

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF GROUP ANALYSIS IN SPAIN

### Epilogue to a Posthumous Prologue

by

Juan Campos and Hanne Campos

Celebrating in 2004 the publication of the first Castilian edition of the Complete Works of S. H. Foulkes, J. and H. Campos extended the historical commentaries Juan had written for the 1981 Castilian version of S. H. Foulkes' Method and Principles the author had entrusted him with.

Twenty-five years elapsed since I wrote the prologue that you just finished reading. In 1980, once cancelled the world congress of the IAGP to take place in Madrid, where the book was to be launched, the translation slept waiting for an editor who dared to publish it. The book, for which I had assumed personally and economically the translation and technical supervision, stewed during that period. In 1976, after Franco's death, when Spain started a transition towards democracy, military repression in Argentina sent into exile many psychoanalysts and group psychotherapists, who had participated in their country in the democratic movement in psychiatry and psychology. As I always sustained about dictatorships, that they are allergic to psychoanalytic and group ideas, once again proved to be true. What encouraged Foulkes to translate his last book was to make it accessible to South America.

«Group-analytic Psychotherapy: Method and Principles» was published in 1981. Although it is possible that the book was an editorial success—in no time two editions were sold out, the original one by Gedisa, Barcelona, and a re-edition by *Fondo de Cultura Económica*, México—we do not know to what extent it has been read; at least the reading has not translated into an incorporation of Latin American members to the Group Analytic Society (London). Its most recent directory does not register a single one of these. Contrary to what happens in Europe, where specifically groupanalytic societies and institutes proliferate, in Spanish speaking countries, Spain included, as far as I know, they still have not appeared.

"*On Group Analysis*", presentation made by S. H. Foulkes in April of 1946 to members of the British Psychoanalytical Society of his work with groups during World War II, begins as follows: "*It has been said with reason that group therapy has a very long past and a very short history*".<sup>i</sup> This is not the case of group analysis. At least I did my best to record its history, so much so as to have been called the Xenophon of Group Analysis. To briefly summarize the landmarks of this history is in itself an enormous job, the reason why I shall limit myself to refer the reader to related texts.<sup>ii</sup> More difficult still is to summarize the situation of groupanalysis in the Latin American countries to which—as in the case of Group-analytic Psychotherapy a quarter of century ago—is also dedicated the publication of these Complete Works.

The first contact that the Group Analytic Society (GAS) of London established with Spain passes through Barcelona. It was in September of 1958 with occasion of the IV International Congress of Psychotherapy, whose main theme was "*Psychotherapy and existential analysis*". Foulkes directed the Special Section in Group Psychotherapy and organized — with the help of members of the Maudsley Hospital and the GAS— a symposium in which he explained the course of training of psychotherapists offered in his Outpatient Unit of that hospital. I remember well the moment when I first saw Foulkes. He was crossing the entrance from the garden to the lobby of the University of Barcelona arm in arm with Slavson and Moreno, one to each side. All who in Spain were interested in group therapies coincided in his Section with the group from London, who came all together, and with the majority of Europeans already working in groupanalysis —Eduardo Cortesão, Leonardo Ancona, Fabrizio and Diego Napolitani, Stjepan Betlheim; also with group therapists of the South and North America. Helen Durkin spoke to us about "*The three main directions of group psychotherapy in America*"; Slavson, like always, pontificated about "*What is and what it is not group psychotherapy*". Foulkes, however, limited himself to humbly share "some observations on the teachings of psychotherapy" offered by him in his Psychotherapy Unit of the Out Patients Department of the Maudsley. We, the Catalans were so impressed that three of us subscribed to the Group Analytic Society (London) and I myself went to London to follow the training in his unit, with the help of a British Council scholarship. On his suggestion I continued my training a year later with Asya Kadis at the Postgraduate Center in New York, where this same year a group training program was initiated. In 1963, upon my return to Spain, if only out of loyalty, I also subscribed as a member of the Group Analytic Society (London) and this way expanded the lists of its overseas members who constituted more than half of the Society. At that time still no regular training leading to a diploma as qualified groupanalyst was offered in London. The foundation of the Institute of Group Analysis in London in 1971 —proceeded by the one founded by Fabrizio Napolitani in Rome and the one by Eduardo Cortesão in Lisbon— would finally bring it about. This implied a radical change in the structure, operation and philosophy of the groupanalytic organization, a turn towards a private school of groupanalysis.

When I returned to Spain in 1963 there were only two psychoanalytic organizations: the Luso-Spanish Society of Psychoanalysis, member of the IPA (International Psychoanalytic Association) and the Clinical Institute of Psychotherapy *Peña Retama* of Jerónimo Molina, founded in 1960 and which in 1966 would constitute itself as the Spanish Association of Analytical Psychotherapy. On the other hand, the role of a pioneer in group therapies should be mentioned, Emilio Mira, who practiced them already in the thirties and started therapeutic communities during the Civil war.<sup>iii</sup> In the Group Section of the Congress of Barcelona, although some candidates of orthodox psychoanalysis had participated, none of the disciples of Molina participated. Curiously, in 1963 none of the psychoanalysts were still interested in the group and, however, en *Peña Retama* they began to conduct therapeutic groups and training groups of therapists. It was not until 1972 that group therapists, psychodramatists and group dynamicists, trained independently, consolidated the **SEPTG** (Spanish Society of Group Psychotherapy and Techniques), which was in the make for already two years. In spite of having attended the pre-foundational meeting, I refused to form part of the founding committee, because they did not accept the training criteria promoted by the AGPA (American Group Psychotherapy Association), of which I was a foreign member.

Without doubt, my experience at the Maudsley and the Postgraduate Center for Mental Health has impregnated all my later activity as chief of Service of Family and Community Psychiatry, professor of the Professional School of Psychology, planner of the Faculty Medicine Faculty of the new Autonomous University of Barcelona and professor and Head of its Department of Psychology and Psychiatry. All my activity had and has a group approach and a groupanalytic direction. I never thought of organizing a groupanalytic association, be it for teaching or clinical work, although in all the group associations I have been member my contribution has been characterized by this same approach, which is part of my own *plexus*, my way of contemplating and conceiving the world.

The second time S. H. Foulkes was in Barcelona was in 1967, on a stopover of a Mediterranean cruise. This time he came only accompanied by his wife, Elizabeth, who unfortunately has passed away in August 2005. He brought me the number zero of **GAIPAC** (Group Analysis International Panel and Correspondence), an informal circular letter, a large workshop or study group which Foulkes published and edited until 1975 and the first numbers of which he financed personally —until the Group Analytic Society took charge. This time I really incorporated myself in the **GAS (London)**, although my teaching obligations and research in group training in this area prevented me from participating in the personal encounters that were arising from GAIPAC, the **European Symposiums in Group Analysis** — to start with the one of Lisbon in 1970— and the **Annual Winter Workshops**. When I left university teaching, realizing that for the moment there was no place nor future for any group-like orientation as I proposed it, I decided to promote these principles within the movement of democratic revolution at the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the organization of democratic psychiatry emerging during the late Franco Regime.

In 1975, Fernando Arroyave, a Colombian psychiatrist —who studied Medicine in Spain and emigrated to England, where he trained as psychiatrist and a groupanalyst of the first promotion of the Institute of Group Analysis, London— came to Spain to establish contact with the local committee of the Congress of the International of the AIPG (IAGP International Association of Group Psychotherapy) to be celebrated in Madrid under the presidency of Maria Prado of Molina of the *Instituto Peña Retama*. Arroyave invited me to become member of this committee. The SEPTG (*Sociedad Española de Psicoterapia y Técnicas de Grupo*) in turn invited Fernando in 1976 to their Symposium in Seville and to conduct a large group. By then the congress of Madrid had already been cancelled, eventually being celebrated in Filadelfia a year later. In the interim, Fernando Arroyave had discovered the possibilities opened to him by his recently acquired title of groupanalyst, to start in Spain a type of migrant training [later called block training].

In addition to the influence Argentine group therapists exerted from 1976 onwards, during the first half of the Seventies another crucial factor was the one of migrant teaching. With the arrival of doctor Guimón as Professor of Psychiatry without tenure of the Independent University of the Basque Country and as head of the Basurto Hospital, the Institute of Psychotherapy of Bilbao was created and, from 1974 onwards, three year training courses for group psychotherapists were offered. In order to start the project, Guimón went to the **Institute Peña Retama** of Madrid, from where at first Dr. González (1974-1975) and later Dr. Yllà (1975-1976) travelled weekly to Bilbao to carry out the training and the individual and group analysis of the first generation of Basque group therapists. In Peña Retama, most of the analysts who there had been analyzed and supervised by doctor Molina, were as well partners of the institution and completed their training travelling abroad during one or more

years to analyze themselves with other therapists in order to resolve their transference. In the case of the Institute of Psychotherapy of Bilbao, where a similar situation occurred in which all were analyzed and supervised by the same person, doctor Guimón invented a method that consisted in offering the members of the Institute short experiences with different methods and professionals. The first of these professionals invited to Bilbao was Dr- Pacho O'Donnell, who in 1976-1977 dictated a course of psychodrama, at the same time that began the visits of other psychoanalytic authors. The students had to take examination in Madrid in order to obtain the diploma conferred by Peña Retama.

The immaturity of group therapies in Spain —added to the fact that many group analysts of kleiniana persuasion on their trip into exile converted to lacanismo— plus the cancellation of the group congress in Madrid, caused that the great opportunity the latter presented for the development of group therapies in Spain was lost. For that reason no editor was ready to publish the last book of Foulkes that we had prepared for the occasion. The only Argentineans who maintained their interest in the group and their revolutionary attitudes were disciples of Pichon-Rivière and cofounders of his **Private School of Social Psychology of Buenos Aires**; among others Armando Bauleo and Hernán Kesselman, who —with a small group presided by Nicholas Caparrós — who had travelled to Argentina—founded in 1976 the first journal of psychotherapy and applied social psychology under the name of “Clinic and Group Analysis”. This small group, in which the Argentineans acted as teaching analysts, constituted itself as **Grupo Quipú de Psicoterapia** and in 1977 registered as an affiliate association of the IAGP during the Filadelfia congress, as did the **Institute of Psychotherapy Peña Retama**. This same year, be it on the occasion of the annual conference of the AGPA (American Group Psychotherapy Association) or the Filadelfia Congress of the IAGP, Guimón travelled to New York and contacted with the Postgraduate Center, where I had been trained. There he knew that I lived in Barcelona. Upon his return he invited me to share my experience in family therapy in a course which that year included a workshop with Olga Silverstein of the Ackerman Institute of Family Therapy of New York. This way I established contact with the **Bilbao Institute of Psychotherapy**, responsible for the position paper on the training of group therapists during the annual symposium of the SEPTG to be held in Valladolid in 1978 and in which they invited me to participate as a speaker. As already mentioned, back in the early Seventies, I had decided not to take part in the founding committee of the SEPTG because I thought that from the fact that most of the founders were self-taught it was not possible to deduce that some standard of training was to be expected of new members. In Valladolid I noticed that the attitude on the matter had changed radically and, consequently, I then registered as member. There was the first time that I made contact with the Argentineans who were "selling training in group". Hernán and Susana Kesselman I did not have occasion to know them until Pacho O'Donnell started the project he had in mind —to publish a symposium on paper between group authors— and invited Hernán and me to participate. The interchange of articles between the authors leads to a face to face dialogue which was celebrated in Madrid and which closes *Dynamic Group Psychology*.<sup>iv</sup> This editorial experience was very important for me because, besides allowing me to personally know the other authors. I established a special bond with Hernán Kesselman, with whom we had begun to resonate mutually before the encounter. I think that this has fed my obsession to use Internet to foment the dialogue in writing, a way of group interaction that still encounters innumerable resistances.

The development of groupanalysis in Spain experienced an atypical development more characteristic of the one followed in the beginnings of the Group Analytic Society (London), something like a learning-teaching association, until in 1971 the differentiation of teaching led to the foundation of the Institute of Group Analysis for Qualified Members. The international expansion was carried out by foreign professionals —generally psychiatrists—who, attracted by the teachings of Foulkes at the Maudsley and the Group Analytic Society, worked with him or trained in one of the courses and thus happened to enlarge the list of overseas members, who represent a fifty percent of the Society. Upon return home —bar exceptions like Cortesão in Lisbon and Fabrizio Napolitani in Rome, who founded groupanalytic institutes— the majority followed my way, using in their practice the groupanalytic orientation acquired and applying this methodology in places where this was possible, without concerning themselves with the training of groupanalysts. The problem arose the moment the Institute of Group Analysis was founded and qualified groupanalysts started to graduate—English as well as of other countries—, and people began to travel to London each week or went to live there in order to qualify. Naturally, the Institute has a limited capacity for absorbing teachers and the newly qualified returned home and founded their own institute of groupanalysis or travelled periodically to the continent or the provinces to secure students. In Barcelona we followed the primitive model of the GAS more than the one of the Institute. The consequence has been that in Spain no society or institute of groupanalysis exists, there are not even journals. The only one carrying this name is the **Forum of Group Analysis in Castilian of RedIRIS**, which functions for the last eight years and the Web [www.grupoanalisi.org](http://www.grupoanalisi.org), an informal and open group.

There are four factors that mark a definitive turn in my groupanalytic practice after the Symposium of Valladolid in 1978: 1) My acceptance to collaborate with the supervision of group work and family therapy in the Institute of Psychotherapy of Bilbao and in the *Hospital of Basurto*, without the intention of offering yet another theory and different analytical methodology, but in the hope the supervision groups help integrate the different orientation which till then had been exposed; 2) my incorporation in the SEPTG in the spirit of contributing from my groupanalytic viewpoint to the aims of this society; 3) my collaboration in *Group Dynamic Psychology*, a work already mentioned, which gave me the opportunity to know different orientations present in the SEPTG and to collaborate in a creative way with the Argentinean group workers headed by Hernán Kesselman and those of *Grupo Quipú de Psicoterapia* and their journal *Clínica y Análisis Grupal*; and 4) the fact that my wife Hanne was training in London, reinforced my bonds with the Group Analytic Society (London) and harnessed my participation in its face to face meetings.

The activities in each one of these contexts somehow were integrated in my daily practice. Although to expose them, like the man of many hats, I will have to do it one in one, being inevitable that they interweave. When referring previously to the influence that the analytical training experiences in London and New York have had in the development of my professional plexus, there is something I have not mentioned and when looking back I realize that it is the voluntarism that characterizes them; it is possible that this is based on the fact that both these experiences were financed by a *scholarship* or *fellowship*. Nevertheless, the most influential factors in each one of my experiences was, in the Maudsley, "*the unit like a whole*" and, in the Postgraduate, "*the group of equals*" that formed the class; aside from the deformation imposed by my previous work with groups of students in college residences for more than ten years. But let us return to the factors I have mentioned.

1) **The supervision in the Institute of Psychotherapy of Bilbao** had been decided in assembly with all the supervisees previously to my trip to Valladolid, where in addition some to the older professors and students —all of them members of the SEPTG— were going to present their educational experience. I accepted on the condition that it only last one year lasted and it developed bi-weekly and in separate groups of family therapy and group therapy. My hope was that the groups would turn into «self-managed groups of equals in co-vision» and that they could do without me once finished the experience. This supervision extended until 1981<sup>v</sup> since it very much related to the assignment Profesor Ajuriaguerra from Ginebra had given the *Diputación Foral de Vizcaya* of a project of reform of psychiatric care, and which somehow José Guimón, pupil of the former, had in mind. When time arrived to put it into practice, I was consulted because of my participation in **“The social function of Medicine” of the X Congress of Physicians and Biologists, in the area of health of the Congress of Catalan Culture**, and also psychiatric reform y mental health care in Catalonia and Spain<sup>vi</sup>, all of which has lead me to the conclusion that prior to a health reform there necessarily must first come an educational revolution. The reform contemplated in the Basque Country, inspired by principles of community mental health, was the great occasion for putting into practice the educative revolution of which I had been speaking. In order to carry it out, training in group work of the existing human resources was necessary and of those the reform needed to incorporate. This idea was already present in the Courses of Training in Group Psychotherapy initiated by Dr. Guimón in 1974. But how make it extensive to the volume of professionals that would need to be recycled or trained anew in little time? The only experience of this sort I had knowledge of was the **General Course of Group Work**, initiated by the Group Analytic Society (London) in 1964, which at the time was carried out by the Institute of Group Analysis. This was an annual course with weekly sessions, in which professional of all disciplines that cooperated in mental health were trained jointly. In addition I knew that that same year the Institute of Group Analysis had begun *training in blocks* in Europe. On the other hand, the work done until then by the Institute of Psychotherapy of Bilbao, the chair of psychiatry of the University of the Basque Country and the Hospital of Basurto, was institutionally promoted with the foundation of OMIE (Basque Foundation for the Investigation and Teaching in Mental Health) in 1979.

That year in the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Barcelona, the Eastern Zone of the SEPTG at my initiative started a Collective of Study of Group Work<sup>vii</sup> in order to prepare the main communication of the following Symposium 1980 *“A group approach in a National Health Service”*. Also in 1980 took place what was the **first Intensive Residential Workshop of Group Analysis in Castelldefels, Barcelona**, in collaboration with Castilian speaking members of the London Institute and the organizer of the Congress of the International Group Psychotherapy Association of Copenhagen, Malcolm Pines, well known member of the GAS, who had started the training in blocks in Denmark. To the workshop came members of the SEPTG, the Collective mentioned and from the Bilbao groups. Thus began a collaboration between the University of the Basque Country and the Institute of Group Analysis of London, and to explore the possibilities in 1981 a call was made for a **second Intensive Residential Factory in Group Analysis** in Cestona, in the Basque Country, to which about forty professionals came who either had attended the training courses in group therapy, or were in the co-vision groups which I conducted, some of which had participated in the workshop in Barcelona. As teachers, Hanne and I came from Barcelona, and Fernando

Arroyave and Malcolm Pines from London, the latter authorized to negotiate a possible contract of collaboration of the Institute of Group Analysis and the University of the Basque Country. Dr. Guimón came the day before closing the workshop and we discussed with him the terms in which this collaboration could be realized. However, contrary to expectations, he did not participate in the general assembly of the workshop, which caused that —perhaps due to the enthusiasm generated and the spirit transmitted by us— a managing committee was constituted by the assembly in order to organize the course of group work. This decision, could have been avoided if, as expected, Dr. Guimón would have been present, although this was not what he expected and, consequently, he withdrew the support of the Department of Psychiatry of the University and all the project was on the verge of being wrecked. Luckily, the summer of 1981 I coincided with Dr. Guimón in the European Symposium of Group Analysis in Rome and we could there clarify the misunderstandings that had taken place in Cestona. In 1982 the **Introductory Course in Group Work of the Department of Psychiatry of University of the Basque Country and the Institute of Group Analysis** was started. The former had to pay a levy, and named me on this occasion Honorary Teacher. Since the programme was to cover an area of students originating from regional administrations and independent communities other than the Basque Country, together with the classic course of weekly frequency for people of Bilbao, another one was initiated of four blocks (four sequential weekend seminars of three days) for people coming from further away. This offered a unique opportunity to compare the weekly training workshops with the block training the Institute of London was developing in Europe. Students graduated from the previous training program in group work were to be the teachers who, supervised by me, were going to conduct the small groups of the weekly course, whereas the blocks would be conducted by Hanne Campos and Fernando Arroyave, members of the Institute of Group Analysis and Juan Campos and Jose Guimón, who for this purpose were named invited professors of the latter. Unfortunately, the investigation was perverted when, for financial reasons, we were forced to mix both training populations in order to augment the number of participants in the blocks for which there were insufficient inscriptions, which as a result were renamed sequential seminars. I was in charge fundamentally of the group conductors of first, whereas Dr. Arroyave conducted the large group experience jointly for both courses. In spite of the limitations, the investigation was carried out by the University and the seminars counted with the invaluable contribution of internal chronicles of the four seminars (Diego Luna in charge of three of them and Hernán Kesselman of one). The collaboration with the Institute of Group Analysis discontinued after a year, not as much due to the cost of the levy to pay to London, but by the untenable subordination to the Institute which this implied. This did not prevent the promoting institution of the OMIE group program from identifying with the spirit and way of conduct of the Institute of London, beginning in turn itself to colonize other provinces or countries. A period of transition followed and a progressive university institutionalization made that OMIE establish relations with universities that offered greater facilities than those of the Basque Country for the development of its project<sup>viii</sup> such as the Autonomous University of Barcelona, the one of Laguna or of Geneva. I stopped to participate actively in the project, although this did not prevent me from accepting to collaborate when the program in Barcelona was started nor in 1989 to be a founding member of the Association of Analytical Group Psychotherapy (APAG) —note: not of Groupanalysis—, an association born from OMIE and incorporated this same year in EGATIN (European Group Analytic Training Institutions).. The last occasion in which we participated was the twenty-fifth anniversary of

training in work group, of which there is the testimony of a video of the conference I gave and a paper given by Hanne —“*Bilbao 1974-1999: debating human groupality*”— as part of the conference table, which for some reason is still unpublished. In sum, the trajectory followed by the training in groupanalysis in the Basque Country has been the one of most of the institutions born from the SEPTG, where one or several of their members end up by establishing an institution specialized in the orientation they uphold and the methodology they use. Most of these, among them the APAG, grouped together on a national scale in the FEAP (Spanish Federation of Associations of Psychotherapy; originally of professional training), a defensive institution born in view of the unification of professional titles on part of the European Union; as well as in order to obtain international recognition in subscribing organizations of their specialty, and as affiliate organization of the IAGP.

2) The SEPTG, the most veteran of the Spanish group societies, and in a certain way the matrix of all of them, was the first and only one of national association to which I subscribed, and also the institution to which I have dedicated more efforts. Although it is true that I have been founder member of others, and I have helped some of them in critical situations, it is also true that I never done so in the spirit of introducing groupanalysis or to secure students to follow these teachings. I was invited to the first pre-foundational encounter in 1970 by Jose Luis Martí-Tusquets, who in 1958 registered along with Carlos Ruiz-Ogara and myself in the Group Analytic Society; and together with whom, upon my return from New York in 1963, we constituted the group of “equals” ( *pares* ) that met in my house to try to conciliate the different orientations and group methods everyone sustained. That group stayed together something over a year and upon dissolution José Luís continued a couple of years more in a supervision group with me. I already have mentioned the reasons that prevented me from joining the founding committee of the **SEPTG** and the reasons that for subscribing in the Symposium of Valladolid. The pre-foundational encounter took place the same year that as members of GAIPAC we were invited to the **First European Symposium of Group Analysis**, held in Lisbon, which had as a first objective the comparison of the types of groupanalysis imparted in Lisbon and in London and, in second place, the foundation, if considered convenient, of a European association of groupanalysis. The fact that I had exhausted my share of congresses for that year prevented me from attending.

Yet, once incorporated in the **SEPTG**, I discovered that its philosophy was more compatible with mine who than any of the English speaking associations of which I up to then was a foreign or overseas member, that is to say, the **American Group Psychotherapy Association (AGPA), the American Academy of Psychoanalysis and the Group Analytic Society (London)**. My incorporation to the **SEPTG** coincided one of its crisis situation which stretched out over two years and which was elegantly overcome during the following **Symposium in Cuenca in 1981**<sup>ix</sup>. Several innovations were introduced at that moment: that it should be the Zones (North, South, East and Center) —not the individual members— of the Society<sup>x</sup> the ones in charge to elaborate the communications and organization of the (annual) Symposium; that the papers be presented in writing; for the first time extraordinary assembly is called to solve critical situations; and a whole Symposium is destined to review the Constitution and By-laws; finally, it is decided to explore the possibility of establishing collaborations with similar societies or organizations in Spain and abroad and I am entrusted during the previous congress to explore these with the IAGP and the AGPA during the Congress of Copenhagen of 1980. The position that it be the Society itself, as a group, the



one to explore and solve its group difficulties, is a radically groupanalytic attitude. It was the first time that it was applied, because not even in the Group Analytic Society (London) had it been tried out, where I had tried to promote this idea without major results. It took the SEPTG years to put this analytical positioning into practice, but finally it entrusted some of its members, endowed with a grant, to carry out an institutional analysis of the first eleven years. With time the convenient modifications of the Constitution were made and, finally, by-laws were established, both eventually published in 1998.

The collaboration of the SEPTG with **Grup d'Anàlisi Barcelona (Gd'AB)** —a small group of equals (*pares*), left-over of the **Group of Studies of Group Work Barcelona of 1980**, which has among others the objective of analyzing regularly its own process— began as a result of the invitation to Pat de Maré to conduct a large group experience during the Pamplona Symposium, in 1988. This activity was preceded by an encounter in a medium group of two days in the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Barcelona, announced as "*With Pat de Maré in the Large Group*". For the occasion Plexus Editor(e)s de Gd'AB published a bilingual edition of the "*History of the Large Group*" of this author and his biography. Together with the publication of the pamphlet "*Conceptual Scheme, Organization, Objectives and Activities (1989)*", Gd'AB established its first Web<sup>xi</sup>, which lodged those of the SEPTG and the Lifwynn Foundation until each one of these institutions established their own.<sup>xii</sup> Hanne Campos, after serving three years as editor (1991-1994) was elected president of the SEPTG, position she held during two terms (1994-1998). While she served on the board of directors, apart from the **Bulletin** —conceived as an instrument of communication on paper in between symposiums which soon increased considerably in size and quality—, she published two monographs on past and present therapeutic communities, inviting to the symposiums authors of international reputation on this subject like R. D. Hinshelwood and Stewart Whiteley. Publicó still another monograph on the already mentioned "*Open History...*", presented during the First Latin-American Congress of Psychodrama in Salamanca; from then on the SEPTG forms a fraternity with the Spanish Society of Psychodrama. Other members of Grup d'Anàlisi Barcelona held positions on the board of directors of the SEPTG: Mercè Martínez (editor 1994-1998 and president 1998-2002); Pere Mir (editor 1998-2004); Montse Fornós (spokeswoman of training) and Isabel Admetlla (secretary). In February of 1998, Gd'AB received a hard blow: the death of Susana Jover after a long illness coincided with the diagnosis of cancer of Juan Campos. Under these circumstances the group collaborated in the bilingual edition of "*A history of the IAGP: facts and findings*". From 1995, Juan Campos was Honorary Archivist of the IAGP, which the SEPTG joined as an affiliate organization in 1986.

In the SEPTG, the institutionalization of training has been one of the subjects that has made run more ink and consumed more energy on the boards of directors, in special meetings and symposiums right from the foundation of the **FEAP (Spanish Federation of Associations of Psychotherapists)** in 1992. It already was an exit that a minimum of disciplinary standards and group experience was accepted in one of first revisions of the Constitution. The invitation to belong to the FEAP led to conflicting debates until definitively this possibility was given up in 1995. Contrary to what I myself thought in 1970, the experience of institutionalization of teaching in the **Group Analytic Society** —with foundation of its Institute and later the organization of different institutes and European societies in **EGATIN**— took me to erect myself in the SEPTG as the firm opponent to any kind of

institutionalization or of recognition of the training imparted privately by some of its members.

In 1998, in Sitges (Barcelona), the annual symposium of the SEPTG was accompanied for the first time by a **virtual symposium**. I have also been promoting the incorporation of a new category of corresponding or virtual members who could participate from cyberspace between one symposium and another in the elaboration of the theme to be discussed face to face. This supposedly presented difficulties of a legal type and of communication in group work, but this seemed to be solved in a definitive way at the end of the Symposium of Majorca in 2002 by means of the formula to accept pre-inscriptions for the following symposium of Seville. We parted for Seville with 20 pre-enrolled at 50 euros each, which in case of attending could be discounted from the real inscription. The organizers of the Seville Symposium, although they benefited from these prior funds, they did not offered the necessary Internet support for the implantation of a virtual symposium, so that the board of directors decided for the following symposium in Allariz to accept pre-inscriptions in the Forum of the Society in Internet without any charge for this commitment. I do not know if someday I will see the existence of virtual partners or correspondents of the SEPTG which make possible to spread its spirit in the countries of the Castilian language. Meanwhile, I try to promote the same one idea in the IAGP and the special sections which I activated as vice-president of that association.

The subject of the XXXII Symposium of the SEPTG held in Valencia in 2005 is "*Encounters and goodbyes: mourning as a process of change*". It seems to me a suitable context for dealing with the theme of what could have been and was not... and will not be in the SEPTG while we will not get onto the cyberspace bandwagon. It could be that for this I organize a round table or a virtual forum.

3) As has been said, the colloquium of December 9, 1979 "*Dynamic Group Psychology*" gave its authors— Hernán Kesselman, Tato Pavlovsky, Pacho ÓDonnell, Pablo Población, Paco Peñarrubia and myself— the opportunity to know each other mutually. For reasons I ignore, Nicholas Caparrós, founder of Clínica y Análisis Grupal, was not able to attend. Nicholas I knew later through Hernán. This colloquium deserves to be read *in toto*<sup>xiii</sup> because, aside from the personal sympathy established through consonances, dissonances and resonances of our texts, during the seven years left of exile, it makes possible an intimate and fertile cooperation between my groupanalytic foulkesiano orientation and his pichonian social psychology. Hernán, while in Europe, carried out an intense educational task, continuation of the already initiated in Argentina, culminating in the creation of the **Spanish School of Social Psychology**. We tried to write a book together of which we did not get past the prologue: "*Group Analysis Operative: Foulkes-Pichon Rivière, a pending dialogue*". With this in mind we set up a working group with students Hernán had in Madrid and other cities, as well as with members of his School of Social Psychology, and during the course 1985-1986 we held ten one-days workshops. We presented/ this experience the first day of the IX Congress of the IAGP in Zagreb, in a sub-plenary session presided by Fabrizio Napolitani, under the title "*From the psychoanalysis to social psychology: Operative Group Analysis*". Last moment we found out that we were not going to have simultaneous translation. In order to overcome this impediment we resorted to sequential translation done by different groups which, with Elizabeth Foulkes, we announced with the warning "*there is no electronic translation, come with your own tongue put: the group translates!*", and it worked. Only the ones speaking to the sub-plenary spoke aloud, whereas small groups united by languages translated *soto*

voce, there was always somebody who could translate what was said aloud. It was an absolute success, not only because of the material presented, but because of the group experience lived through. But this *compte rendu* was our last collaboration in presence since that same year finished with the repatriation of Hernán and his family a Buenos Aires. Our prologue to the planned book has been published by Hernán on different occasions and in different places. What was our cooperation is well described in "Chronicle of a psicoargonauta", first volume of his book Operative Psychotherapy, illustrated partly with photos of his wife Susana<sup>xiv</sup>. I am not going to amend what Hernán wrote of the seven years of ours cooperation during his exile in Spain and less still will I expose the thoughts this evokes in me. I fell into the temptation, however, to open the archives of **GAO (Grupo Análisis Operativo)** from where like from a box of Pandora emerge pleasant and painful memories. As I said before, I never have had founding desires, although Hernán in his book contradicts me when he states that "*with Juan we founded Analytical Convergence, GAO (Grupo Análisis Operativo) and SEGAO (Spanish Society of Operative Group Analysis)*". All this is certain, but they never arrived to be projects. We dedicated many hours to them and we implicated people, but no group ever was formalized legally. The unpublished story of encounters between members of the Group Analytic Society (London) and the Private School of Social Psychology of Pichon Rivièrè —by Elizabeth Foulkes and Ana Quiroga during the Congress of Copenhagen—describes well the illusions we harboured from the beginning. My desires of integration, added to Hernán's capacity of call-up, natural leader of "*psicoexilados*" in Europe, lead us to dream of new alternatives of social organization of the profession. Hernán was one of the few valid interlocutors that I have found in this country, but we were not only pals as he says, but our respective plexus, familiar and professional networks and friends united in a group context. The fact that both we had suffered under the dictatorship of the dependent associations of the IPA and rebelled against them, lead us to look for healthier alternatives. Our encounter at the end of 1979 on my part coincided with the teachings in Bilbao, the return of Hanne from her training in London, the two intensive residential workshops of groupanalysis in Castelldefels and Cestona and, finally, my mediating role between the University of the Basque Country and the Institute of Group Analysis of London in relation to the training of healthcare professionals of the Regional Government of the Psychiatric Services of the Basque Country. Hernán, on his part, grouped together Argentinean social psychologists with the idea of founding a Private School of Social Psychology in Spain, at the same time that he developed an intense work in the training of psychotherapists in his Madrid office, travelling throughout Spain and Europe. In this context Analytical Convergence was conceived as an attempt to overcome differences between psychoanalysis and group psychotherapies and different orientations and methodologies. During a first stage it was something very informal that, in order to avoid the legal constitution of an association, lead us to register individually and to affiliate ourselves as an organization to the IAGP. The latter was not possible because only legalized groups were accepted. From 1981 onwards, we constitute ourselves as a self-governed small group of equals (*pares*), which we call Analytic Convergence, self-managed that meets periodically in Madrid, Barcelona and Alicante, and that stays united by means of interchange of papers and correspondence, and even initiates a circular correspondence. The thing was not easy. The *Grupo Quipú de Psicoterapia*, invited by Hernán, declined to join Convergence because they felt that they were in a different historical period from ours, although they offered to organize intergroup encounters with us as we had been doing until then, mainly through *Clinica y Anlalysis Grupal*<sup>xv</sup>. The multiple "belongingness" or professional associationism of

each one of the members of **Analytical Convergence** implied problems of belonging and leadership which culminated in a workshop coordinated by Fabrizio Napolitani of Rome as "*man on the boundary*". This group is a prolegomenon of *Grup d'Anàlisi Barcelona* that we started in 1989.

I already explained how **GAO** arose. We were on the verge of legalizing a Spanish Society of Operative Group Analysis, and we would have done it if it was not because Hernán returned to his country after the Congress of the IAGP in Zagreb. In fact, our hispano-argentinian cooperation moved between these two congresses —Copenhagen and Zagreb— and the pity is that neither Hernán nor I travelled to the one in Mexico in 1984, with which the projects of cooperation with workshops in Buenos Aires where one would study Foulkes and in Spain where we would look for the consonances, dissonances and resonances between the latter and Pichon, were left void and did not culminate in the bi- or tri-lingual workshops which we should have maintained before congress. The journals of one and the other institution neither were used for this interchange. Thought well, **GAO** and **SEGAO** were consequences of that primitive desire, but they ran into the obstacle that we were not able to renounce our mother institutions. In my case the international projection of the Group Analytic Society (London) in which, with *my revolution of the overseas members*, was triggered off, first, a European Groupanalytic Movement and, later, when judging with other Italian and Portuguese colleagues that the London context was not a suitable one for this development, were activated the Special Interest Sections of the IAGP with the Network of Study Groups in Group Analysis, which later became the Group Analysis Section. On the part of Hernán, it was the beginning of the Spanish School of Social Psychology that prevented him to dedicate more efforts to GAO. In summary, we could define our cooperation in terms of "*an unexpected encounter and an unforeseen separation*", and it confirms to me the slogan I always maintain: "*once an émigré, an émigré forever*". In my case, I had emigrated only three times, and the most difficult one was the return to Spain. I don't know how the return to Argentina will have been for him, because Hernán now defines himself as psicoargonauta, I would say in practice, and his emigration from Spain has still not been completed.

For me it was also difficult, as proves the fact that when he left I accepted a proposal from *Grupo Quipú de Psicoterapia* to appear as founding president of the **Spanish Society for the Development of the Group, Psychotherapy and Psychoanalysis (SEGPA)** founded on 1988. Surely what impelled me to accept it was the nostalgia of what we had initiated with Hernán. I made myself the phantasy that finally our historical moments coincided, but I was wrong. Grupo Quipú was born with a magazine under its arm and dedicated to training. As happens in other associations of this type, during the first years the group can absorb as teachers many of the students it graduates, but it needs to found an association to give shelter to those who graduates once the capacity to incorporate them *is saturated*. *That even happened to the original group of Freud: the Psychologische Mittwoch-Gesellschaft bei Prof. Freud*. Together with Quipú we went to the Congress of Amsterdam with a communication related to the theme of the congress "*The actual meaning of the group: an place of encounter and divergence*" which was elaborated throughout a whole year and appeared in group coordinated by Nicolás Caparrós and Hanne Campos, and in which Hernán participated as "the man on the boundary". At that time, SEGPA was founded and consolidated with this theme. Nevertheless, two years later it would be SEGPA jointly with APAG of Bilbao and others, the ones that promoted the FEAP in Spain, whereas some other few like the SEPTG were against such institutionalization of training.

4) The fact that my Hanne wife trained in London during four years, maintaining her professional work during week-ends in Barcelona, increased remarkably my contact with the Group Analytic Society (London). Upon her return at the end of 1979, instead of coming to found a groupanalytic society or institute in Spain, we dedicated ourselves to contribute to the development of other group associations. For the students of the Institute of Group Analysis it was then obligatory to subscribe as student members and at a reduced price to the Group Analytic Society. It was already fifteen years that I paid full membership in it, in spite of being considered an *overseas member*. I was well conscious of the fact that living on the continent it was not possible to enjoy the same advantages than those who lived in the United Kingdom. Nevertheless, what called my attention to the discrimination then in course was that in my copy of GAIPAC was not included the note encouraging her to remember that "this is your Society". This prompted me to write a letter to GAIPAC the 10 of June of 1979. In it, aside from questioning the future of the journal, I asked myself if time had not come to start ***an association of groupanalysts*** as predicted by Foulkes when taking leave as director of GAIPAC, and I proposed calling a meeting of overseas and UK members of the Society and of subscribers during the oncoming Congress of the IAGP in Copenhagen. To my great surprise, Jane Abercrombie, the then president, summoned the meeting for the lunch hour. It was attended by more than sixty people. She asked me to amplify my proposal and the exposition was such a success, or the question was so mature, that since then I have not stopped to implicate myself in the evolutionary process of the Group Analytic Society (London) and the international projection of groupanalysis. This took me to conceptually lead the European Groupanalytic Movement and a to serve on the Committee of the GAS. When we became convinced with other colleagues of the continent that from the Group Analytic Society (London) it was not possible to overcome the London domination in the international development of groupanalysis, we tried to obtain it in the context of the IAGP, of which the GAS (London) is one of the founding affiliated organizations and where most of us old overseas members of GAS are individual members. With this in mind, the already mentioned Section of Group Analysis of the IAGP was constituted, which recently counts with a Yahoo-group to communicate.

The international evolution of groupanalysis is reflected in the text I wrote —when the IAGP named me its Honorary Archivist<sup>xvi</sup> —as a result of an interview during the congress of the IAGP in Buenos Aires, which in turn caused the creation of the Web <[www.grupoanalysis.org](http://www.grupoanalysis.org)>, **and that the Forum of Analisis Group in Castilian Language of RedIRIS was started.**

From then on, whenever the Group Analytic Society (London) has entered a crisis situation, I have taken as a model the idea of a "paper group" to approach the problem as a community. From 1993 I have been preparing historical documents to complement the collaboration I was asked for me in this sense. The last one was in answer to a cry of help sent by the Committee which was facing the serious situation the Society is presently going through due to the shortage of economic means and the accelerated loss of members. In preparation of the Special Study Day that preceded the general assembly of members of 2004, we prepared with Hanne a dossier that includes the events related to the debate on the internationality of the GAS from 1982 to the present. The same one has been including in the section "[History](#)" of the Web of the Group Analytic Society (London) and in a [page of Geocities](#) where it is together with the address I sent to both Yahoo-groups and from where one can

interact with the dossier and to continue the Forum "On Internationality" which was initiated two years ago in that Web of the GAS.

Let us hope that with this edition of his Complete Works in Castilian we fulfil Foulkes' wish that justified the translation of the last of his books. The Congress of the IAGP in São Paulo of 2006 will be a good opportunity to make good the lost occasion of Madrid 1975, that is to say, to make his books available to South America since he had the impression that in their approach to the group, and in spite of certain differences, the Latin Americans went in the same direction than he himself.

*Juan and Hanne Campos*

Barcelona, 17 of November of 2004

---

## References

- <sup>i</sup> S. H. Foulkes: «On Group Analysis» en Selected Papers. Psychoanalysis and Group Analysis, Karnac Books, London, 1990, pp. 127-137.
- <sup>ii</sup> «La psicoterapia analítica entre nosotros», 1978; «State of Group Analysis in Catalonia and Spain», 1981; «Recuerdos, olvidos, y reminiscencias, o la SEPTG y "sus viejas historias"», en Hanne Campos (ed.): Historia abierta: 25 años de la Sociedad Española de Psicoterapia y Técnicas de Grupo, monográfico mayo 1998, pp. 9-49, <[www.septg.org/historia/historia.htm](http://www.septg.org/historia/historia.htm)> (noviembre de 2004); Una historia de la AIPG: hechos y hallazgos, edición bilingüe inglés-español, Plexus Editores, Barcelona, 1998, <[www.grupoanálisis.org/historia/esp/index.shtml](http://www.grupoanálisis.org/historia/esp/index.shtml)> (noviembre de 2004). Véase asimismo Hanne Campos: «Bilbao 1974-1999: la grupalidad humana a debate», presentación sobre 25 años de historia de la experiencia de Bilbao en relación a la formación y sus instituciones; pendiente de publicación y que añadimos por su interés a este epílogo.
- <sup>iii</sup> See Juan Campos: «Recuerdos, olvidos...», op. cit., n. 2.
- <sup>iv</sup> Juan Campos, Nicolás Caparrós, Hernán Kesselman, Pacho O'Donnell, Eduardo Pavlovsky, Francisco Peñarubia y Pablo Población: Psicología dinámica grupal, Fundamentos, Madrid, 1980.
- <sup>v</sup> Hanne Campos: «Bilbao 1974-1999: la grupalidad humana a debate», op. cit.
- <sup>vi</sup> Juan Campos, Jordi Gol y Jesús Moll: «Características cualitativas de la asistencia médica» en Jesús M. de Miguel (comp.): Planificación y Reforma Sanitaria, Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas, Madrid, 1978, pp. 49-72 y Juan Campos: «Hacia un modelo de ruptura educativa para una reforma sanitaria» en ibídem, pp. 121-152. Juan Campos: «Hacia una alternativa democrática para la formación de recursos humanos en Salud Mental» en Manuel González de Chávez (coord.): Actas del XV Congreso de la Sociedad Española de Neuropsiquiatría: La Transformación de la Asistencia Psiquiátrica, Mayoría, Madrid, 1980.
- <sup>vii</sup> Integrado por 26 profesionales de distintas disciplinas y procesando 12 experiencias institucionales. Yo fui entonces vocal de la Zona Este de la SEPTG.
- <sup>viii</sup> 1986: Diploma en trabajo grupal y diploma en psicoterapia grupal, tercer ciclo postgrado de la Facultad de Filosofía y Ciencias de la Educación, Universidad de Deusto. 1988: Curso General de Trabajo Grupal, Dir. José Guimón, Catedrático de Psiquiatría de la Universidad del País Vasco con Profesorado de Bilbao, Barcelona y Londres; colabora con CITRAN (Hospital de Sant Pablo de Barcelona, Programa docente de la Sociedad Catalana de Psiquiatría, y certifica OMIE. 1989: Master de Postgrado en Psicoterapia de Grupo (Bilbao y Barcelona), Primer nivel: Curso Introductorio al Trabajo Grupal; Segundo nivel: Psicoterapeuta Grupal (2 años), profesorado de Bilbao y Barcelona. 1991: Experto en Trabajo Grupal (1 año) y Master en Psicoterapia Analítica Grupal (2 años), Bilbao y Barcelona, Director José María Ayerra, Director de Uribe Costa, Bilbao. 1996-presente: Master y Experto, se imparten en Bilbao, Barcelona, La Laguna y Ginebra; en Bilbao el programa vuelve a la Facultad de Filosofía y Ciencias de la Educación; el profesorado figura no ya según procedencia sino con nombre propio.
- <sup>ix</sup> Véase Boletín Monográfico (época IV, mayo de 1989), compilado y coordinado por Hanne Campos "Historia abierta... 25 años de la Sociedad Española de Psicoterapia u Técnicas de Grupo (SEPTG)", pp. 120 y 121, y en su Web <http://www.septg.org/historia/historia.htm> Una lectura posible de 25 años de historia de la SEPTG por Hanne Campos (14-11-2004).
- <sup>x</sup> La SEPTG, geográficamente está organizada por Zonas: Este, Norte, Sur y Centro.
- <sup>xi</sup> <[personales.com/espana/barcelona/gabarcelona](http://personales.com/espana/barcelona/gabarcelona)>

- 
- xii Cuyas respectivas URL son: <[www.septg.org/](http://www.septg.org/)> y [www.lifwynnfoundation.org](http://www.lifwynnfoundation.org) (14-11-2004)
- xiii Psicología dinámica grupal, op. cit., pp. 185-256.
- xiv Juan Campos y Hernán Kesselman: «Desde el psicoanálisis a la psicología social: grupo-análisis-operativo», en Temas de psicología social, 7 (agosto de 1985), 7-15; en Temas grupales por autores argentinos, editado por la Asociación Argentina de Psicología y Psicoterapia de Grupo, la Sociedad Argentina de Psicodrama, la Primera Escuela Privada de Psicología Social y el Instituto Máscara, Ediciones Cinco, 1987, pp. 169-175; y apostillado en Psicoterapia Operativa, vol. 1, pp. 240-250.
- xv Formaba parte de su consejo editorial desde que, a principios de los años ochenta, a instancias de Hernán, publiqué mi primer trabajo allí: «Leyendo a S. H. Foulkes, con ánimo de entenderlo», Clínica y análisis grupal, 20 (enero-febrero de 1980), 48-55.
- xvi Juan Campos: Una historia de la AIPG: hechos y hallazgos, edición bilingüe inglés-español, Plexus Editor(e)s, Barcelona, 1998, pp. 259, [www.grupoanalisis.org/historia/esp/index.shtml](http://www.grupoanalisis.org/historia/esp/index.shtml)