

**2010 Comentario de Hanne Campos a una correspondencia
de Juan Campos con Malcolm Pines entre 1992 y 1994**

Parece que el objetivo de la correspondencia es el proyecto de escribir conjuntamente un libro de Historia sobre “S. H. Foulkes y Grupo Análisis” a publicar por Routledge como parte de una serie sobre figuras importantes de la psicoterapia moderna – Bowlby, Bion, Foulkes en los primeros números, dirigido a lectores profesionales y generales. El esquema del libro se encuentra en el archivo No. VIII de esta correspondencia.

Se trata de una correspondencia post-Symposium de Heidelberg (1993). Para los lectores interesados en la obra y contribución de Juan Campos al Grupo Análisis, lo interesante son los dos largos comentarios –véase número IV de los presentes archivos- que Juan hace para Malcolm Pines sobre su “Visión general del desarrollo de la Sociedad Grupo-Analítica y la impronta de S. H. Foulkes al respecto”. Obviamente, antes de ponerse a escribir un libro con Malcolm, Juan quiso que éste supiera cuál es su visión particular de Foulkes y la impronta de éste en el desarrollo de la Sociedad... visión, que tiene la impresión que los colegas que vinieron al Symposium de Heidelberg no estaban muy dispuestos a discutir...

**2010 Commentary de Hanne Campos on the correspondence
Of Juan Campos con Malcolm Pines between 1992 and 1994**

It seems that the objective of the correspondence is the project of jointly writing a book of History on “S. H. Foulkes and Group Analysis” to be published by Routledge as part of a series on important figures in modern psychotherapy – Bowlby, Bion, Foulkes amongst the first volumes, intended for both professional and general readers. The scheme of the book can be found in archive VIII of this correspondence.

This is a correspondence post-Symposium of Heidelberg (1993). For the reader interested in the work and contribution of Juan Campos to Group Analysis, the interesting parts are Juan’s two long commentaries –see number VIII if the present archives- on his “General view of the development of the Group-Analytic Society and the imprint of S. H. Foulkes in this respect”. Obviously, before starting to write a book with Malcolm, Juan wanted him to know his particular view of Foulkes and the imprint the latter had on the development of the Society... a view, which he had the impression that his colleagues at the Heidelberg Symposium were not very much prepared to discuss...

**Dr. Malcolm Pines
The Group Analytic Practice,
88 Montagu Mansions
LONDON , W1H 1LF**

9th February, 1992

Dear Malcolm,

Thank you for the copy of the Dr. Scheidlinger letter to the Editor of the AJPA and the one on resistances to New Ideas of which I agree the former is a good example. I wonder if you would be interested in me writing a short commentary on it either for the Correspondence section or as a short article for Group Analysis. Or should I better try my chance with a letter to the Editor of the AJPA?? Please may you send me the address of that Journal.

I had a few words with Sheidlinger about Burrow in Montreal just before our presentation on the Lifwynn Foundation and I must confess I was not very impressed either about the weight and soundness of his arguments or by his intelligence. What impresses me to the utmost is how the AGPA could trust upon the hands of such a limited and opinionated person the Editorship of the Int. Journal of GP for so many years. I would not be surprised if that letter prompted out from our meeting. I don't know if you have received you Autumn 1992 issue of Lifwynn Correspondence, Vol. 2 N°2. It came out very nicely. It thoroughly covers the Symposium, and gives notice of the meeting on The GA Study Group's Network.

There is a question regards Freud's correspondence * which I wonder if you may help me clarify. I got from Yale University a complete copy of his Correspondence with Burrow and also from Foulkes to Hans Syz. As far as I know, this correspondence is not registered in Freud's Archives. In order to quote from those materials, may I freely do so or have to ask permission? And if so, from whom and to which address? Further, since I am finishing my book on Group Analysis I wonder if there are any * limitations for quoting Foulkes from GAIPAC or any of his published material? And what about from the unpublished manuscripts and notes on the Theory Book? If so, who is holding the Foulkes * rights. Elisabeth? The Society?

With best regards and best wishes for the year from Hanne and myself

Juan Campos Avillar

PS. I had postponed to mail you this letter because I was waiting for the answer to a letter to Rudnitzki regards the Symposium, of which I attach here copy. Knauss has answered me as chairman of the Symposium telling me you are the one who is organizing a Fishbowl on the topic in the Tuesday meeting and suggested me to get in touch with you if I am interested to contribute. So I do willingly. I wonder if the theme I suggested to Rudnitzki fits on your plans I take we are going to see each other at Palermo in April, but since Knauss says the deadline set for the program by the Local Organizing Committee and the Symposium Sub-Committee is at the beginning of March. I would appreciate if you can give me an answer the sooner the better.

Juan Campos Avillar M.D.
Pº San Gervasio 30, 6º
08022-Barcelona SPAIN
FAX 343 418 0331

Dr. Malcolm Pines
Editor of Group Analysis
The Group Analytic Practice
88 Montagu Mansions
LONDON, W1H 1LF

Barcelona, June 8th, 1993

Dear Malcolm,

Thank you very much for granting me permission in writing as Editor of Group Analysis for reproducing articles in a facsimile version of the old GAIPAC under the title of "**Group Analysis International: A GAIPAC View**", the first draft of which I showed you in Palermo.

This publication is intended as a contribution to GAIPAC's Jubilee and as documental support in my participation to your "**Heidelberg Fish bowl**". I do hope it will serve as well as a jumping board to stimulate further writings towards a "*A Critical Group History of Group Analysis International as recounted by its present and past members*". I think the moment is ripe for it. Heidelberg will be a turning point in that history. Most of us are forgetting the long way it took to reach this point and texts of the journey are not easily available to the younger generations and future members. It is conceived as an open ended and interactive text. Fabrizio and Leonardo have promised me to write a Roman version that way. I myself am coordinating a Spanish one. Maybe, after seeing its first draft, some of you in the British Isles will feel encouraged to write their own. Regardless, I would be very grateful for your foreword.

I am not yet ready to give you the exact details of the final copy since I am still interacting with the original GAIPAC documents myself. Anyhow, before going to Heidelberg and reproducing its final draft, I will send you a copy of the master so that you can supervise it. I am working on an enlarged edition of the "working document" I showed you in Palermo. Basically what this one contained were xero-copies of articles published in News and Views and in GAIPAC which relate to Foulkes' putative "*international association of group analysts*". It was spiral-bound under the cover of a reproduction of the April 1981 XIV/1 issue, the one of Robin's "U-turn". I would like to add to that collection copy of relevant write-ups from the Bulletin and the Jubilee issue of GROUP ANALYSIS. The definitive copy will contain some articles of mine on the topic not yet edited in English and some of the speeches delivered to the Society or somewhere else on the subject.

Thanking you very much for all your help, wishing you a good meeting on June 14th and my best to you all,
Cordially,

Juan Campos

PERSONAL PS:

I have not heard yet from Peter Bott nor Werner Knauss. I did get an answer from Brian Boswood who seems quite enthused about my "decision". It is funny that at one point in history when because of age I am turning life fellow or member of honor of all the professional societies I belong to, I had to subscribe anew to the Group Analytic Society (London). Usually, this condition implies losing the right to vote, matter about which I don't care much. But, I am glad to rejoin the Society in order to recover the right of vote we have paid for so dearly since Rome, in order to be able to use it in the Heidelberg General Assembly. After that, I think that just with my right to speak I will be more than satisfied. It is of wise men to change of mind, so they say.

Our "narcissistic meeting" went alright. It was well attended, a Workshop of forty-four, which we most likely will continue in a year's time, probably in Pamplona, the place where the whole thing started five years ago. Maybe you will be interested in an account of this experience for Group Analysis. It is already a five-year experiment on the boundaries between the written word and the spoken voice which started with the publication of the bilingual edition of Pat De Maré's "History of the Large Group" and an intensive workshop lead by him in Barcelona and Pamplona within the context of the SEPTG (Sociedad Española de Psicoterapia y Técnicas de Grupo, founded 1972) and under the auspices of our Cooperative Grup d'Anàlisi Barcelona. As a matter of fact, the experiment is inspired by that "Study of Communication in a Group by a Group" which our forerunners of 7 Linnell Close submitted to the Mental Health Congress of London in 1948. We have, however, enlarged this study to an inter-group level (five groups participated in this experiment). Last weekend, we showed the six-minute video "The Metamorphosis of Narcissus" to the participants of the annual Symposium of the SEPTG in Valencia which was about therapeutic communities. That leads us to explore another frontier, the one between the image and the spoken word. During this meeting I discovered that the French have already published the Ferenczi-Freud Correspondence. Thanks for the note on Jones.

By the way, I am happy to tell you that one of your Institute Members and your colleague in group editing, Hanne Campos, has been elected President by acclamation of the above mentioned Sociedad during its AGM in Valencia.
Vale!

Dr. Juan Campos Avillar

Paseo San Gervasio, 30, 6º

08 022 Barcelona, Spain

Phone (343) 417 5639,

Fax (343) 418 0331 or (343) 418 77 48

Malcolm Pines

The Group Analytic Practice

Fax, 07, 4471 935 1397

Barcelona, October 15, 1993

Dear Malcolm,

This is in answer to your FAX of this morning. Of course, I shall be very pleased to cooperate with you on the Routledge book on Foulkes and Group Analysis, among other reasons because it will give us a good excuse for seeing each other and of corresponding regularly and, besides, it complements the three writing projects I am actually involved in: my book on Group Analysis for the Collection of Cuadernos Metodológicos of the CIS (Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas), the GAIPAC-story and the materials for the course on Psychoanalysis and Sociology at the School of Sociology of the University of Barcelona. By the way, this last one, being prepared delivered by our group here is going to serve as basis for a Master and a Ph.D. course on Group Analysis at the University two or three years from now.

Regards the Routledge book, I would like to know more details about the conditions of the contract and, also, how available are the materials at the Wellcome Foundation and if there is any chance of counting with a research assistant or not. Also, I would be interested to know about the possibilities of a Spanish version.

By the way, I would appreciate it if you gave me permission to reproduce in the GAIPAC-story your conversations published in the "Practice of Group Analysis" and in GAS Bulletin No. 36. Thanks.

Kind regards from Hanne and myself to you and Iris,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Juan Campos Avillar". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a long vertical stroke at the end.

Dr. Juan Campos Avillar

Paseo San Gervasio, 30, 6º

08 022 Barcelona, Spain

Phone (343) 417 5639,

Fax (343) 418 77 48 (with preference, in case of no answer try)

(343) 418 0331(comercial firm, office hours and days only)

Malcolm Pines

The Group Analytic Practice

Fax, 07, 4471 935 1397

Barcelona, October 18, 1993

Dear Malcolm,

I had been over the weekend giving some further thinking an a possible collaboration on the Routledge book on Foulkes and Group Analysis. I am sure you had in mind a sound outline for the book when you spoke with Edwina Welham, and through our talks on the topic of so many years your are quite familiar with my views. In the "GAIPAC' Story" I gave you in Heidelberg there is an English translation of my prologue to Foulkes' Spanish version to which you contribute with a foreword- our first and only collaboration in writing so far. I do not remember however if the issue I gave you included any versions of the "one page" statements for the Fishbowl we were asked to send in by Peter Bott. Since, I think it may be of interest to you to see some of the questions that there I make myself I include you here copy of both of them.

Bye now, cordially



"Historical Overview"

Juan Campos, SPAIN

We have been asked by Peter Bott, one of the "conversation leaders" of the "Historical Overview" Fishbowl on that Symposium, that in order to avoid this experience turning into a reading session and as an attempt at making of it a "learning conversation", we the Primary Discussants may provide a one-page written presentation of what we would like to be stated; then they will collate it, photocopy and distribute these pages among the rest of the membership early in the Symposium. The amount of correspondence the preparation of this meeting has generated is already the size of an old GAIPAC issue and of as much good reading all those were. A mini-GAIPAC, as Peter says. Regardless, here goes my page.

What I was originally interested in exploring in Heidelberg were the epistemological, methodological and ideological boundaries and borders in the roots of Foulkes' thinking, I mean to say between psychoanalysis (Freud, Adler, Jung), Critical Theory (Horkheimer, Adorno and the people upstairs of the Institute of Social Forschung), Gestalt (Gelb), Field (Kurt Lewin), Organismic Psychology (Goldstein) and Burrow's Group Analysis. In other words, the "there and then" of our thinking today.

However, the mood of Group Analysis does not seem to be on that wave. The point of urgency in Group Analysis, rather is and always has been on the practical aspects more than the theoretical ones and, of late, in the organizational aspects of the profession, that is on training, ethics and professional efficiency and, at this moment, in the process of **licensure** of the group psychotherapists (accreditation of training centers and qualification of professionals and regulation of their practice). Has that anything to do with the personal character traits of Foulkes or with the fact that he studied in Heidelberg? In effect, there in the Bibliotheca Palatina we can see the famous 14th Century Pergaminus of **Articella or Ars parva de Galeno** which starts with the classic Isagoge des Johannicius with such lapidary words: "*Medicina dividitur in duas partes, id est in theoreticam et practicam*" and it seems, in our field, it still is. No wonder then, that when by 1967 the institutionalization of teaching and learning in London seemed inevitable and the founding of an Institute was imminent, **he had to create GAIPAC as an International Correspondence on Group Analysis and cognate fields**. But when he did so, he did it because of very practical reasons. "*In my observation*", he said, "*there is an enormous waste of energy in that a multiplication of work takes place on the problem by individuals or whole groups in the field, nationally or internationally. To link these efforts up by intercommunication will be a great step forward and will also lead to cross-fertilization.*"

Once upon a time I was a Maudsley boy. I worked there for Foulkes and I learned from him a lot of what it takes to be a therapist. Unfortunately, I could not be trained by him because in England neither in Europe, there was any formal training program in group psychotherapy not to say group-analytical and neither available of paying one's way in if you were a foreign student without financial means. So, on his advice and with the help of his influence, I went to America, trained and qualified both in individual psychoanalysis and in analytic group psychotherapy. Upon my return in 1963 I joined the Society, but I think I would not have turned to be a group analyst myself if it was not because I joined as well GAIPAC since its inception and then, in 1975, I was lucky enough to participate in the London Colloquium which the Group Analytic Society (London) held on occasion of the 29th International Congress of Psychoanalysis. These experiences gave me a start at mending the split between the two provinces of the science of the unconscious, psychoanalysis and group analysis on which I had been trained and I was qualified. Ever since, my main topic of research has laid precisely the one of the relationship between the knowledge we are trying to generate and the sort of social organizations we set up to do so. From this point of view, here are a few of the questions regards the development of Group Analysis that puzzle me:

First, in relation to Foulkes himself. Is it really true that his choice to study medicine instead of philosophy or psychology depended mostly on his family's recommendation to study something practical with which he could make a living? If that was so, I don't feel that he was very successful at it, since he went mostly on studying for close to twenty years. Could it be that his influence as a telegraphist under fire during the first

World War had something to do with the decision? What was his political position during the social upheaval of those post-war years?

Secondly, regards his training. Up to the end of his life, Foulkes attributed his adherence to Freudian psychoanalysis to his early readings of Freud while at Heidelberg. With such an early vocation, having been in 1923 in Berlin, then the world capital of Psychoanalysis, how to explain that he postponed starting training until 1928? How to explain that he chose the long way round of a full post-graduate training in neurology with Goldstein and in psychiatry? Were they just material circumstances that forced him to take this job? Finally, why did he follow Landauer's recommendation of going to study to Vienna if he could not be analyzed by Freud and why, once there, accepted Helen Deutsch's proposition, the Chairwoman of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Institute, to analyze him first and later also his wife?

We know that, once trained, he returned to Frankfurt and was appointed head of the Clinic of the Institute. That everybody knows, but what I was surprised to learn from Heinrich Meng's Report on the Institute that the Clinic lasted only two years from 1930 to 1932, when it had to be closed because of economic reasons; and that during those years most of the efforts of the only half-time appointed analyst, S. H. Fuchs, were dedicated to classical analysis, that is five times a week, of young promising intellectuals -I take it, coming mostly from the Institute für Sozialforschung upstairs, a task that in his London exile Foulkes pursued with people such as Borkenau and Elias. Also, what is more surprising is that the Frankfurt Institute and the Clinic were not at all addressed to training analysts, but mostly to the diffusion of psychoanalysis and the joint exploration with other areas and disciplines of knowledge relevant to mental hygiene purposes. Knowing that, I am not so puzzled as Ilse Seglow when reminiscing in 1981 her encounter with Foulkes in Paris in 1933 when she heard him saying "*Can you tell me what I shall do with myself?*". He had lost his country, he had lost his library, he had lost again his job and as far as a psychoanalyst, he was just a *foreign graduate* in a no-man's land. What really puzzles me is, why did he choose England of all places to settle when the promised land for German analysts was in America. What I am sure of is that his experience as a foreign analyst first, in his own country (remember the content of his letter to Freud complaining about Berlin) and later in England and Scotland must have influenced his outlook on the psychoanalytic profession. In this regard, I remember his insistence that he has been personally analyzed only once, what I did not understand at the time, but maybe it has a lot to do with his well-known attitudes toward the neurosis of transference and interminable analysis.

Ilse Seglow comments as well that Foulkes and Norbert Elias were particularly interested in the pre-war years in examining the tensions and power relations between the English society and groups, in the development of dynamic processes to replace a static concepts in society, in the network of social relationships and interdependence; in the fact that human beings are born into the world not as isolated individuals but as a nexus in a social network. Here is one of the boundaries or the borders between biology and sociology where the psychology of the unconscious lies. Maybe, that is why Foulkes remained close to Europe. Maybe, he just tried to avoid the success that America offered to analysts of such a category as Erich Fromm.

My interest for Foulkes is not just because of my unresolved transference neurosis with him. If there is any, I caught it through GAIPAC. And also, from reading everything

that he wrote and more than once. It is the revolutionary potential that are lying behind his half-formulated thoughts which interest me the most. Since I am also convinced that in a new science as is ours the imprinting left by the founder on the matrix of the group is of paramount importance, but also are the relationships established between the founder and his followers **and that of those groups with other groups**. So, here I would like to address myself to some of the CRITICAL EVENTS and evolutionary stages to which Peter Bott points on his "Reflections on barriers and boundaries" of September 12, 1992.

I am convinced if it were not because of the war that forced him to emigrate to Exeter, Foulkes in London would never have dared to start his experiments in groups knowing that the eye of big brother, Ernest Jones, was on him. Regards Northfield, I don't know. We know that he succeeded where Bion and Rickman failed. But, of course, when he did, others were the circumstances and others also threw in a helping hand. The bosses at the time there were Tom Main and R. Bridges. Besides, on top of that leading the whole thing was the General Brigadier J. T. Riess, the clinical director of the Tavistock until the war. What I think is of importance is the role played by the war on the private thirty year war between Tavistockians and Foulkesians that he mentioned. To that I can point to a few facts that maybe explain Foulkes' slip of Hitler for Rickman.

To start with, this war was not so much between the Tavistock and Foulkes, but between the "boys of the Maudsley" and the gentlemen of the Tavistock Clinic; and it lasted more than thirty years since it was already going full blast in the early twenties when Crichton Miller dared to offer the model of the new psychology for the training and organization of British Psychiatry opposing the one sustained by Edward Mapoher at the newly established Maudsley Hospital. Rickman, in effect, was against Foulkes being appointed as medical director of the Tavistock, but not because he was a Freudian but most likely because he was a foreigner, was not part of the inner circle of the Walhalla, and, besides, maybe, he was not at the right time for the right job. By 1946, when the "**Tavistock Operation Phoenix**" took place, I think that Major Foulkes still had not been demobilized.

Foulkes death is the other critical event Peter Bott mentions, being dealt with at a projective level. And, I agree. I don't think Foulkes had the character to be the sort of charismatic leader, the Hero, that the Group Analytic Society (London) needed at the moment of his death. But, I am certain that the people in London did their best to turn him into one. There has been no way of knowing what did actually happen, what was the subject at the time in the group session where he died. His last words, f.e., I have been told or read somewhere, were "*I am sorry, I cannot go on any longer*". Those words can be used emblematically, meaning that he could not go ahead with the things how they were going in London by then, it has to be remembered that the split between the Institute of Family Therapy and the Institute of Group Analysis took place precisely than; or plainly, knowing Foulkes, which is most likely, that he was excusing himself for not being able to finish the session. Nobody killed Foulkes. He just died. He, after all, was not the one to write Totem and Taboo.

The last critical event mentioned was the change membership structure of the London Society, regards which I indeed have a lot to say, since I was the person who put forward the motion at Bedford College of this brilliant solution, motion that was seconded by Colin James and what started and what I feel now finishes the so-called

European Group-Analytic Movement. What followed is such a fascinating development that it cannot be said but, mind, it cannot be said because of the social repression that all of us, myself included, have in facing this sort of truth that lies behind our social neurosis. I did many times try to tell the part of it I know, but what happens is that my mind gets puzzled, my words get twisted and even I myself get tired listening to myself. Maybe it is not a story to be told or to be told by a single person but should be worked through the way we do with patients in a group. I remember that when this first spring meeting in London was finished, I went to Selfridges and I was scared to death to find that the floor under my feet was moving. It was not a disorder of my cerebellum quite usual at my age then and without importance as told me an eminent neurologist, neither a psychosomatic condition. When I look back at it I know, it was just that the world was moving and I myself wanted the world to keep still. So, I do not know how long a way we have gone on this long march towards building up a society of group analysts, a Society -with a capital S- of group-beings and neither I know how far away we still are if we have to go to get into the permanent cultural revolution of which dreamt Mao Tse Tung. Maybe all that are chimeras, pipe dreams. But, if there is something that makes us really human that is that we are capable to dream and not only for vicarious wish fulfillment, but that we are able to create dreams that help the world go round. My dream, my pipe dream, my chimera is that the knowledge of ourselves can make of us better human beings, or if not at least makes life easier to live.

Maybe what is not good to be said is possible to be written, at least that is what I said in my fare-well letter to the Society Committee. But mind, I find it difficult to write about it as well. It is clear that the social repression makes no exception with any communicative means. As Foulkes said, the social unconscious in the matrix of a group is something that everybody knows is there, that has happened, but it cannot be said. So, as a last attempt, I thought of a scheme for defeating the social unconscious in us. The very same one I proposed in 1979, that is to apply to ourselves as a group the skills with which we are so professionally proficient with others. In that is in what I have been since 1979. I have been more than once on the point of giving up hope, but thanks to a stroke of luck, the debate in Group Analysis on Trigant Burrow's "Toward Social Sanity and Human Survival" led by steps towards the Lifwynn Foundation, the Society by him founded in 1927 and to know the editor, Alfreda Galt. To my surprise, I found that Group Analysis, the way I understand it, can work. And recently, a sort of "**Operation Phoenix GAIPAC**" is taking place through the Lifwynn Correspondence, edited by Alfreda and the **Study Groups of Group Analysis** of the International Association of Group Psychotherapy, which at the moment is chaired by me.

I see once again I failed in my attempt of keeping my experience to one page. There is much more to be thought and much more to be said. [So put together a few pages where are collected my thoughts about my experience and bits and pieces of correspondence private or public under the cover of a GAIPAC issue XIV/1 of April 1981 by me considered my Rubicon in Group Analysis. I feel it may serve as documental evidence and as a working document for a history to be written by group. Copies of it can be ordered from the bookstore at the Symposium.](#)

Just to finish. I remember Foulkes' address "On Group Analysis" to the British Psychoanalytic Society which he started by saying "*Group Psychotherapy has a long past and no history*". Now that I am addressing myself to the London Group-Analytic Society at the point where it may turn into a true association of group analysts, I would

say myself that Group Analysis as well has a long past and no history. Maybe we have been so busy making history as to write about it, but as my English-speaking Spanish speaker Jorge Santillana says: "The history we don't remember we are condemned to repeat". So let us begin by writing it!

Second attempt at a true "one page"

I have been asked to give in just one page an overview of the development of the Group Analytic Society (London) in the close to 35 years which I have been in contact with it. For those who do not know me (I have not been around in societal gatherings since the first Oxford Symposium) it could be of interest to know that some of those views may be colored by the following facts. I first worked as a Clinical Assistant for Foulkes at the Maudsley in 1958 and then, after joining the Society in 1964, when I was already a fully trained and qualified psychoanalyst and analytic group psychotherapist (PGCP, class 1963), I was finally invited by Foulkes in 1967 to join GAIPAC as an active correspondent. **This last and most creative endeavour of S.H. Foulkes was always understood by me as addressed to the constitution of "an international association of group analysts"**, an aim which I have done my best to achieve since 1979. In pursuing those aims, I have not only suggested to the Society to convene a series of pertinent meetings and put forward in Bedford College the motion to launch the later so called European Group Analytic Movement, but also I first served four years on the Society Committee and then other six as Vice-president in the Executive of the IAGP, Association to which the Society in turn is affiliated as "organizational member". At the present I have anew been elected to its "Board of Directors" and confirmed in my responsibility as Chairman of its "**Study Group in Group Analysis Committee**", a development that was initiated in 1987 when it was felt by some Mediterranean group analysts that further development in the above direction was not possible within the context of the London Society. From this perspective I will state the following points: 1) If I was to single out one factor as mainly responsible for the idiosyncrasies of Group Analysis, I would say it is related to the imprinting left in the matrix of the London group by S. Foulkes' attitudes towards the authoritarian personality. Foulkes' dictum "that the conductor in a therapy group should rather follow than lead the group" which makes wonders in therapy, if applied to management of group analytic organizations has paradoxical when not deleterious effects.

To illustrate what I mean, in Foulkes' life time, when in a meeting of the 7 Linnell Close group on March 20th, 1950, at a crisis over the need for more organization, the collective name of **Group-Analytic Research Center** was adopted, Foulkes' position was only reluctantly accepted after "...the group agreed to continue meeting ...but the procedure should be more systematic and contributions read and discussed." The original idea of setting up a "pilot group center" in 22 Wimpole Street, out of which The Group-Analytic Society and The Group-Analytic Practice emerged, was to set up a single place where everything would be together: practice, training and research". The "private group center" was established only after attempts at having a "public" one had failed. Foulkes was to give in to the "Young Turks" sponsoring the "palace revolution" to found "The Practice" and later the training revolution to found "The Institute", but never stood up for setting up "The Clinic" or "The Research Center" at which, surely, he was secretly aiming at ever since the Frankfurt Clinic of the Psychoanalytic Institute he headed had to be closed because of lack of funds in 1932.

So, by refusing to adopt a strong leadership he was forced into tamed "followership" by the former patients and students with whom he had founded the Society which he tried

in vain to turn into colleagues¹. The unavoidable **Dire Mastery/faithful discipleship trap** of which Foulkes himself was not capable of escaping mirrored itself later in the London Group Analytic Society as an organized group.

2) To my understanding, Foulkes being half-aware of this danger took as a provision to set up a peer level on equal basis association, first within the more comprehensive IAGP and later, when he felt that there this did not work, with launching GAIPAC. A genuine alternative to the leadership/fellowship dilemma can only be overcome at a fellowship on equal bases or partnership on equal terms level which basically I feel GAIPAC meets.

3) The tragedy of the The London Society lies in that as a "leading group" in the international arena, it finds itself in the very same difficult spot of its originator when trying to pave a way from being a student or trainee to becoming a colleague, that is to say someone with whom one is engaged in a life-long, continuous, mutual learning association. That is maybe the one corner of Confucius' which nobody showed Freud, but which Foulkes discovered by himself and the only good reason for him to found GAIPAC, a Corresponding Society, for which may be, we can find a precedence in the ones molded on the 1792 London Corresponding Societies founded during the French Revolution by the shoemaker Hardy Thomas with the objective of promoting parliamentary reform in Great Britain under Pitt's regime.

4) If it was hard for Foulkes to learn the lesson, even harder it seems to be for the flock of people who followed his teachings. So far, evidence of the old pattern repeating itself may be found in London in the confrontation of "qualified youngsters" of the Institute with the "unqualified grand parents" of the Society; the "pseudo-problem" of the overseas members covering up the rebellion of the "over-seas training institutes" as shown in EGATIN and, finally, in the repetition of it at the level of "Provinces" between the "diplomating" and "diplomates" of the London Institute of Group Analysis.

I had forecasted all those sad events and my warnings were of as little help as the weather forecaster's announcing a tornado. I am here to witness the results of a reform I sparked off many years ago and to forecast, if possible, the future consequences we are likely to expect from the measures taken during the oncoming AGM at this Symposium in Heidelberg. Regardless, paraphrasing Foulkes in his 1961 editorial of News and Views, I would like to state how much I appreciate the work done by all those who *"Thanks to a start of fifty years or so in the organization there in England and the willingness of some to give time and money and to take trouble, the Society is as it is". With our co-operation, that is of past, present and future cooperators, Group Analysis will live and grow, without this, it will die. Let us begin!-* On our way to Heidelberg

Tuan Guifan

MALC1810.doc

¹That my view seems supported by the wording of the booklets "Aims, organization and activities" issued before and after Foulkes' death. In the 1967 version it says: The Society "..., a scientific association, was founded by a group of pupils and associates with the purpose of exchanging ideas about group analysis and of extending the work of teaching and training carried out by Dr. Foulkes at the Maudsley Hospital". By 1984, the version had already changed to the following: "... is a scientific body which was founded by the late S.H.Foulkes and a group of colleagues for the purpose of exchanging ideas and experiences about group analysis".

Juan Campos Avillar, M.D.,

Paseo San Gervasio, 30, 6º
08 022 Barcelona, Spain

Phone (343) 417 5639
Fax (343) 418 0331 ,o 418 7748

Barcelona, May 3, 1994

Dr MalcolmPines Group Analytic Practice

Dear Malcolm,

Thanks for your Fax of last Friday. I am very glad to see you feel ready to reengage yourself in the project on Foulkes and Group Analysis. I am going to Santander of course and the dates you suggest suit me fine. Even though we have not yet discussed our Summer holiday plans with Hanne, if you were to come to Barcelona we may go up there together by car and do touring of the North Coast on the way. I agree with you on those couple of days together would be a good start. I wonder if there is any financial support for this project. If there is maybe a good thing if we hire a part time assistant to dig in the Foulkes Archives at the Wellcome, at least to know what is there and quote it as a source!

By the way, did you have a chance to look into "The History of Group Analysis told the GAIPAC" way which I brought to Heidelberg? I would love to include some feed-back from you on it. I brought copies of Rome for Ancona and Fabrizio and I hope they will write as well. I heard through Giusy and Di Maria of the meeting you held in Washington last February on the IAGP Group Analytic Section. I understand I expressed there your feelings regards the distinction between the aims and purpose of the IAGP Section (a world wide network of study groups interested in group analysis in its broad sense) and those of the GAS (London) affiliate society of which I a would love to hear from directly. I feel that there is some confusion and misapprehension in the latter regards the purposes of the first. It seems to me that a letter of mine, as Chairman of the Section, addressed to CONTEXTS or even as Correspondence to the AGM clarifying the issue would be to the point. What do you think about it.

Luisa Brunori must have told you in Paris about the meeting that with her, Leonardo Ancona, Giusy Cuomo and myself we held at the Gemelli Hospital last Friday. We decided to hold a Symposium in Buenos Aires on a theme which sounds something like "**On the eve of the third Millennium: A group analytic view of a peer society**". The Symposium will be based on the work not of individuals but of study groups or workshops set up back home by members of the Section or of affiliate societies and reported by writing in advance. I would appreciate if you were to help us on the wording of the theme. I feel the Section is at the point were its need to enlarge and formalize its coordinating committee and for securing itself some institutional support. Ancona agreed to take its Secretariat. We will see how it works. I am going to put regular FAX machine at the 343 4187748, meanwhile use the (343) 418 0331
Warmest regards to you and Iris



Gas_fax Cover Sheet

To:	Malcolm Pines
Company:	Group Analytic Practice
Fax:	07, 4471 935 1397
From:	Juan Campos Avillar, M.D.
Company:	Chairman Group Analysis Section, IAGP
Phone:	343, 417 5639
Fax:	343, 418 7748
Date:	6/7/94

Dear Malcolm,

It is amazing how at your age, that is at our age, may you remain so active. By certain the fact the Concorde shadows the roof of your home twice a day may have something to do with your secret. Let us know the day or your flight to Spain, so we may say hellow to you two from down here. We are sad that this time we will not see her. Send her our love.

I am very glad to see that, finally, your papers will be put together in book form. We all will be than full to her for pushing you into it. Also, I am looking forward to get my sight into your Schisms' paper. You know that has been one of my pet topics. If you are going to mention Burrow, do not forget to read his 1917 paper "Notes with reference to Freud, Jung and Adler". My own research is leading me to believe that "the big bang," as seen from America, may not be at all alien to the fact that he invented at that time Group Analysis. At least, it dates from his seminal experience with Clarence Shields and his 1917 New York Lectures to the Child Development Association America on the topic of institutionalizing are most likely a forerunner. You may quote me on that. I may send you copy of "Notes..." if it is for you not available.

Have you seen the proceedings from Heidelberg? Well, they give me an idea for a start to our "FOULKES AND GROUP ANALYSIS" How it sounds to you if we were to take the points brought up by Peter Bott, Göran Ahlin and myself at the Fishbowl as an outline and what has been silenced or went unsaid as its sounding board? Our correspondence to this respect may serve as an introductory chapter. Our collaboration in the foreword to the Spanish version of Method and Principles may serve as a model. Well here you have some food if not for thinking at least for 'Faxing'.

Con un abrazo bien fuerte

Dr. Juan Campos Avillar M.D.

**Paseo San Gervasio, 30, 6°
08022-Barcelona, Spain**

Phone. (343) 417 5639
Fax (343) 418 7748

Barcelona, July 15, 1994

Dr. Malcolm Pines
via FAX 07, 4471 935 1397

Dear Malcolm,

I've just woken up thinking in the outline for the history book. The Foulkes letter to Helen Durkin just published by EF in Contexts most likely was in the back of my mind. The issue of Kurt Lewin influence - (The Anthony affair?)- is paradigmatic of the ways of Foulkes dealing with the influence of other authors and colleagues on the development of his own thinking. A matter on which we have commented more than once. Recently, reading 1933 "Who shall survive" I got the impression that Moreno's influence on Foulkes was greater than what was by him acknowledged in his "Autobiography" or the Introductory Book.

Back to the HD letter on K.Lewin, that is the reason for this note. Do you know if Anthony still spends his Summers in England? If so do you ever see him? Do you have his phone or FAX numbers there or in America? If we may hold a conversation or correspond with him on the topic may be very illustrative. It may clarify the idea which woke me up, namely, that most of Foulkes' writings were born in discussion with colleagues or with books, that he forgets to acknowledge or to quote when published. HD was in the early sixties my "overall group supervisor" at the PGCMH. That is just after SHF' visit there and her interest in group dynamics was starting. We had long chats on the topic then. Unfortunately I did not ever discuss it with Foulkes himself when I was translating his book. I was more interested in his relation with Melanie K. than with HD or with Hans Syz. By the way, are you aware that the last two were at the Londoner meeting of August 1964? Unfortunately I was late for that meeting. I was engaged with some matters of the IV Congress and I arrived there just when it finished. (A report was published in GRAN 2/1 1969 pp15-22. Were you there?)

Let us continue with this "conversation" in our way to Santander.
Have a nice week-end

PS Did TB' Notes on Freud..." arrived OK?

Dr. Juan Campos Avillar M.D.

Paseo San Gervasio, 30, 6º
5639
08022-Barcelona, Spain
7748

Phone. (343) 417

Fax (343) 418

Dr. Malcolm Pines
Via FAX 07, 4471 935 1397
Barcelona, 16/7/94 7:52
Dear Malcolm

I've just wake up thinking in the outline for the history book. The Foulkes letter to Hellen Durkin just published by EF in Contexts most likely was in the back of my mind. The issue of Kurt Lewin influence (The Anthony affair?)-is paradigmatic of the ways of Foulkes dealing with the influence of other authors and colleagues on the development of own thinking. A matter on which we have commented more than once. Recently, reading 1933 "Who shall survive" I got the impression that Moreno's influence on Foulkes was greater than what was by him knowledged in his "Autobiography" or the Introductory Book.

Back to the FID letter on K.Lewin, that is the reason for this note. Do you know if Anthony still spends his Summers in England? If so do you ever see him? Do you have his phone or FAX numbers there or in America? If we may hold a conversation or correspond with him on the topic may be very illustrative. It may clarify the idea which woke me up, namely, that most of Foulkes' writings were born in discussion with colleagues or with books, that when forgets to knowledge or to quote when published. HD was in the early sixties my "overall group supervisor" at the PGCMH. That is just after 51ff' visit there and her interest in group dynamics was starting. We had long chats on the topic then. Unfortunately I did not ever discussed it with Foulkes himself when I was translating his book. I was more interested in his relation with Melanie K. than with FID or with Hans Syz. By the way, are you aware that the last two were at the Londoner meeting of August 1964? Unfortunately I was late for that meeting. I was engages with some matters of the IV Congress and I arrived there just when it finished. (A report was published in GRAN 2/1 1969 pp¹⁵⁻²². Where you there?)

Let us continue with this "conversation" in our way to Santander. Have a nice week end

PS Dit TB' Notes on Freud..." arrived OR?

For Malcolm with all my sympathy Juan
Let us get Foulkes out of our system. Write "The Book"

The History Book on

"S.H.FOULKES AND GROUP ANALYSIS"

80.000 words. Routledge series on important figures in modern psychotherapy - Bowlby, Bion, Foulkes amongst the first volumes. Intended for both professional and general readers.

Meeting in Barcelona, 30-31, August 1994

Aims:

- 1. To explain the outline and to remake it
How SHF fits into the development of a general current of thought aiming at a syntesis of pa and Soc. -specifically of historical materialism?**
- 2. To define Foulkes Key Ideas and our method of working on the book.**

Regards the first we finished with the following Outline
Regards the second we will look into the Welcome's Archives and we will correspond.

Dr. Juan Campos Avillar

Paseo San Gervasio, 30, 6º

08 022 Barcelona, Spain

Phone (343) 417 5639,

Fax (343) 418 0331 or (343) 418 77 48

Malcolm Pines

The Group Analytic Practice

Fax, 07, 4471 935 1397

Barcelona, September 25, 1994

Dear Malcolm,

I just got your message in the answer machine. I would love to speak with you this morning I will be available from 11 a.m to 1:30 and in the evening from 7:30 pm onwards. Looking forward to it.

Cordially