Christ’s College, Cambridge; enrolls at civilian flying school; later obtains pilot’s licence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Helen Bowden (Nanny) dies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>Graduates from Cambridge University; gap year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Timothy’s first short visit to Ireland and Mullaghmore since 1979; starts work in television production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1989</td>
<td>Timothy meets David Loftus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1991</td>
<td>Timothy’s second short visit to Mullaghmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Timothy, now working as BBC journalist, assigned to Crimewatch UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 August 1994</td>
<td>IRA ceasefire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 1995</td>
<td>Timothy’s first experience of psychotherapy; ends after few months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1995</td>
<td>Family visit to Aasleagh, John Knatchbull’s childhood home in Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 1995</td>
<td>Timothy begins weekly sessions with new psychotherapist, Berenice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1996</td>
<td>Timothy meets Isabella Norman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1997</td>
<td>Agreed ending of psychotherapy with Berenice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1997</td>
<td>Timothy and Isabella move to Boston; Timothy begins Masters degree at Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1997</td>
<td>Address by Martin McGuinness, Visiting Speaker at Kennedy School of Government, Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 April 1998</td>
<td>Good Friday Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1998</td>
<td>Marriage of Timothy and Isabella; move to Washington where Timothy joins Discovery Channel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 January 2000</td>
<td>Birth of Amber, first child of Timothy and Isabella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 March 2000</td>
<td>Timothy’s letter of gratitude to Elizabeth and Dick Wood-Martin, his rescuers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 February 2001</td>
<td>Birth of Milo, second child of Timothy and Isabella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2</td>
<td>Return to London of Timothy and his family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2002</td>
<td>IRA apology for deaths and injuries among civilians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid August 2003</td>
<td>First visit of Year of Visits to Sligo; Timothy visits Classiebawn Castle; attempted visit to Dick and Elizabeth Wood-Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-27 August 2003</td>
<td>Timothy visits Classiebawn Castle, Mullaghmore harbour and site of explosion, and meets Dick and Elizabeth Wood-Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early October 2003</td>
<td>Timothy meets Wood-Martins again and Paul Nicholson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 October 2003</td>
<td>Timothy’s “Words with Nick” at Classiebawn Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 November 2003</td>
<td>Timothy meets Tony Heenan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 November 2003</td>
<td>Timothy meets lifeboat men who recovered Nicholas’ body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 November 2003</td>
<td>Timothy meets John Maxwell, Paul Maxwell’s father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2003</td>
<td>Timothy meets Mary, Paul Maxwell’s mother, Brian Best and other rescuers; obtains lifejacket retrieved from scene of explosion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2004</td>
<td>Timothy and Amanda visit Mullaghmore, Classiebawn, and Sligo Hospital and Mortuary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2004</td>
<td>Timothy’s meeting with State Pathologist who undertook post mortem examination of Nicholas’s body in 1979; visits Paul Maxwell’s grave with John Maxwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2004</td>
<td>Timothy visits Mullaghmore and stays at Classiebawn Castle with wife and children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 August 2004</td>
<td>Timothy visits Mullaghmore on 25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; anniversary of Nicholas’s death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2005</td>
<td>IRA declaration of end to violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 September 2005</td>
<td>John Knatchbull, 7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Lord Brabourne, dies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Publication of ‘From a Clear Blue Sky’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4

Mid-Term Break

I sat all morning in the college sick bay
Counting bells knelling classes to a close.
At two o’clock our neighbours drove me home.

In the porch I met my father crying—
He had always taken funerals in his stride—
And Big Jim Evans saying it was a hard blow.

The baby cooed and laughed and rocked the pram
When I came in, and I was embarrassed
By old men standing up to shake my hand

And tell me they were ‘sorry for my trouble’.
Whispers informed strangers I was the eldest,
Away at school, as my mother held my hand

In hers and coughed out angry tearless sighs.
At ten o’clock the ambulance arrived
With the corpse, stanched and bandaged by the nurses.

Next morning I went up into the room. Snowdrops
And candles soothed the bedside; I saw him
For the first time in six weeks. Paler now,

Wearing a poppy bruise on his left temple,
He lay in the four-foot box as in his cot.
No gaudy scars, the bumper knocked him clear.

A four-foot box, a foot for every year.

Seamus Heaney
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