

The groupanalytic orientation in the training of psychotherapists:

the teachings of S. H. Foulkes¹

by

Juan Campos Avillar

S. H. Foulkes is one of the few psychoanalysts that are excused of saying «*mea culpa*» to which Balint invites them for their carelessness and negligence in the development of group psychotherapies.² His contribution at the theoretical level, Group Analysis, is only comparable to the contribution that he made in this field as an organizer of therapeutic services and educational programs and as a therapist of psychotherapists and group therapists. His educational activity moves in three directions: the training of psychoanalysts, the training of psychotherapists in the military and civil hospitals where he had clinical responsibility, and training of group psychotherapists —specifically group analysts. Balint suggests that it would be very interesting to make a historical — and psychopathological— study of why, in spite of Freud’s insinuations, psychoanalysis showed disinterest in the field of group psychotherapies. In the present article I will analytically and critically set forth the work of S. H. Foulkes as an educator and his ideas in relation to training.

In approaching this problem we need to refer to four main sources: 1) The way Foulkes was able to integrate in himself his psychiatric and psychoanalytical training. 2) His personal experience as trainer. 3) The educational activities, programs and institutions he inspired, designed and promoted. 4) The personal experience of those of us who at some point in our lives had the privilege of training at his side.

I shall now examine these four aspects, and reflecting on them I will try to make explicit the implicit model of teaching-learning that Foulkes used all his life. It is my conviction that this same model, with the analytic attitude he adopted and the groupanalytic orientation he developed, will be of utmost benefit in the development not only of group psychotherapists but of all kinds of therapists who want to promote mental health and help solve problems of human coexistence among all fellow citizens.

Foulkes the psychiatrist, psychoanalyst and disciple of Freud

At the end of the First World War, after having served two years in the German army and having fought in the front, at 21 years of age S. H. Foulkes begins his medical studies firmly decided to become a psychiatrist. During the first semester, his preoccupation with the incomprehensible problem of the obsessional neuroses leads him

¹ Juan Campos Avillar, in *La formación en psicoterapia de grupo y en psicodrama*, colective work coordinated by José Luís Martí Tusquets y Leonardo Satne, 1979: Barcelona, Argot, pp. 23-41.

² Michael Balint (1968) *The Basic Fault*. Londres: Tavistock Publications, p.102. “...Constituirá un fascinante estudio histórico -y psicológico- averiguar qué es lo que ha llevado al psicoanálisis a adoptar exactamente la actitud opuesta en lo que refiere al caso de las psicoterapias de grupo. Aun cuando el mismo Freud sugería que sería necesaria cierta aleación del oro puro el psicoanálisis para adecuarlo a la psicoterapia de amplias masas de población, y a pesar de que casi todos los pioneros en psicoterapia grupal fueron psicoanalistas no se responsabilizaron de su posterior desarrollo -en mi opinión en deterioro de todos los implicados y sobre todo de nuestra propia ciencia. Han sido otros quienes han venido recogiendo una rica cosecha en este importante campo y nosotros perdimos, quizás de manera irrecuperable, la oportunidad de obtener observaciones clínicas de primera mano en la psicodinamia de las colectividades.”

to read Freud. From that moment onwards he decides to be a different kind of psychiatrist and, eventually, become a psychoanalyst. In spite of the precocity of this vocation he doesn't neglect, however, his training as a classical psychiatrist, neurologist and doctor. According to the customs of that epoch, a long pilgrimage to the best universities and clinical services throughout Germany in search of the best teachers, takes him successively to Heidelberg, Munich, Berlin, Frankfurt and Vienna. His doctoral thesis is on the medical sociology of tuberculosis. When he finally arrives in Vienna for his psychoanalytical training in 1929, he neither abandons his psychiatric activities and he maintains positions in Wagner Jauregg's, Pötzl's and Herschmann's university clinics, where he spends many an hour, being one of the few analysts at that time that have psychosomatic experience and clinical responsibility with psychotics. Psychoanalytically a grandson of Freud's through his analysis with Helene Deutsch and his control analyses with Hitschmann and Nunberg, upon completing his psychoanalytical training he returns to Frankfurt. There he becomes the director of the Clinic of the Psychoanalytical Institute which is located in the same building than the Institute of Sociology of Frankfurt, the sociological school where personalities such as Kurt Lewin, Horkheimer, Marcuse, Mannheim, Adorno, Norbert Elías among others come from. The combined activities of both institutes lead to the crossfertilization at the conceptual level between psychoanalysis and sociology. The Jewish Diaspora caused by Nazism, forces Foulkes to immigrate to London in 1933 where he is very much welcomed by Ernest Jones. Convalidation of his medical studies and the professional adaptation in England delay his full incorporation as member and teacher of the British Psycho-Analytical Society until 1937.

S. H. Foulkes' teaching experience as a student, or at least the learning ideal that he forged himself through it and which will guide him as a teacher for the rest of his life, I believe is contained in the quotation of Confucius he chose for the heading of his first book: "I do not expound my teaching to any who are not eager to learn; I do not help out anyone who is not anxious to explain himself; if, after being shown one corner of a subject, a man cannot go on to discover the other three, I do not repeat the lesson."^{3 4}

his is the way Foulkes learned psychoanalysis from Freud; this is how he taught group analysis and how he taught us to teach it. In his search of the other three corners he discovered the circle; the groupanalytic situation on which rest the groupanalytic method and the theory, a radical change of orientation in accordance with current theoretical developments of individual and social human behaviour. According to him, group analysis is the best method of investigation method for investigating the conditions and nature of psychotherapeutic processes and of change in human behaviour.

The career of Foulkes as a teacher

As I have already pointed, the teaching activities of Foulkes concentrate themselves in three fields: psychoanalysis, psychotherapy in institutional settings and group analysis. Depending on the environmental circumstances in which he found himself and the historical moment of the development of his thought, he put more or less emphasis on one or the other of these fields; although he always worked simultaneously in all of

³ S. H. Foulkes (1948) *Introduction to Group-Analytic Psychotherapy: Studies in the social integration of individuals and groups*. Londres: Heinemann Med. Books, p.IV.

⁴ S. H. Foulkes (1975) "Qualification as a Psychoanalyst as an asset as well as a hindrance for the future Group Analyst". *Group Analysis* VIII/3, p. 180.

them until the end of his days. However, for the sake of clarity of this exposition, I will treat them separately.

a) Didactic Psychoanalyst. The career of Foulkes as didactic psychoanalyst was delayed for some years due to the emigration to England. It had begun as director of the Clinic of the Psychoanalytical Institute in Frankfurt, in London however, he is not admitted as didactic member of the British Psycho-Analytical Society until 1937. Apart from his responsibilities inside the Institute as didactic analyst and teacher, he helped Anna Freud in the theoretical training of students in what would later be the Hampstead Child Therapy Course and Clinic. The demands of the development of group analysis and of group psychotherapy occupied his time, and although he continued to publish in psychoanalytical journals, he did not continue teaching nor carry out didactic analysis in the Institute. However, among the Freudian analysts and the ones of the middle group analyzed by him, most shared with him their interest in group analysis, some of them becoming well known group analysts as is the case of E. James Anthony and Malcolm Pines. This proves that what was compatible for Foulkes is also compatible for others.

b) Teacher of psychotherapists. The career of Foulkes as group psychotherapist begins in Exeter in 1939. Once Freud died, and at the beginning of the Second World War, in a state of relative isolation of his psychoanalytical group of reference, in his private practice in a provincial town he put some patients he was analyzing individually together into a group. During two years the theoretical reflection on the group experiences he carried out crystallized in what would later be group analysis. At that time, the only cooperation he counted with was the one of the analytic psychotherapist Mrs. Eve Lewis, with whom he would jointly sign the first article on group analysis.

His incorporation as Major of the British Army takes him to the Northfield Military Hospital where he works from March 1943 until January 1946. This was a hospital dedicated to the rehabilitation of soldiers suffering from war neurosis. It is there where for the first time a systematic group approach to an urgent social need of that moment is carried out. What is known as the *Second Northfield Experience* would become the cradle of what later was to be the movement of therapeutic communities in England and the development of group psychotherapies. Bion, Rickmann, Bierer and Foulkes, are amongst the few that had previous group experience. Foulkes, however, is the only one who has an advanced theoretical formulation in those moments. Northfield would give him the opportunity to test his groupanalytic principles in an institutional setting. First, he applies them to the management of the Unit for which he is responsible. Creating this operative example is how he progressively is able to extend the application of groupanalytic principles to the rest of the hospital. The constitution of a therapeutic community where psychotherapeutic aspects are integrated with occupational aspects and rehabilitation, encounters as a principal barrier the one the psychiatrists have built up in their own minds as a result of their previous training. Foulkes became the soul of this revolutionary movement. In his own words: “nobody remained unaffected; and those in whom this reorientation took roots, have a different approach to the psychological problems of their patients for the rest of their days». During this period, it was Foulkes’ responsibility to teach and spread group psychotherapy in the hospital, and this way imbue sensitive colleagues with the principles of group analysis, at the same time leaving them full freedom to apply them in their own way. Foulkes comments: “I deliberately cut down formal teaching to a minimum, and refrained from spoon feeding. While this involved considerable restraint on my part and often produced a sense of frustration on the part of my “pupils” .I think that the result, on the whole,

justified my approach.”⁵ This is another of the characteristics of Foulkes as teacher. The British Army asks him to edit the “Memorandum on group psychotherapy, ADM 11 BM (for military use)” (Foulkes, 1945). On the other hand, the Northfield Experiment is profusely and faithfully reported in *Introduction to Group Analytic Psychotherapy* (Foulkes, 1948) and *Therapeutic Group Analysis* (Foulkes, 1964), of special interest for any psychiatrist who wants to undertake group psychotherapies in a psychiatric hospital without previously having had the benefit of a specific training.

Once the war is finished, S. H. Foulkes incorporates himself into the National Health Service as Clinical Assistant, being responsible for the Service of Ambulatory Psychotherapy of the St. Bartholomew's Hospital. There he meets a similar situation to the one at Northfield. A long waiting list of patients referred for psychotherapy has to be confronted with limited resources. For Foulkes, naturally, the group approach imposes itself. I have no data regarding whom his co-operators were during this period and in this Service, and which were the teaching activities during that time, if any. I do know, however, that these coincide with the discussion and study groups and study among group psychotherapists working in different hospitals of the London area that were carried out in his home at 7 Linnell Close and of whose development the Group-Analytic Society would be born in 1952.

Foulkes' teaching activities, focussed on the psychotherapeutic training of postgraduate psychiatrists, begins with his incorporation to the teaching hospitals of the Institute of Psychiatry of the University of London, The Bethlem Royal and Maudsley Hospitals. There Foulkes is Director of the Psychotherapy Unit of the Outpatient Department. The old situation repeats itself: having to respond to excessive demands with limited resources, here with the added complication of having to attend these patients with the help of psychiatrists in training, very little experienced in psychotherapy. The creativity of Foulkes in solving this problem is shown in the way he organizes the Unit with the triple function of treatment-teaching-investigation, which he describes thoroughly in *Therapeutic Group Analysis* (Foulkes, 1964) and *Group Analytic Psychotherapy: Method and Principles* (Foulkes, 1975). I will present my personal interpretation of what this Unit was like later when speaking of my experience as Clinical Assistant there. However, I would like to point out that there we were trained as individual therapists as well as group therapists, and that although the weight of the clinical task was on our shoulders, Foulkes took advantage of it in a way that this was done with maximum guarantee and efficiency, thanks to the supervision and training program he imposed on the Unit. In this respect it is important to remember another fundamental point in the educational philosophy of Foulkes, which in his own words is as follows: “My idea was that it is not much good teaching and preaching therapeutic tenets, however sound they may be unless the practice upon which they are taught sets a good example. It is not satisfactory to proclaim principles but continuously have to point out that they cannot be practised here and now because of practical difficulties.”⁶ Foulkes always organized teaching on the basis of a good practice and his genius was in how to take advantage of the global situation to make this possible. The dissociation between teaching and therapy for him never was conceivable. Naturally, many of us who began our training with him at the Maudsley, would later supplement it with a training as psychotherapists, group psychotherapists or group analysts in the Institute of Group Analysis or other centres of analytic training.

⁵ S. H. Foulkes, op. cit. en 2, p.20.

⁶ S. H. Foulkes (1964) *Therapeutic Group Analysis* Group Analysis New York: UIP, p.235.

c) Teacher of group psychotherapists and teacher of teachers. Ever since Northfield, S. H. Foulkes was joined by young psychiatrists who worked with him and who were going to be faithful followers and co-operators in the development of group analysis. Upon return to civil life and his incorporation to the National Health Service he begins to meet with a small nucleus of especially interested colleagues that practiced group psychotherapy in different hospitals. Once a week they met to exchange experiences. All benefit in a similar way from this contact and most of them at least improve their standards a good bit. Some turn progressively towards group analysis and finish up founding with Foulkes what today is the Group Analytic Society, while some others he helped us perfect our own theoretical formulations.

The ideas of Foulkes regarding the specific training of group analysts, evolves in the measure that he overcomes his psychoanalytical prejudices, and makes progress in the theoretical conceptualization of group analysis, weaning himself from the psychoanalytical pattern in which he himself had been trained. This evolution is well reflected in his successive writings, which are best quoted textually and in chronological order. Beyond the dates of publication, the dates of the quotes, whenever possible, make reference to the historical moment in which the declaration appears in the development of group analysis.

1942. "Naturally anyone who wants to conduct a group on analytic lines should himself be a well-trained psycho-analyst, as much in the interest of the group as in his own..."⁷

1948. "For the group analytic approach, the conductor should of course preferably be an experienced Psycho-Analyst, [but] the snag is that Psycho-Analysts are not, *per se*, good Group Analysts. Rather the contrary."⁸

At the same time he also says: "Whether it will be necessary and possible to follow the example of Psychoanalytic training and have every candidate pass through his own group analysis, is an open question."⁹

1957. The question of didactic analysis is decided: "Psycho-analysis has long recognized that a most important part of the training of the future psycho-analyst is his own personal therapeutic analysis. In the field of group-analysis one comes to the same conclusion."¹⁰

This group analysis is better for the candidates to make it together with other patients that come to it exclusively for therapeutic reasons than in homogeneous groups reserved to candidates. This can bring complications but they can be solved analytically. On different occasions, Foulkes insists in the fact that having been analyzed individually or being a trained psychoanalyst doesn't exempt the candidate from the necessity of making a personal group analysis, since psychoanalysis generates attitudes and leaves defences that go against a good practice as grupoanalista.

1975. The problem regarding the order of the sequence in the training of psychoanalysts who want to become group analysts is turned around to say that:

⁷ S. H. Foulkes (1944) "Group Analysis: A Study in the Treatment of Groups on Psychoanalytic Lines", en op. cit. en 5, p.25.

⁸ S. H. Foulkes (1948) *Introduction to group-analytic psychotherapy. Studies in the social integration of individuals and groups* Londres: Heinemann Medical Books, p. 148.

⁹ S. H. Foulkes, op. cit. en 2, p.149.

¹⁰ S. H. Foulkes, op. cit en 5, pp. 248-249.

“... the future psychoanalyst should have a fundamental training in group analysis, if possible prior to his psychoanalytical training”¹¹

In reference to didactic analyses, Foulkes asserts that the «analytic attitude» which is pursued, can be acquired by the candidate in his own group analysis, provided that it is sufficiently intensive and extensive, recommending in any event to complete it with a couple of years of analysis in the two person situation.

Between the first and the last of the dates mentioned elapse 33 years of active professional life of S. H. Foulkes more intensely dedicated to the development of group analysis. His ideas evolve in the measure that he meditates and in creative dialogue with other colleagues discussing the experiences in which he is involved in different therapeutic and didactic situations. Previously to 1942, his only didactic experience at an analytical level comes from his familiarity with the model of orthodox psychoanalytical training. By 1946, the group experiences of Northfield and of Bart's, and the weekly discussions with psychotherapist colleagues already belong to history. In 1957 the training program in psychotherapy of postgraduate psychiatrists at the Maudsley is already under way and the personal and collective experience with other peer colleagues related to the treatment, supervision and education of future group analysts is wide. In 1975, the work of S. H. Foulkes is practically finished: The *Institute of Group Analysis* has already been founded; the *Introductory Course in Group Work* is already an established program; and the three year *Qualifying Course* training group analysts following the ideal model designed by Foulkes have already passed the experimental phase. In the chapters seven and eight of «*Group Analytic Psychotherapy. Method and Principles*»,¹² —a work of inevitable reference for the ones who in the future wish to devote themselves to training in this field— there is a detailed and broad account of this program and its philosophy in the training of group psychotherapists. On July 8, 1976, S. H. Foulkes gave his last lesson as teacher of group psychotherapists. He died just as he lived —teaching and learning— in the course of a group session with a group of colleagues and friends he had conducted for years. With the life of Foulkes, his teachings do not end. He leaves us his example and the model to continue training group therapists.

From the integration of the three aspects of Foulkes' career the model of groupanalytic training was born. Deliberately I have chosen those quotations which refer to changes in his point of view regarding didactic analysis, since this constitutes the key element on which any program of analytic training is built. Psychoanalysis is the first form of therapy that conditions the training of the therapist to a previous experience as patient in the method he later wants to practice himself as therapist. A deep change of attitude is necessary to be able to proceed to learning. The attitudes to change are partly of a neurotic type and have deep roots. But as important as these, are the equally unconscious attitudes which the future therapist ideologically and by way of prejudice has been acquiring through his basic and postgraduate training as a doctor and psychiatrist. The model of training and educational experience to which one is subjected conditions the future orientation as therapist. The personal experience in individual analysis allows to de-medicalize and psychologize the future analyst's orientation, at the same time that through it he resolves, partly and not forever (Freud, 1937 “Terminable and Interminable Analysis”)¹³ his own neurotic problems and unconscious resistances that block or make the learning of psychoanalytic theory and its therapeutic praxis

¹¹ S. H. Foulkes (1975) *Group-Analytic Psychotherapy. Method and Principles* Londres: Gordon and Breach, p. 162.

¹² Op. cit. en 10, p.161.

¹³ Sigmund Freud (1919) “Lines of advance in psychoanalytic therapy”. SE 17/177169.

impossible. Trained in this model, Foulkes first admits it as valid for the training of group analysts. Later he starts to doubt when verifying the difficulties psychoanalysts find in the form of psychological resistances and defences against group analysis. As a solution he thinks of personal group analytic analysis substituting individual psychoanalysis —that which is good enough for a patient must also be so for an analyst. After accumulating enough experience, he finally decides for this and even recommends that group analysis precedes individual psychoanalysis in those therapists who want to receive a double training in psychoanalysis and groupanalysis.

Personal psychoanalysis —individual or in group— in spite of being indispensable, is not enough to be trained as a psychoanalyst or groupanalyst. It is necessary to have a complete conceptual framework and sufficient training, individual and/or group, based on clinical experience. In the model of individual psychoanalytical training, the work in seminars and the control analyses are in charge of these two aspects. Originally, what today is known as “didactic analysis” embraces the latter of these functions, but today, the only source of information with which the supervisor counts regarding what happens in the psychoanalytical session he supervises, is the verbal account of what happens, made by the analyst in training, a “certain kind of candidate to be psychoanalyst.” The only corrective for the secondary elaboration and the degree of distortion that this can bring about, is the analysis of the supervisory situation itself. Anyhow, the split that exists in psychoanalytical training between didactic aspects — reserved for control analysis— and therapeutic aspects —reserved for the personal analysis—is a split that makes integration of these aspects inside the candidate most difficult. In groupanalytic training, on the other hand, access to the therapeutic situation is direct in the didactic analysis as well as in the supervision of the therapeutic practice. The first one is carried out in group and in the second one direct access is assured by means of the participation of visitors or observers in the group —be they teachers or colleagues— and also, at the moment of being supervised in group once again one counts with participant observers. In psychoanalysis what repeats itself always at all levels is the «model of two» —analyst-analysand, didactic analyst-trainee, teacher-student. In group analysis, on the other hand, it is the «model of three or more» —the group model. Therapy and teaching are *of* the group and *by* the group of which the conductor forms part as a therapist, supervisor or teacher. Therapy and teaching are integrated inside a global situation. As Foulkes says in this respect:

“My experience points toward a procedure in which such teaching takes place in a number of situations graduated according to the degree in which the psychotherapeutic element, in frankly personal application enters into the admixture. To put it in another way, each situation, designed deliberately for its particular purpose, sets its own limitations and boundaries in this respect.”¹⁴

The future groupanalyst in a continuous sequence passes from being patient to candidate, later to therapist under supervision to end up possibly being a therapist without supervision. But, even then, the continuous training that he/she receives or the learning that develops through groupanalytic teaching that he/she imparts is always made with a double complementary focus: therapeutic and educational. In the end both processes have in common the objective of change of attitudes, neurotic attitudes that impede the personal development, learned social attitudes that don't leave space for new learning. As Foulkes says:

¹⁴ Op. cit. en 5, p.249.

“The main overall capacity which should be cultivated and preserved [in a therapist] is the capacity to learn, that is to change one’s attitudes according to one’s experiences and insights, to remain flexible over one’s convictions and to overcome the defences and resistances against learning in the more profound meaning of this term.”¹⁵

The same flexibility he aspires to for the future group analyst, he demands of himself in the programs and educational activities he designs and in the way he puts them into practice. I will point out the four fundamental elements on which the groupanalytic training model is based:

1. Personal analysis in a groupanalytic group over a minimum of three years which can be supplemented afterwards with an individual analytic experience.
2. Supervision in a small group based on the practice of conducting psychotherapeutic groups and the active participant observation.
3. Practical-theoretical seminars and reading seminars in small or large group, conducted didactically on groupanalytic lines.
4. Joint scientific sessions with all members and colleagues of the Institute, students as well as teachers and active members.

These are the four radically essential elements intervening in any training program with a groupanalytic orientation. This model is very flexible and can be applied to any educational or therapeutic situation.

Activities, programs and educational institutions inspired by S. H. Foulkes

The Institute of Group Analysis of London this last decade has become the most important centre of training for therapists in the United Kingdom. Every year more than a hundred therapists attend their *Introductory Course in Group Work*, most of them employed by the English National Health Service. This course in a way is the continuation of the postgraduate training program begun by S. H. Foulkes at the Maudsley. Many of the registrars and group analysts trained by Foulkes, today consultants in psychotherapy and chief of service in the NHS, university professors or professionals spread not only over the islands but also the European continent and the rest of the Commonwealth, modelled their teachings on the program of the Maudsley or created new institutes like the Institute of Group Analysis of Lisbon. Members of the IGA and of the Group Analytic Society, as visiting professors implement programs for the training of group psychotherapists everywhere. Denmark, Holland, and Germany benefit on a large scale from long-range programs based on successive periodical workshops. Introductory courses or symposia have also been given in Austria, Italy, Switzerland and even Spain. This whole task would not have been possible if it was not for the valiant and fertile work in education and training of Foulkes. Not only the educators trained with him, but they use a basic model of groupanalytic orientation that consists of the following elements:

1. Group of groupanalytic experience in small groups, the prototype of which is the groupanalytic therapy group. A group of 6 to 10 participants, ideally 7 or 8, of an hour

¹⁵ Op. cit. en 10, p.165.

and a half duration per session and a frequency that varies depending on the set up of the global educational situation of which it forms part: twice per week in courses of one year, like the Introductory Course; once daily as in the Workshops, symposiums and conferences of a few days of duration; and twice weekly for a three year minimum duration as in the Qualifying Course.

2. Work groups in small group that, according to the task, will be for diagnosis of patients, supervision of psychotherapies, or study and investigation in the continuous training of colleagues, etc.
3. Mainly instructive activities presented and discussed in a large group, a model used in limited seminars, etc.
4. Experiences in large group where everybody attending participates in an educational activity; trainers, administrators and registered subscribers of the program.
5. Staff groups or groups of those responsible for the planning, administration and execution of an educational program.

With these elements it is possible to build any educational activity. Their spirit and orientation are determined by general groupanalytic principles:

1. The total situation serves as point of reference for all operations and for the interpretation and understanding of the phenomena observed. The situation implies all the circumstances of objective reality and the rules, explicit and implicit, observed in the encounter.
2. All persons involved get together and meet regularly for a complete and frank discussion and exchange of points of view (large group). This is supplemented with free discussion in a small group according to the partial functions assigned (group of experience, work group) and ad hoc groups (for example staff groups) that arise spontaneously in particular circumstances. Maximum recognition and mutual communication is the objective, shared by all those implied, therefore making possible for the whole group to participate actively in the endeavour.
3. The leader or team of leaders is, without doubt, the most important variant in determining the dominant culture and the prevalent tradition of the group. He should use this ability and interest in benefit of the group of which he is the first servant. He should follow the group, guiding it toward its legitimate objectives, helping it confront destructive and self-destructing elements, if possible making them unnecessary. Of maximum importance in the leader's function is that he recognizes and maintains the dynamic boundary of the situation, and that he knows and respects what should and should not be done or said according to the circumstances from which he derives his command and which defines it.
4. The situation should not be explored according to what it *seems* to be, but according to what it is *really*.

Paraphrasing an old groupanalytic adage, extrapolated from the therapeutic to the educational situation, the teaching *of* the group and *for* the group, in which is included the educator, is how group teaching is done in group analysis. In this respect it is worth mentioning the learning ideal that Foulkes marked for himself:

“In other words, if a man has preserved this capacity (the one of learning) and has developed it during his training, and is able to develop it even further in his own work, then he belongs to the group of those that go on improving as they advance. If he has

lost this capacity, inevitably he will be caught up, will regress and go on deteriorating as a therapist and probably will encounter personal difficulties.”

My personal experience with S. H. Foulkes as a teacher

The responsibility of a teacher is to create a situation and to establish in it the type of relationships that make renewed learning possible for the student. The relationship teacher student is based operatively on the differential of knowledge, abilities and experience that exist between them, which the first possesses and the latter aspires to. One way in which it is possible for the teacher to stay in this position of power and prestige for life, consists in limiting himself to teach facts and abilities to the one who doesn't know, indoctrinating him without being aware neither one of them of the authoritarian model of “the one who knows and the one who does not”. These for me are the professors, the chair holders, those who, in the academia, occupy the chair of power. The teacher, on the other hand, is that one who centers his function in the learning process, where the common denominator is in learning how to learn, and learning how to teach to learn. To arrive at this, the first thing is unlearn all those things which in the mind and the person occupy that space where new learning should take place. The relationship between teacher and student in this circumstance becomes that of co-operators —collaborators and friends— embarked on the same endeavour and following the same path. S. H. Foulkes was the first teacher I found with these characteristics in the course of my professional development.

I met him as chief of service, as consultant at the Maudsley Hospital. The Psychotherapy Unit of the Outpatient Department was one of the few existing ones at that time in teaching hospitals with a dynamic orientation. The general orientation of the hospital didn't in fact favour the development of a «personal psychiatry» based on a psychoanalytical orientation. Social and academic psychiatry enjoyed more prestige. The psychoanalyst consultants at the Maudsley occupied a rather marginal position and in the famous Monday conferences, professor Lewis tried to show them up. S. H. Foulkes spoke little in the meetings; they let him be and he was greatly respected. He was not a competitive man but a cooperative one. His Unit had become a global situation of teaching-learning, of individual and group psychotherapies. There neither masterly conferences nor multitudinous demonstrations were given. The center of the educational activities was the supervisory seminar of group psychotherapies to which all registrars and clinical assistants with clinical responsibility in the Unit came. A minority of us was assigned to the Unit, the majority continued running groups there and participating in the seminars in spite of not working officially anymore with Foulkes. The atmosphere in that Unit was really stimulating. Given the organizational structure that Foulkes had created, we all knew almost all the patients in treatment and the course of their therapies. Among the colleagues, the mutual help we offered each other in the supervision group didn't finish in the three hours a week dedicated there, it continued in the groups where «we observed» and were observed and in the free discussions which throughout the week arouse spontaneously. Curiously, the typical «psychoanalytic fury» that accustoms to appear in services or educational institutions of analytic orientation, shone by its absence. Of the registrars I knew there, some supplemented their training as group analysts or psychoanalysts, but not all followed this track, although I am sure that none could escape the «groupanalytic» impact that this experience implied. Myself, I followed a double training; first as psychoanalyst and later in analytic group

psychotherapy at the *Postgraduate Center for Mental Health* in New York, when the first training program of specialized group psychotherapists began to be set up in the United States. Although a member of the *Group Analytic Society* I don't consider myself by right although in spirit a group analyst. Others are today qualified group analysts and also psychoanalysts trained in institutes different to the one where S. H. Foulkes was teacher.

S. H. Foulkes did not distinguish himself for speaking and writing a lot, his forte rather always was to know how to listen and make that people explained themselves. I remember the supervisions with him, he never was too explicit. In individual sessions there was no other way than to clarify oneself and in the group sessions the ideas sprang from the group and the level of understanding was enlarged in depth and in extension in keeping with the rate that we learned how to listen and to contribute in a way the group was ready to understand. In a dialogue of this type, the interior monologue is incessant and when it is externalized, comes to light, is shared in the communication with others, the sensation that one experiences is that the ideas of the other are mine and that mine are of all, for having discovered them together. This peculiar ability of Foulkes was contagious. When in January of 1977 in an international workshop of the Group Analytic Society, we met for the first time after his death; I remember the anxiety that all of us visitors experienced regarding the future of the work that he had begun. It was a great relief for all to see that the group continued functioning and that in spite of the bereavement we continued to be able to learn and to create, thanks to the spirit that he, in the «matrix» of the group, had contributed to develop. This is not the place for emotional reminiscences but for reflections about that which in my own mental «matrix» S. H. Foulkes has taught me.

The citation of Confucius used by Foulkes in his first book, mentioned at the beginning of this paper, speaks of the other three corners to discover when we have already been shown the first one. I will try here to look for them and of the group psychotherapy that he taught me, I will sum up the three that I believe to have found starting from him. I consider that they are of interest in the future training of individual, group and social psychotherapists.

By way of conclusion: concrete observations regarding the training of psychotherapists

1. In the first place, I consider that a system of training of specialized psychotherapists, that necessarily leads to obtaining a specific title with added professional privileges and, still more, implies a prestigious incorporation, runs the risk of becoming institutionalized and emptied in favour of interests other than the therapist's progressive training. This was the road followed by the International Psychoanalytical Association in whose midst the committees of training, with the purpose of assuring the training standards of psychoanalysts, ended up institutionalizing the «didactic» analysts and creating a power structure that impeded the natural development of the science. The groups split off from the International reduplicated the training system and with it the hierarchization and control of thought and of professional development of the associates. The A.G.P.A., the biggest association of group therapists that exists in the world, began in a free and democratic way. Today, for reasons of professional defence and before the imminent change from a system of private medicine to another one essentially socialized or controlled by the State, its concern for the training standards of its members will turn it into a society of accreditation highly suspect of falling into the same defects.

2. The traditional pattern used in most of the training centers of group psychotherapists is still inspired by those used by the psychoanalytical societies in the training of its members. The necessity that the candidate not only undertakes psychoanalysis or therapy for therapeutic ends but particularly as a future therapist is a common characteristic required in all training programs. Most of the institutes that I know require from the candidate to be admitted in a group training program, that they previously completed a training more or less extensive in psychotherapy or individual psychoanalysis which includes the analyst's personal analysis and clinical practice with a minimum number of hours of «approved» supervision. This was the case of the Postgraduate Center Mental for Health requiring a completed psychoanalytical training, and which is reflected in the spirit of the A.G.P.A. in their Guidelines for the training of group therapists 1968-1970.

For me, this generally accepted position, it is not based on a real demand for training but rather is consequence of a historical juncture in which the psychoanalytical training is still the more accepted one in the ambit of dynamic psychotherapies. An added factor is derived from the fact that most of the group psychotherapists who today direct training institutes and professional organizations of grouptherapists, followed themselves this road, being first individual psychotherapists and then dedicated themselves to group work without complementary training, and less still group analysis. The maximum they dare imagine for the future therapist is that he participate as member in a group. The A.G.P.A. in the «last edition» (1978) of their Guidelines, proposes a minimum requirement in the training of psychotherapists of 90 hours of experience as a patient in a psychotherapeutic group. The Institute of Group Analysis, on the other hand, proposes a training scheme for groupanalysts extensible even to the training of psychotherapists and psychoanalysts, in which the twice a week group analysis during a minimum of three years becomes the fundamental element, prevailing in any training of therapists.

If this proposal came to be accepted as a model of training for psychotherapists, I am sure that the psychoanalytic and group training centres would become something very different to what they are today. The didactic analysts would lose power at the rate the therapists in training acquired autonomy when their basic personal analysis developed in the context of a group and mainly when all supervision was based on direct observation and the device of the group.

The function of the therapist's personal analysis is not only to solve his personal problems and unconscious conflicts, but to acquire an «analytic attitude» that allows him to work as a therapist whatever the situation —group, didactic, triadic, family— in which he practices therapy. If we are convinced that the same therapeutic objectives that are pursued for a patient can be reached equally by means of an individual or a group analysis, than this same philosophy can and should be applied in the personal analyses of therapists. Not to do this implies a contradiction of ideological origin which should be analyzed and resolved inside the educational institution. In this case, the best method is the discussion in a large group, according to the general principles outlined in group analysis. If this is not done it is out of fear that the collective social unconscious in which the power structures are maintained could manifest itself.

3. The teaching of S. H. Foulkes was developed in a double context, that of the N.H.S. and in private practice. For the therapists in training in his Service he had found a master formula: training at work and education for healthcare centred on the supervision group already described. Individual private practice was appropriate for psychoanalysis and the controls of psychoanalysts in training, but for group analysis and supervision of

those who wanted to specialize in group analysis, Foulkes had to associate himself with other colleagues and set up the Group Analytic Practice and Society. When his Maudsley model became generalized as other hospitals adopted it, the demand of training grew and made it necessary to found the Institute of Group Analysis.

In 1918, Freud speculated with the idea that someday psychoanalysis should be socialized. To achieve a «psychoanalysis for the people», financed by the State, two conditions would have to be fulfilled: to find an alloy of the pure gold of analysis that was effective and would not spoil it; and to find a system to train a sufficient number of analysts well prepared to attend the mass of population. The alloy, I believe, has been discovered and the system for training analytic psychotherapists, I believe, also. Group analysis as therapy and the model Foulkes proposes for the double training of psychoanalysts and groupanalysts can be the solution. As he says: “I am convinced that this work (groupanalysis) is the best method to make effective the revolutionary discoveries of psychoanalysis on a wider front in psychotherapy and in teaching.”

Barcelona, April 28, 1979