

A PROTOTYPE OF GROUP MODEL FOR PSYCHOANALYSIS: From the «Group of two» to the «Group of 2 + n persons»¹

Dr. Joan Campos i Avillar

Preamble

“Any change in an individual forming part of such a net (personal network or plexus) alters the total equilibrium inside it. Granted that this is as true for doctors, psychologists or psychoanalysts as for anyone else, there exists a deep-rooted interest in that this is not discovered, since it would oblige us to take much more into account that which happens not only in the network of the patients but also in the one of the doctors themselves.” (S. H. Foulkes, 1973)

The purpose of the present paper is to expose the concept of professional Plexus that the author has been elaborating from his study of the resistances in groups of psychoanalysts and groupanalysts to accept with all its consequences the hypothesis of S. H. Foulkes that all mental processes are of a transpersonal nature.

The author reviews various encounters and experiences carried out for this purpose on different occasions and with different groups, in which he has been participating and contributing for over ten years, be it as a member or in the capacity of group conductor, as a consultant, a reporter or “a man on the boundary”.

With this paper, especially elaborated with respect to the theme Present-Day Psychoanalytic Models of the Group, adopting the role of clinical historian as recommended by Anthony in his introduction to a History of Group Psychotherapies, the author proposes applying the knowledge he puts forward to a wider study of the psychoanalytic institution from a group point of view. He does so in the hope that this way, and once we know where we come from and where we are heading for, each individual and each group of our common groupanalytic matrix will be better able to discover their professional identity and last purpose (E. J. Anthony, 1971).

The reader of the text that follows should take into account that the term group can be used in the sense of technical device designed for the practice of psychotherapies, in education, and/or investigation of normal or pathological mental processes, something that can be done from different theoretical frames or schemes of reference (ECRO in the sense of Pichón Rivière); or else group in the sense of context, framework, situation, in other words the space in which the aforementioned conceptualizations are generated, including the improvement and progress of the frameworks and schemata themselves. We ourselves use it in the second of these senses and, warned by Freud about how dangerous it is for ideas as well as men to be uprooted from the place where they originated and

¹ Campos Avillar, J. (1990). Un prototipo di Modello Gruppale per la Psicoanalisi: Dal <Gruppo a Due> fino ai <Gruppi di Due poi n Persone>. En Gian Marco Pauletta d'Anna (Ed.) *Modelli Psicoanalitici Del Gruppo*. (65-87) Milano: Guerini e Associati.

developed (Freud, 1930) and, following the example of Trigant Burrow and S. H. Foulkes, we tried not to embark on this journey in solitaire, but in a group and with a group.

On the other hand, the expression "psychoanalytic model of the group" can be understood as: 1) a "model group", that is one that traditionally has come to serve as pattern or ideal in organized psychoanalysis, orthodox or no, from the days of Vienna, the prototype being the original group of Vienna in 1902 –*Die Psychologische Mittwoch Gesellschaft bei Prof. Freud*– from where, together with the Zurich "Society of Freudian Physicians" the Psychoanalytic International Association evolved in 1910; or 2) "group models", this is to say the various modes and forms psychoanalysts carry out the practice of different therapeutic, educational and/or institutional groups, independently of their psychoanalytic orientation or concrete obedience they adhere to. What is more, knowing that in questions of groups the number of bodies or people is important (Rickman, 1950), we wish to point out that we do not work with the concepts derived and originated in the group of two, the one of hypnotic cure or pairing love, typical of the classical or private psychoanalytic cure (Freud, 1921), but with the foulkesian "model of three" or the "model of 2 + n people, when $n > 1$ and < 100 " (S. H. Foulkes, 1948, 1950, 1955, 1957, 1964, 1975) and the ideas of Trigant Burrow of the "group as an organism".

The paper is divided into three parts: First we expose the concept of professional Plexus as it has been elaborated from the most general concept of S. H. Foulkes; then we describe some of the related group experiences and the author's papers where the concept was elaborated; finally, we applied the concept in an analysis of the "group function" in the development of the psychoanalytic institution.

1. Milan, nodal point in the group network of the IAGP

This is not the first time that I come to Milan with the idea of "models of group" in mind, neither is it the first time that the city of Milan shelters a group therapists' congress on a similar theme. From July 18 to 21, 1963, the Third World Congress in Group Psychotherapy took place in Milan, the theme for that occasion being: "Present-day aspects of group psychotherapies" very similar to the one the *Associazione to di Psicoterapia di Gruppo* proposes to-day, except that this time the tendencies are restricted to the psychoanalytic ones and are announced as models. Curiously, it so happens that the association coordinated by Prof. Enzo Spaltro who took care of the local organization of that Congress, fue the *Associazione Italiana di Psicoterapia di Gruppo*. I don't know if there is any relationship with our actual host, the A.P.G.

The aforementioned Congress marked a double milestone in the history of the International Association of Group Psychotherapy: Organizationally, the moment in which the restricted promotional committee, the *International Committee for Group Psychotherapy* --initiated in Paris by Jacob Moreno in 1951 and, presided by him, had organized the two previous Congresses, Toronto 1954 and Zurich 1957-- turned into an *International Council* which, enlarged to 40 representatives of different orientations and techniques and of different countries, would be responsible for organizing the two following congresses --Vienna in 1968 and Zurich in 1973. Finally, during the latter congress the Constitution was elaborated and the Association founded. Also, 1963 was the moment that, thanks to the numerous participation to the congress (1,215 attendants of 61 countries) and the quality of the 261 communications presented and published in the shape of a book (Moreno, 1966), group psychotherapies started to be considered something serious. The Milan Congress was a great step forward in winning a place in the tree of science, without losing its air of craftsmanship,

Therefore, personally and as a member of the Executive representing the IAGP, I would like to start by expressing our gratitude to all those Italian colleagues, many of them present here today, who with their dedication and generous effort had made that Congress possible. To them applies what Churchill said to the crew of the Air Force during the raids of London: *"Never so few did so much for so many"*. Let us hope that the encounter which now starts here will be remembered in a similar way.

Unfortunately, it was not possible for me to take part in that encounter. To have done so, perhaps my path as a psychoanalyst and a group analyst in Europe would have been quite different. I even had prepared a paper for the occasion where I summed up my training experience and work in two different systems of group psychotherapy. I contrasted two models of group therapy of psychoanalytic orientation with which I was familiar: The *"English model"* --the one considering the group as a whole and its task as analysing the group or foment that the group analyses itself --in which I included Bion as well as Foulkes and Ezriel, and the *"American model"* --the one which considers the group as an aggregate of individuals to be analysed in group or inside the group, represented by Alexander Wolf or S. R. Slavson. This paper and the circumstances under which I found it anew after having lost it for many years, I shall mention afterwards as an example of internalised institutional resistances to accepting the transpersonal nature of mental processes and the implications such an acceptance brings with it. (J. Campos, 1963).

2. Professional Plexus

2.1 Sanitary and political context of the idea

The idea of Professional Plexus arises from almost twenty years of theoretic-practical and political work, dedicated to trying to overcome by analysis the resistances to put into practice and develop a group approach in health systems in general and, particularly in those groups which due to their professional dedication should be more capacitated and interested in securing such a development; as for example psychiatrists, psychotherapists, grouptherapists, psychoanalysts, in short, professions for which health and disease, care for the sick, prevention of disease and promotion of health should be conceived as a human behavior that is at the same time individual and collective.

I should make it clear that the concept of group approach, in turn, emerges from collective movements that take place in Spain during the period of transition towards democracy, in which as professionals we found ourselves much involved. I am referring to the *Second Report on the Social Function of Medicine elaborated by the X Congress of Physicians and Biologists in Catalan Language in Perpignan* in 1976 (J. Campos, 1978, 1976) (J. Campos, 1978), and to another major Report on *A Group Approach in a National Health Service* elaborated by the Study Group of Group work of Barcelona (CTGB *Colectivo de Trabajo Grupal de Barcelona*) for the VIII Yearly Symposium of the Spanish Society of Psychotherapy and Group Techniques (SEPTG *Sociedad Española de Psicoterapia y Técnicas de Grupo*) In Palma de Mallorca, 1980.

Both Reports were conceived and elaborated in groups as operative investigations based on field work, addressed to achieving a structural change ("Educational, Sanitary, Psychiatric Reform... etc.) by means of applying at a community level the general principles of Group Analysis, as understood and practiced by the author (J. Campos, 1972, 1980). The preparation of said Congress, in which more than a hundred professionals collaborated, was done, basically, through work in small groups, over the period of a year. From a total analysis of the situation of Medicine in Catalonia at those moments, its history and social context, evolved a Catalan definition of health which proclaims that: "to be healthy is a way of living which is autonomous, solidary and joyful", joyful being understood as the enjoyment that

comes from a disposition to cope hopefully and for the individual, the groups and the community as a whole to assume internal and external difficulties. The slogan used to express the idea was: *"The health of all is responsibility of everyone, the health of everyone is the task of all!"* Starting from these premises, a model for a Catalan System of Health was designed, first backed and taken on by the Catalan Congress of Culture --a multitudinous scientific-popular movement-- through which, during the transition toward democracy, the people owned again the innovative tradition which had led to the proclamation of the Autonomous Republic in 1933 and made possible an anarchist government during the first year of the Civil War.

The Report of the Collective Barcelona (*Colectivo de Trabajo Grupal de Barcelona*), in which participated 27 professionals, representative of group experiences during the past decades, was conceived as a group of groups that met every two weeks during one year and analyzed critically the twelve experiences on which the study is based. Although the Collective did not arrive at a theoretical definition of "group approach" nor solve the epistemological and methodological difficulties that such an orientation supposes, it did, however, arrive, in an operative way, at some conclusions that deserve to be remembered since they had influence in the elaboration of the idea of plexus. (Footnote¹)

Of the various experiences examined by the Report, there is two of particular interest. One on Medical Education carried out by the author at the Autonomous University of Barcelona (1968-1975). Another about the planification of the care system of a new oncological hospital carried out by Hanne Campos (1977-1981), where some of the concepts and methodologies were generated later used by the Collective. The first consisted in a course in *"Institutional Pedagogy"* on the subject of *"The patient doctor relationship and the process of becoming a physician"*. This was the culmination of an operative investigation carried out by the Office of Medical Education of the Institute of Educational Sciences of the Autonomous University on the problem of socialization of adults and of professionalization, (J. Campos, 1973). These studies of student groups with serious problems of professional identity in conflictive occupations —the first one in crisis because of the professional plethora and *numerus clausus* and the other related to a new specialization without a recognized professional status— gave the author an especial sensibility to the problem of psychoanalysis and groupanalysis as a profession. During this phase, until 1975 when the author retires from the University as Chair of Psychiatry and Psychology, the aforementioned interest led him to cooperate as an expert with the *World Health Organization in the Teaching of Mental Health in Medical Schools* and, also, as a consultant apply group techniques to an institute of psychoanalysis in Madrid in the resolution of institutional problems. This was the first time that the author experimented with a professional group of psychoanalysts the technique he later developed under the name of *Plexus Network Therapy*.

The ideas emerging from the aforementioned group experiences served as conceptual base for the design and development of other programs and experiments, as for example, the program of health education by means of *a course in group work for a psychiatric reform* that was taking place in the Basque Country during six years. Hundreds of professionals have passed this course which has had a great impact as to the change of attitudes in the helping institutions. Also, the exploration of alternative professional associations and schemes of investigation, clinical application and teaching of psychoanalysis, psychotherapy and group analysis and clinic, which in successive approximations took shape in the constitution of *Convergencia Analytica Internacional*, *Grupo Análisis Operativo*, and the foundation of *Grup d'Anàlisi Barcelona: cooperative of associated work and services*. The latter collaborated with another cooperative of the same type, Grupo Quipu de Madrid, in the organization in June 1989 of the First International Meeting in Group, Psychotherapy and Psychoanalysis, founding on this occasion the respective Society for its integrated development, the *SEGPA (Sociedad Española para el Desarrollo del Grupo, la Psicoterapia y el Psicoanálisis)*.

Amongst its activities, Grup d'Anàlisi Barcelona has collaborated with the Multidisciplinary Experimental Project *"Models of the future, new technologies and Cultural Tradition: Opening the way for a change of Civilization"*, initiated in Barcelona in November 1988 and programmed for a four year period. This project counted with the cooperation of specialists and experts in Social and Human Sciences and New Technologies from all around the world.

The developments taking place during the decade of the eighties match the ones that have taken place in Italy, proof of it being the creation of COIRAG. In our case, these developments have been possible because of a continuous effort of group reflection with the objective of a transformative praxis of our own professional plexus and based on progressively becoming conscious of the resistances to change in the helping professions. The projects and development turn around the concept of professional Plexus.

2.2 Groupanalytic roots of the concept

The denomination professional Plexus, which according to the circumstances I qualify "... of the therapist ... of the analyst ... of the grupoanalista, etc." is applicable to any occupational group with the characteristics now described. Obviously, not only the term but also the idea of "plexus" as equivalent and interchangeable with the one of network or net is inspired by S. H. Foulkes as he describes it in the Chapter on "Groups in real life" in his *Method and Principles*. There, once more, he acknowledges having taken the term "network" from his mentor, the neurobiologist Kurt Goldstein (S. H. Foulkes, 1975). It is there that Foulkes uses the expression of Plexus for the first time, as an abbreviation of *complexus*, in order to refer to the old concept of network or *nexus* which he already used by transferring it to social networks in his review of the second volume of Elias' *Civilizing Process* in 1940. There he states that "the individual's psychology is comparable to a microscopic anatomy or anatomopathology, a microcosm of the individual repeating and reflecting the microscopic changes in society, of which he is a member. The individual not only depends on the material conditions, e.g. economic or climatic, the world that surrounds him and on the community, the group in which he lives, the demands of which are transmitted to him by his parents or parent figures, but he is literally impregnated by these. He is part of a social network, he is a little nodal point of this net, and which can only artificially be contemplated in isolation, like a fish out of water" (S. H. Foulkes, 1948). If this is so, I ask myself, can we study the therapist, the conductor of analytical groups, in isolation?

For Foulkes, the concept of Plexus is fundamentally a clinical concept. He was convinced that in the occurrence of neurotic disorders in the individual, who in fact is the real object of treatment, "a whole group of people is actively implicated, people intimately related with one another, although they are not aware of it nor want to become aware of it." In like manner he was convinced that the patient was only a symptom of a disorder that concerns the whole of this net of circumstances and people. And, that it is this net of circumstances and people which should serve as the field of operation for an effective and radical therapy. But, he added, perhaps this is so in the future, since under present conditions it proves to be very difficult to carry out this multi-personal therapy in practice. It would be necessary for this work to be shared by a team of therapists who had been trained in psychoanalysis as well as in groupanalysis. (S. H. Foulkes, 1964, 1961).

What Foulkes is talking about in *Method and Principles* is rather the Plexus of the patient, that is, of "that intimate dynamic network constituted by a relatively small number of people, that includes the family, and that forms a group dynamically as the process of the treatment advances around the central person --the patient-- especially in connection with his conflicts, which are significant in the disorder which led him to consult us". Besides, he emphasizes there, the network as a whole is multiform. In our

culture each individual simultaneously always belongs to many networks. It is extremely characteristic the way these groups relate to each other and the way each individual belongs --or does not belong-- to these different groups (S. H. Foulkes, 1975). Originally, for Foulkes the concepts of Matrix and Network were equivalent and he used them interchangeably. Little by little, however, Network was becoming more and more objective, like a phenomenon that in fact exists between people, reserved more for group networks and groups of people existing in reality, while Matrix became more dynamic, conceived like the changing dynamic charge that takes place inside one of these networks. Inside these networks or Plexus and, depending of how intimate is this network of people centrally implicated in the conflicts that the patient is bearer of, he differentiates between Plexus and groups with an occupation.

It was in the prologue of my Spanish translation of *Group Analytic Psychotherapy. Method and Principles* (J. Campos, 1981) that for the first time I used the expression professional Plexus. With it I referred to the groups of professionals, to those intimate networks of people and circumstances related to "the manner in which a scientific professional, a psychotherapist, develops his analytical attitude, conceptualizes, organizes and justifies his practice and becomes an agent of therapeutic change (H. Kesselman and J. Campos, 1987, and 1988). I remember that in the same text Foulkes always said that Group Analysis is a method of therapy in small groups, but also a method for studying groups and the behavior of the human individuals in their social aspects. I ask myself now, after almost fifteen years of practically not doing anything else, is group analysis also useful for studying the groups that psychoanalysts form for the theoretical and practical development of Group Analysis?

After his retirement from the Bethlem Royal and Maudsley Hospitals in 1963, Foulkes obtained a contract for one year of the Joint Hospitals to investigate "patients' networks" or what today we would call patients' plexus. This had been a project dear to him --the Ford Foundation project-- with which he wanted to substantiate his network theory of neuroses, but for which he never obtained the necessary funding. In this occasion, however, he was able to examine the plexus of each and everyone of the members of a psychotherapeutic groupanalytic group conducted by one of his assistants and herewith confirmed that, effectively and without exception, the plexus of every one of them was actively implicated in the conflict that had brought the patient to treatment and the possibilities of solving it. Curiously, however, Foulkes forgot to examine the therapist's plexus! If he had done this, it would certainly have compelled him to include all the members of his Service, or perhaps even all the ones belonging to the Group Analytic Society (London) and the British Psychoanalytic Society and the respective Institutes. The plexus of the therapist has the size of a tribe! And, we still talk about psychoanalytic families!

The analytical investigation of the Plexus of the patient, this is to say the group networks of interaction and intercommunication in which he is embedded, can be done *in situ* or by proxy through an artificial group of strangers, the small groupanalytic psychotherapeutic group. In the first case, what we commonly understand as groupanalytic therapy of the family, it is easier when the Plexus coincides with the root group than when it is more extensive or implies people strange to the family. The investigation of groups with an occupation, when requested, normally is not in regard to problems of the individual members of the group but in relation to the cooperative action in terms of the group's objectives. The fact that it is the criteria of centrality or marginality regarding the central nucleus of the life of an individual which defines his inclusion or not in the Plexus, for me is of principal importance, the same if it refers to the professionals Plexus or to the patients Plexus.

2.3 A radically 'group' model of professional Plexus

Summing up, if we take into account that doctors, psychologists and psychoanalysts, in general, are people little inclined to accept theories that, in addition to require them to change themselves force them to take responsibility for their patients' disorder and the Plexus in which one and the other are included, it is not surprising that there are few volunteers "to embark in the pathology of the cultural communities" and that there are many who soon after setting sails defect the ship!

Even though Freud considered that the analytical dissection of the aforementioned neurosis, true diseases of civilization, could lead to therapeutic recommendations of great practical interest, and without going as far as to say that such an attempt be senseless or doomed to the failure, he reminded those of his followers who attempted it that they will come up against two serious difficulties: 1) that in the diagnosis of the collective neuroses we lack the contrast which distinguishes a sick person from his environment which is considered "normal" --in a group whose members are all affected by one and the same disorder, this backdrop does not exist and we will have to look for it somewhere else and 2) that regards the therapeutic application of psychoanalytic knowledge, in a group whose members are all affected by one and the same disorder, what could be the use of the most correct analysis of the social neuroses, if nobody possesses the authority to impose the said group therapy? (Freud, 1929, 1930).

Freud insists that these speculations are only based on analogies. But, assuming that there were not analogies but tangible realities, that the diagnosis that some civilizations or possibly the whole of humanity had become neurotic is correct, and then one asks, what to do when faced with such a situation? Freud knew well what Trigant Burrow was thinking with regard to this matter. Apart from the extensive correspondence they had maintained before and after the presentation in the Bad Homburg Congress of Burrow's "*The Laboratory Method in Psychoanalysis*", this author had already published his first book: *The Social Basis of Consciousness: A Study in Organic Psychology* and over 27 articles, among them "The Group Method of Analysis" (T. Burrow, 1926, 1925) --probably the one Foulkes said to have read in that epoch-- defending his position in relation to the neurosis, this is to say that the latter is of a social nature, and that the individual cannot be treated in isolation. Of his psychoanalyst colleagues, Burrow comments: "*Instead of receiving the support of a consensual group of workers, Freud was received with an irresponsible resistance of a social order, of the type of collective pseudo-group reactions... He was left isolated in his position and isolated he was incapable of facing up to that uncoordinated reaction in its social form. This was inevitable. In the absence of the social consensus of a group of co-workers, it was not possible for Freud to include the generic social unconscious. However much it is inherent to the very same nature of the Freudian discovery that the only competent instrument we have in understanding the problems of conscience is a laboratory spirit of consensual observation, the social resistance that imposed itself from the very beginning remains unrecognized and is still pending resolution within our psychoanalytic ranks*". By contrast, he says that "*The position of my associates and myself, working as a group, is that pseudo-group prejudices are the unconscious base of our social resistance that will not be resolved until we recognize them as so definitively unconscious for the social mind as are the individual resistances in the individual analysis*". And --he continues-- "*that resistance is so little resolvable in the absence of social analysis as are the private resistances of the individual patient. Otherwise we became Freud's followers merely in the sense of arbitrary, pseudo-group, collective participants, and the spirit of the discoverer remains submerged under the weight of a mass of imitative and competitive social unconscious... far from moving away from the essential significance of Freud's basic discoveries, what emerges from our group analysis are simply the results which for Freud remained temporarily blocked in the absence of consensual collaboration on the part of his social relations*" (T. Burrow, 1927).

Burrow's statements, however much exaggeratedly he tries to exculpate Freud, perhaps explain that in spite of undoubtedly counting from 1902 with a group --they meet regularly every week, same day and hour for several hours-- Freud says not to have come out of his splendid isolation until 1906-1907. Obviously, for Freud this was not a group of co-operators or scientific colleagues, a team of peers who he respects. At most it was a group of students, in his words *"not worse than the staff of any clinical head of service I can think of."*

From what we have been commenting, emerge, between others, the following questions:

- Is it pertinent to study the therapist, the conductor of analytical groups, in isolation?
- How much more will we have to wait in order for an effective and radical therapy of neuroses to be possible?
- Will it be necessary for that multi-personal therapy that the "teams of doubly trained therapists" should previously have experienced in their own person these public analyses the same as is demanded of the ones who wish to practice with others private or individual analysis? And, if so,
- Will we introduce only their personal or family Plexus and/or also their professional Plexus?
- Is groupanalysis only for studying patients' groups and analysts' groups or also, as already suggested by Foulkes, will it become a true social, transpersonal psychopathology, and a trans-cultural anthropology?

From 1919 onwards, Trigant Burrow started to work with groups in order to overcome the impasse to which led him the analysis in equalitarian conditions in a "group of two", and in 1927 with his associates he founds The Lifwynn Foundation for Laboratory Research in Analytic and Social Psychiatry, institution that still subsists and keeps on divulging the work of Burrow, in my opinion the first really psychoanalytic group. The most surprising for me is the ostracism to which they were condemned. I already indicated Freud's silence. Foulkes himself does not seem to have gone very deeply into Burrow. The latter is an author much referred to but little read, amongst other things because of the difficulty in getting one's hands on his writings. I attempted it in vain for over twenty years. Only by chance did I come across the Lifwynn Foundation's address (30, Turkey Hill Road South, Westport, Connecticut 06880), which I refer here in an attempt to undo the conspiracy of silence.

In May 1989, celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of its foundation, the first National Congress of the Portuguese Society of Group Analysis takes place in Lisbon. The theme for the occasion is "Pattern, Matrix and Interpretation". Amongst the attendants are some people who in 1966 with Foulkes started the first Group Analytic Workshop of London, dedicated to revise groupanalytic concepts. Group Matrix was then defined as *"that hypothetic fabric of communication and relations in a given group, common and shared territory which in the last instance determines the significance and meaning of all the events and all communications on which rest all communications and interpretations, verbal or not"*.

Talking about Matrix, Foulkes clarifies that *"we are in front of a pyramid that goes from the least the more specific, from the universal and general to the more individual. We can describe this pyramid as the one belonging to the species as collectivity, to culture, to a class, to the family, or the individual."* The Dynamic Matrix is the one which changes and upon which we operate in a treatment situation, the one that grows on depth and extension and that interests us as object of change, we could speak about shared change. When we speak about Matrix without qualification, it is this one we refer to (Group Analysis Vol. 1 No. 1, 1967, p.32). However, if we talk about our common psychoanalytic or groupanalytic matrix, what are we talking about? The patient's personal or family matrix is altered and changes in as far it is brought up to date and interacts in the Matrix of his groupanalytic group. But, what happens with the Plexus of the analysts? In an ordinary patient it's possible that after his/her personal private or group psychoanalysis he transformed the conditions of his primary or root group and the ones

belonging to his present-day Plexus in transference situation. But, does the conductor or analyst have the same opportunities than the patient? The famous TTT situation (Foulkes' transference, therapy and training situation), works a different way. The personal analytical experience in group of the analyst, the so-called didactic analysis, is no more than one of the elements of the tripod of training; the other two consist of supervised experience in conducting groups and acquiring knowledge of the experience of others through literature, which all in all have the function of assimilating oneself to the profession.

Edoardo Cortezao, one of the participants in that Workshop, developed there the concept Pattern. Foulkes understood that Cortezao with this expression referred more to the specific and particular imprint that the conductor has on the Dynamic Matrix of the classical groupanalytic group and not so much to patterns or repeated psychodynamic constellations observable in groupanalysis and other types of groups, or else, the privileged relationship established with a model! This imprint we studied experimentally during the first six months of the life of a psychotherapeutic groupanalytic group (J. Campos and H. Campos, 1982). We found that the way the analytical attitude in the group is instilled depends more on the personal style of the therapist than of the theoretical and technical principles that the therapist holds; it happens if the therapist has the intention or not, even without him being conscious of it, he transmits ideologies and prejudices acquired in the course of his own training by his group or professional Plexus. From our observations we have reached the conclusion that in the case of the psychoanalyst, he acquires through transference characteristics so intimate as the ones that take place inside a family or any other secondary group which uses the family as model, as is the case of religious orders or other professions that imprint character. If these appreciations are right or no, has to be seen. What definitely is true is that the therapist's professional plexus can have different characteristics throughout his professional life and should, therefore, vary in function of the needs of the members and the group as a whole. No therapist, let alone if he is an analyst, can live in isolation. He needs, first, a group of colleagues from whom to learn the craft and with which to identify himself; next, he needs a group to which to belong, that accredits and supports him; and, finally, he needs a group of colleagues he can confide in, in conditions of sufficient psychological and material security to be able to refer and follow to process his experiences and contrast his ideas. These three types of groups I call respectively group of identification, group of belonging and group of reference.

Within organized psychoanalysis, the models on which the International Association of Psychoanalysis is founded in 1910 and which served Freud as an experience to write his *Mass Psychology as experience ...* (Freud, 1921), the ones in control, are the first two types of group. In the period of initiation or basic training, the candidates have no choice than identify with the leader or with the idea leader that are transmitted through their didactic analysis, their supervisors and their teachers. Besides, belonging to the organization provides security and recognition, and the "bread and salt" that supposes receiving the nourishment of patients and students; however, it implies to become incorporated into a patriarchal group structure, totally hierarchical, where the communication and the interaction between several strata and generations is not easy. Only exceptionally and, often, even outside of the organization itself or the school it occurs that the analyst finds a group of peers with whom he can share his experiences and contrast his ideas.

3. From psychoanalysis as a model group to a group model for psychoanalysis

3.1 *A groupanalytic model for analysts*

As I said before, if I had come to Milan in 1963 I would have done so thinking about the analytical models with criteria of "political geography": The American, and the British. Many years had to elapse, over twenty, in order to get to Milan, and when I finally did, on October 12 and 13, 1985, for the Seminar

of the SGAI on Concezione gruppoanalitica dell'insegnamento and dell'apprendimento (J. Campos, 1985-1986), I still had analytical models in mind. However, what I had in mind this time was the psychoanalytic model of training, its "advantages and inconveniences for the training in group psychotherapy" which we had just discussed in a World Congress of Medical Psychotherapy in Opatija in which we had participated with Fabrizio Napolitani. The model we used for that occasion is the one defined as "Model of Training in Group Analysis" by the European Working Party of the European Group Analytic Movement, that is,

"From a groupanalytic frame of reference, the groupanalytic training is understood as a process which advances in a continuous dialogue between personal groupanalytic experience, its cognitive integration in the theory and a certain type of supervision of the work according to a model of professional development its parameters considering the ulterior training of the group analysts as a transpersonal process inside a professional network: a Training Network in Action (Training Network in Action, F. Napolitani, Zagreb, 1983).

The model I defended should not be reserved only for the basic and continuous training of group psychotherapists, public, groupanalytic —this is to say groupanalysts, but is extensible and results ideally suitable for the training of all kinds of individual psychotherapists, including those dedicated to private psychoanalysis. Under these premises it is understandable that, at least in reference to training, neither Fabrizio nor I showed much enthusiasm for the idea of transferring the "psychoanalytic model" to the group. Instead, while we rested between sessions on the rim of the Adriatic, we let our imagination flow in relation to the theme and we conceived the metaphor of the Tree of Opatija, of which I want to speak, if pertinent, in the dialogue that follows, but which basically consists of contemplating the whole development of psychoanalysis as one belonging to a tree which goes on opening branches, and which, if it is well true that they have common roots and drink the same sap, amongst themselves they neither listen nor talk to each other, nor understand each other.

The encounter of Milan '85 is a milestone. It is the half way mark of the decade of Italian-Catalan cooperation in the Operation "Ave Phoenix GAIPAC", a campaign with which the "Green Peace of Group Analysis" begins in favour of this *rara avis* threatened by extinction, fatally wounded, by a senseless "change of format"; campaign whose alarm I rang when suggesting a face to face encounter between correspondents of the journal and British and "overseas members" of the Group Analytic Society (London) during the Congress of Copenhagen in 1980. An operation, the first battle of which took place during the famous European Group Analytic Symposium of Rome in 1981, when Fabrizio Napolitani, our coordinator, suggested to discuss the subject of Resistance in Group Analysis. For me this was the moment when the European Groupanalytic Movement really began, conceived of not like a new version of "cultural colonialism" but like "a network of people, groups and organisms in intercommunication, interested in the psychoanalytic micro- and macro-sociology of the individual and of his groups".

I announced in the introduction that I would try to apply the concept of "group function" which derives from the ideas of professional Plexus and Foundation Matrix to a study of psychoanalysis, the institution, seen as a whole, like a system formed by the integration of people and of ideas in constant interaction. The history of psychoanalysis can be considered in many different ways, all depends on the frame of reference from which this is done and the intention with which it be done.

Glover was one of the victims of one of those many civil wars which characterize psychoanalysis in its history as a group, concretely, the one I baptized as the Battle of the Channel, undertaken under the leadership of Ernest Jones in view of, with Melanie Klein's help, getting free from the Viennese and converting London into the world capital of Psychoanalysis. Instructed by his experience, Glover advises the social historian who wants to undertake the study of the initial scientific groups in psychoanalysis, to

take into account the nature of the conflict derived from the ideological contents. Edward Glover says textually:

"In studying the pioneering phases of psychoanalysis, one is impressed by the many identities between the biography of an individual and the life of a scientific group. Groups manifest very clearly the influence of family organization and reaction; also, during their earliest phases, small scientific groups reproduce those stages in individual development at which various introjections and identifications shape the mental apparatus and determine the expansion or, alternatively, the contraction (progression or regression) of their subsequent activities."

"In psychoanalytic societies, this structural aspect is reinforced by a dynamic factor, namely, the conflict aroused by the ideational content the groups ostensibly set out to sustain and advance. The social historian would, no doubt, be content to express all this by saying that the life history of a scientific group involves a study of its leading personalities and the part each plays in advancing (or retarding) certain scientific aims and theories. Although this is the most labour-saving approach it tends to overemphasize individual leadership at the expense of specifically group interactions, particularly those unconscious interactions that modify the growth of any society."

According to Glover, the early psychoanalytic groups appear to follow a pattern that could be called an "act of participation", a sort of primary identification "with the first and more intimate followers of Freud. In this respect the growth of all of them has much in common. But, for understanding the characteristics of every group, one should retrace the complicated inter-play of group factors --at the same time constructive and disintegrative-- which followed the development of the function as independent group, this is, the birth of the group". (Glover, 1966, the underline is mine)

Bion, in turn, in the prologue of his *Experiences...* deplores not having discussed the issues of sovereignty and power, since, such small groups as he describes there, power and sovereignty do not unfold in all their maturity and the ripe forms are extrinsic to it and infringe in the group only in the shape of invasion by another group.

These comments of Bion and Glover's were the first thing that came to mind when I tried, following E. J. Anthony's suggestions, to take the development of psychoanalysis as if it was a clinical case study and to treat it analytically. This approach of "clinical groupology" is the one I am following ever since writing *Psychiatrists, Psychoanalysts and Group Psychotherapists* (J. Campos, 1980-1979), when thanks to Balint I realized where the "basic fault in psychoanalysis" lies, that is to say that *"... in spite of the fact that the majority of the pioneers in group psychotherapy were trained analysts, we, as a body, have refused to accept responsibility for its future development, in my opinion in detriment of all implicated and especially our own science"* (M. Balint, 1968), point of view with which I cannot but be in accord.

What I did not realize, was the arduous road waiting for who is tempted by 'how fascinating a historical and psychological study could be of the why the psychoanalytic community adopted that position in the case of the group psychotherapies." I should have known better. Logically, if one "embarks on the analytical dissection of cultural communities" and one does it with live groups, than this is not dissection, it is vivisection, and without anesthesia. All in all, a savagery. It is not surprising then that the group, the investigated community resists, even if it submits itself voluntarily. All this we should have learned from individual psychoanalysis. The unconscious does not forgive, it argues, it resists, it rebels, it kicks and retaliates. If on top of it one happens to be a member of the family or group investigated, then it is not only a foolish task, but also an impossible one!

This group approach to the history of psychoanalysis which Glover proposes still has to be put into practice and this for different reasons. The foremost, in my opinion, is that psychoanalysis until recently lacks a method of group analysis equivalent in exactness and efficiency to the one of individual analysis. It is true also for the psycho-biographies initiated by Freud himself and for famous cases like the President Wilson or Moses. Today the group technique has improved and we are beginning to have reliable means. But, even so, our institutions are resistant to using them on the level of isolated groups and, naturally, still more on the level of a system. What is most important, however, is that if this history is made with the intention of understanding a present-day situation and with the aim of making a diagnosis that implies change --the clinical method-- then one needs the cooperation of the whole group to carry out the project.

As far as I know, with the exception of The Lifwynn Foundation for Social and Analytic Research, the association founded in 1927 by Trigant Burrow and his group of associates and colleagues in America, no other group, although explicitly dedicated to the group, takes heart to apply to their own group the medicine they recommend to others, *pari passu* the old saying "doctor, first heal yourself". This basic principle of didactic psychoanalysis should go together with the now famous "what made the group ill, the group should heal" and "group, first heal thyself ". We now know the price this group of pioneers pays. They were condemned to the most absolute ostracism by the rest of the psychoanalytic community. It is not enough then that it be only one group to analyze itself, but it should be the whole psychoanalytic community. But... would the latter not find itself in the same predicament then the small group and, in consequence, would not demand that the cultural community, society at large should cure itself?

Personally --perhaps because before working with patient groups I had worked as a consultant in human relations with companies or factories at odds-- different experiences of this type presented themselves and I had the opportunity of taking part. The first was, at the beginning of the seventies, as a consultant to a psychoanalytic organization in crisis, which for reasons of professional discretion I cannot comment on. The second one was a considerable success. It was the SEPTG's aforementioned institutional analysis, which led to a constructive revision of the objectives and Constitution of the society. Still another was the European Group Analytic movement, of which it is premature to evaluate the results, until we do not proceed to a psycho-social and analytical post-mortem of the whole process. In my view, I regard this paper a contribution in this sense.

Anyway, for us the balance is positive. We applied to ourselves the treatment on different occasions and with different groups: First, *Convergencia Analítica*

Internacional: An experience during which we created the concept of "man on the boundary" and the one who first occupied this place was our illustrious Italian colleague and great friend, Fabrizio Napolitani. Then we attempted it again with the *Course in Group Work* in Bilbao. This time we brought in an "institution on the boundary" --The Institute of Group Analysis London-- and I have to confess that for us, ideologically, it did not come out well, since on this occasion the Diploma for Foreign Graduates was invented. Even though, we were able to perfect the figure of the "reporter" in groupanalytic encounters, having in our files the reports of the Course by Hernán Kesselman and Diego Luna. With my colleagues of *Grup d'Anàlisi Barcelona* we have started a major revision of what the development of groupanalytic theories and techniques has meant for psychoanalysis from its origins to our days, from a group point of view and in terms of my concept of professional Plexus.

From the methodological point of view three are the sources of data we use in the analytical study of the "psychoanalytic cultural community": 1) review of texts of different authors through which we follow the evolution of the ideas; 2) the oral and written tradition, the so-called history; and finally 3) the imprint

we carry as individuals and as group, on the level of the individual and collective unconscious, and the social contexts. In this respect we have been investigating in a large group for over three years.

Previously, in the same sense, with Hernán Kesselman, after founding *Operative Group Analysis I*, we created "*Experimento Madrid*", which under the title of "*From Psychoanalysis to Social Psychology*" we presented as Sub-plenary contribution at the IX International Congress of Group Psychotherapy in Zagreb in 1986. With *Operative Group Analysis I*, we proposed to review the psychoanalytic model in as much as it had left a mark in us who had subjected ourselves to it. During ten long working days of twelve hours each, over a year, thirteen psychoanalysts and two group conductors, all trained in psychoanalysis and in social psychology or Group Analysis, we dedicated ourselves to explore what it had supposed in the life course of every one, to make the step which goes from Individual (organized) Psychoanalysis to Social Psychology. The conclusion we arrived at was that the step which goes from Psychoanalysis --understood like individual psychoanalysis-- to collective or group psychology, in this way and in this sense becomes practically impossible. The possibility, if there was one, goes just in the opposite direction. After all, Freud in "*Mass Psychology...*" had already shown us the way when reminding us that from the collective psychology, "*from the oldest human psychology we only manage to isolate the individual psychology on the basis of disdaining any chink of mass psychology, differentiating it much later, very slowly and only partially*" (Freud, 1921).

In the light of this conclusion, let us now review the development of the institution of psychoanalysis, not as if it was a family, but if the question was the life of a group.

3.2 From the groups of Freud to the Freudian groups.

Freud writes his scientific testament on three occasions. The first, "*Kurzer Abriss der Psychoanalyse*" of 1923, is the article that he had pending for the book of the editors of the Encyclopaedia Britannica *These Eventful Years: The Twentieth Century in the Making, as Told by Many of its Makers*. He began to write it just upon coming home after his double operation of cancer and the total vasectomy. Still convalescent he writes it practically in one go. The second, "*An Outline of Psychoanalysis*", he began when waiting to leave Vienna, in April or May 1938, returning to it in July when arriving to London. In September he had written eighty-three pages, when a new and serious operation obliges him to interrupt. Curiously, the German edition of the "Outline..." is titled "*Abriss der Psychoanalyse*", a very similar title to the one of 1923. In the third and last, "*Some Elementary Lessons in Psychoanalysis*", only a few pages long, probably the last ones he writes, he finishes talking about the unconscious in the following words:

"With its investigations (psychoanalysis) has arrived at a knowledge of the characteristics of the psychic unconscious which until now were unsuspected and has discovered some of the laws that govern it. But nothing of this implies that the quality of being conscious has lost its importance for us. It keeps on being the light that illuminates our way and takes us through the darkness of mental life. As a consequence of the especial character of our discoveries, our scientific work in psychology implies translating the unconscious processes into conscious processes, this way filling the lacunae of conscious perception..."

He begins "*Kurzer Abriss...*" by saying: "*Psychoanalysis, it can be said, was born with the twentieth century, since the publication in which it sees the light of the world as something new --my Dream Interpretation--*" is dated 1900. He then explains that he chose this date because from then onwards psychoanalysis comes to have a double meaning: Not only is it a new method for treating some neuroses, but it also is a new psychology. Psychoanalysis, which had started as a project of scientific

psychotherapy addressed to investigate the genesis of mental disorder, has become a new scientific psychology of normal states. What is important, however, is what he then adds:

"If the psychological discoveries, gained through the studies of dreams, were well taken in account, only a step was necessary before psychoanalysis could be proclaimed a theory of profound mental processes, not directly accessible to consciousness --as a profound psychology, previously to being applied to all the mental sciences. This step is the transition that goes from the mental activity of the individual to the psychological functions of human communities --this is, from individual psychology to the psychology of the group; surprising analogies forced us to give this step" (Freud, 1923, SE Vol. XIX, p. 205).

Curiously, all these times coincide with moments in which the perception of death is inevitable, moments of transcendence, in which Freud thinks in the group. At that time he considers that he already had given this step. No doubt, what he had in mind was *Totem and Taboo* of 1912, of which he always had been very proud and which represented the first attempt on his part of applying the points of view of the psychoanalytic discoveries to some unsolved problems of social psychology (*Völkerpsychologie*). Let us remember that there he recurs to the analogy of the primitive horde, a concept he takes as dogma to explain the step from social psychology to individual psychology. Or else, it was *Mass Psychology and Analysis of the Ego* of 1921.

It was while writing "*Beyond...*" how Freud came upon a simple idea to explain the psychoanalytic foundation of collective psychology (Letter to Ferenzci, May 1919). In spite of being an accompanying paper... it took him nearly two years to finish *Massenpsychologie ...* (Freud, 1921). The same as happens before with *Totem and Taboo* and afterwards with the rest of the "sociological writings", he takes the trouble of exhaustively reviewing the literature in order to document the works that are children of his imagination. They are not clinical papers, neither are they based on facts of observation --an inescapable condition for Freud to justify the scientific character of psychoanalysis-- but analogies, that is to say without any other observations than his own experience, be this as a member of a group, be it as leader of the same. Even if they could not be considered scientific, these papers, however, give a faithful picture of what Freud thought about groups, in other words, the groups which have served him as a model for his scientific activity and a model of group which he used operatively for the development of his own science.

Freud begins "*Mass Psychology...*" stating that "*however much individual psychology is occupied with the individual and explores how the latter intends to achieve the satisfaction to his impulses, only rarely and under exceptional conditions the former can ignore the relations of the individual with others. In the mental life of the individual there always appears an "other" as model, as object, as somebody which helps him or as adversary. In this way, individual psychology is at the same time and from the beginning social psychology, in this wider sense but entirely justified*". (Freud, 1920-1921) This is the first time that Freud uses the word model. The "other" Freud has in mind, the object, the model, obviously is a singular individual. Nowadays we know, or at least the majority of us who work in groups, we believe that what we introject are not objects of instincts but models of relations, matrixes of interaction or, as some call it, internal groups. I have asked myself many a time what could be this "simple idea" that took Freud from thinking in adding a new instinct to his meta-psychology, the death instinct, to have to make a desperate effort to prove that the old libido is sufficient to explain the nature of the bonds of individuals with the group, without having to recur to another strange instinct as is the gregarious one. Not even for a moment, however, it occurred to Freud the model of group as a collection of individuals that criticizes the absurd biological metaphor of Le Bon --"*the psychological group is a provisional composition of elements which combine for a moment, just as the cells that constitute a live body, they form in their reunion a new being that shows different characteristics to the one possessed by each individual cell*" --Since when do we find in nature an isolated cell, or even

tissue, if not in the artificial conditions of the laboratory? Instead, taken by his biological prejudice, *"the mind is inside a skull and contained in a skin"*, the only thing that worries him is which the nature of the link is, which the cement that permits individuals to gather in group.

Obviously, Freud has been the model for his followers. Of course, Freud was the leader of the group and the leader of the psychoanalytic movement, even though that time after time he put somebody as figurehead, as for example Carl Jung as President of the International Association and Alfred Adler of the Society of Vienna. Perhaps it was the only way he could save himself from a father complex of the primitive horde. What we cannot say is that his activity as conductor of the group was very analytical. We even know that *Totem and Taboo*, the same than the History of the Movement were used as powerful weapons to get rid of his favorite son, the Crown Prince of the Movement. Freud's personal experience most likely was in groups similar to the ones he describes and with whose leaders he identifies. The model of organized group with which Freud operates, is the one of the church and the army, basically a "model of two", hierarchical, with a double psychology, the one of the leader and the one of the followers. The leader is not at all a *primum inter pares*. He should be bearer of a sufficiently powerful narcissistic charge as to be able to refrain from the object love of his subordinates. This is what gives him the energy to, in *"splendid isolation"*, become the object of identification of his followers.

All this is very well, but from where did Freud draw the model he used for constructing his own group? For Freud there existed not one but two groups that he used as a model: The one of the *Berliner Physikalische Gesellschaft*, of Helmholtz's famous Medical School, and the one of the *grand savant* Charcot, clinical head of the Salpêtrière. The first, a small group of four, amongst them his teacher in Vienna, Brücke, the greatest authority he ever met and in whose laboratory of physiology he found "calm and full satisfaction and, also, men I could respect and take as models". Amongst these he would afterwards choose Joseph Breuer, his mentor and patron who in turn introduced him to Wilhelm Fliess, successive companions on the trip who would be useful as "imaginary friend" in the discovery of psychoanalysis. The experience with Charcot, on the other hand, was one with an admired charismatic teacher who distinguished him by asking him the favour to translate his book or inviting him to one of the soirées at his house. ¿With who or with what does Freud identify himself? ¿With which one of these two lived experiences? ¿Does he identify with only the leader or rather with the kind of relation between colleagues, between teacher and disciple, and all these with knowledge? Or only with the father substitute or the authority with which he identifies transferentially? In reality, Freud had a double identification. On the one hand, with the group from Berlin, the one of hard science, the one sworn to the forces of attraction and repulsion, the "laboratory rats" and, on the other hand, with the great clinician of Paris, who said *"la théorie, c'est bon, mais ça n'empêche pas d'exister"*. Upon his return to Vienna in 1886, Freud develops his professional activity in two group contexts entirely different; on the one hand, his groups *literally "of two"*, first with Breuer and then with Fliess, his more immediate professional Plexus; on the other hand, his teaching activity at the university, which he does not interrupt until 1917. However, it was not until 1902, the same year he is nominated Extraordinary Professor, and he finishes his relation with Fliess, that he constitutes his own group --a small circle of young doctors, beginning with four, that flocked around him with the explicit intention of learning, practicing and spreading the knowledge of psychoanalysis. The small circle grew and often changed composition in the years to come and in the History of the Movement he would say that all in all it was scarcely inferior to any clinical chief's staff he could think of. This was the first group of psychoanalysts, the prototype, the model from which starts psychoanalysis.

From what Freud says of this group in 1914 and from the minutes taken from 1906 to 1918, it becomes evident which is the clinical material that Freud uses for writing his *"Mass Psychology"*, as also the kind of vicissitudes becoming manifest later in the History of the Movement. Freud had well started as a democratic leader, but he repents of not having been more authoritarian from the first moment. His

estrangement from this original group was due to considering that he had not come out of his “*splendid isolation*” until 1906, which is when some of the members of the group start to publish on their own, Rank --first non-physician-- is incorporated, minutes of the meetings start to be taken, and Freud is recognized from Zurich by the pioneers of what later would be the first group of Freudian physicians in 1907.

Until that moment, the explicit objectives of the group were being obtained in an integrated way -- they start to exercise as analysts, publish papers, write in the press about the meetings, refer each other patients who are often supervised in the group and make publicity of psychoanalysis. The group identifies itself as the *Mittwoch Gesellschaft*.

The colleagues from Zurich, however, presided by Bleuler and Jung, when they form a group in 1907 they do so as *Society of Freudian Physicians*. It is, therefore, the ones from outside that adopt the name of the “father”. From then on, the group of Vienna changes its name and calls itself the Psychoanalytic Society of Vienna. There were, then, two different groups. While the ones from Vienna identified primarily with Freud as a person and with the occupation of psychoanalyst, the ones from Zurich, on the other hand, rather identified with their true leader who was Jung, and it was through this identification that they identified with Freud. With the *first Encounter of Freudian Psychology in Salzburg in 1908*, there already start the first frictions between groups. And, in Nuremberg in 1910, when the *International Psychoanalytic Association* is founded (API), Freud had to use all his influence to achieve that Jung was accepted as President.

The different local groups adopt the informal model of Vienna until there appear within the association the first schisms. The first, an intra-group scission, was the one of Adler which splits off for reasons of scientific freedom, constituting the Association of Free Psychoanalysis in Vienna in 1911. The second is an inter-group schism, the one of Carl Gustav Jung who resigns as President of the IPA, provoked by “the secret group of the seven rings” which in the meantime had been formed around Freud to help him maintain the theoretical purity and the academic discipline in the teaching of psychoanalysis. This is an important turning point in the group development of psychoanalysis. The model of clinical chief without clinic is abandoned, the one of Charcot, with which he had identified, and adopted is the one of a scientific society, governed by a secret group. Within the association of groups and within each of the member societies, the group model remains the one of the “*group of two*”, this is to say, the one of teacher-student, founder-followers and hypnotizer- hypnotized.

At the end of the First World War, a major revision of the psychoanalytic organization is set forth in three areas: a) the one belonging to the analytical psychotherapies that includes the possibilities of a psychotherapy for the people, which in turn implies a modification of technique —alloy of the “*pure gold of analysis*”, the socialization of services and a reorganization of the system of training psychoanalysts (Freud, 1919, “Lines of advance in psychoanalytic therapy”); b) the one of revising the relationships of Psychoanalysis with the university (Freud, 1919 “*On the teaching of Psychoanalysis at university*”; and c) the one of instituting prizes for psychoanalytic writings (Freud, 1919 “*A note on psychoanalytic publications and prizes*”) and the reorganization of the system of publications through the creation of a personal publishing firm, *der Verlag*. At that time the psychoanalytic societies had constituted an organization which permitted them to do without the university that had excluded them.

The model of organization adopted by the API as from 1925 is the one of the Policlinic of Berlin, founded by Eitingon in 1921 with the following functions:

- 1) make therapy accessible to a majority that suffer of neurosis and do not have the economic resources with which to paid for it,

- 2) provide a center where Analysis can be taught theoretically and where the experience of senior analysts can be transmitted to disciples that are eager to learn, and
- 3) perfect the techniques while putting them to test under new conditions. This is the model of society, institute and clinic that has prevailed to our days.

In 1921, H. Crichton-Miller founded the Tavistock Clinic, designed explicitly as a model to be copied by the psychiatric departments of teaching hospitals and other ambulatory clinics with a base in mental hospitals. The Tavistock model, totally eclectic, had the purpose of applying the "New Psychology" originated in Vienna and Zurich to the problems of mental health, with the quadruple objective of understanding and treating the mental disorder, promoting the investigation of its causes in the hope of finding means of prevention in mental hygiene and teaching the new concepts and abilities to future specialists and to medical and non-medical staff related to mental health and human relations. After the Second World War, however, in an informal manner it became narrowly linked to the British Psychoanalytic Society and Institute of London. This model, even though it was successful in itself on the level of investigation, training and service, was accepted more by psychoanalysts than public health as was intended. On the other hand, the first one, the "model Berlin", as it offered in substitution of a leader a doctrine or technique leader with which the group can identify and to which one owes doctrinal and academic obedience, has been adopted not only by their own orthodox institution, but by the very same orthodox groups which separate from it or, criticizing it, constitute themselves outside its realm.

It is said that institutions often are no more than the shade of an individual, a monument to the founder of which they will never be free.

4. A triple start and a kind of conclusion

We have seen that for psychoanalysis --pure psychology, a profound, "abysmal" psychology as translated by López Ballesteros-- to be "applied to almost all the mental sciences", it was necessary before to take a step which goes from individual psychology to collective psychology (SE 1924f [1923] p.205). This objective Freud considered already attained in 1923, so much so that in 1932 in his *Weltanschauung*, he refers to Marxism, "... making of it a true social science, since Sociology, which is about man's conduct in society, neither can be anything but applied Psychology. Strictly speaking, there are no more than two sciences: Psychology, pure and applied, and natural science. (SE 1933 [1932] p. 79, my underlining)

The point in humanity's mental development in which the leap is made from collective psychology to the individual, Freud thought to have located it correctly in the primary parricide of the "primal horde", an analogy which he later uses to explain the nature of repression (SE 1921c, p.137). The hypothesis that religion, morality and social sentiments have developed phylogenetically from the father complex, the first two through direct subjugation to the Oedipus complex, and the social sentiments through the need to overcome the ulterior rivalry between the members of the younger generations, *si non e vera, e ben trovata*. Freud was so proud of it that he would not ever abandon it, for as many problems it would cause him.

Totem and Taboo, was the first attempt on the part of Freud to apply points of view and discoveries of psychoanalysis to some problems pending of *Völkerpsychologie*, which today we know had a "secret agenda" --to bring back to the fold or pull the ears of C. G. Jung, whose idle mystic pursuits led to a final separation, which can be guessed at already in the first part of *Wandlungen und Symbole der Libido* (C. G. Jung, 1911). The hypothesis that in humanity's history there is an event which man incorporates into his culture is not disgusting to intelligence and is compatible with later ideas like for example the

"double inheritance" of Litz with which we come equipped into this world --the biological one which stopped developing hundreds of thousands of years ago and the cultural most recent one, only some thousand years old, which is transmitted from father to son; or Foulkes' more radical one, that it is the Foundation Matrix which makes human communication possible. La de Freud is not sufficient for the *scientific Weltanschauung* of the physicists, since culture presents more problems than it resolves. The nature of repression should be left anchored in the brain, so to explain it psychologically we have no other solution than to accept the transmission of acquired characteristics, of an inherited morality, where a supposed super-ego comes from the ancestral experiences we received from the *totemism of the primitive*; a hypothesis that inexorably take us to a Lamarckian evolutionism.

The problem is serious, more so when repression, cornerstone of the theoretic building of psychoanalysis, becomes a weapon and touchstone to validate fact-finding psychoanalytic lines in the argumentation of opposing views, first, of Adler, and afterwards, of Jung and the group from Zurich. The theory of repression, according to Freud is deduced from two facts of observation: the one of transference and the one of resistance, facts that do not belong to the hypotheses of psychoanalysis rather being their result and any line of investigation that recognizes these two facts and that takes them as starting points for its work will have a right to be named psychoanalysis even though it arrives at results different to his. Obviously, Freud's criteria to validate a science come from the *Berliner Physikalische Gesellschaft*, a group with which he identifies.

Adler was the first, although recognizing the facts, who dared to question not so much the how but the why of repression. In the session 129 of the Society of Vienna, of which he was President, on February 1, 1919, talking about the role and significance of repression and masculine protest in the dynamics of neurosis, he begins provocatively by saying: *"the question I ask myself is the following: ¿The driving force in the neurosis is repression which, when you take a closer look at it, again meets up with repression? All repression is produced under the pressure of civilization, but ¿where does civilization come from? Answer: repression!"* This presentation caused a long debate in the Society, a true critical trial, political more than scientific, that lingered on for three sessions, and which Freud passed over bluntly: *"...It is not a question of a play on words, but precisely its objection. If one examines these proposals as they are formulated in their origin, they do not constitute a contradiction. Repression takes place in a singular individual and is required by the demands of civilization. ¿What, then, is civilization? It is a precipitate of the work of repression carried out by preceding generations. What is demanded of an individual is to acquire all repressions which already have been acquired before him"* --to finish with the following sentence-- *"Prof. Freud has for false the Adlerian doctrines and considers them dangerous for the development of psychoanalysis. But, it is a question of scientific errors, result of the application of false methods, (recurring to social or biological points of view); and these are errors that honour the author. Even rejecting Adler's considerations, one can appreciate their consistency and logic."*

This is, for me, the crucial point in the history of the psychoanalysis as a group. The very moment in which one or another pathway could be taken, and one took the wrong one. This decision and procedure will serve as a model to settle different scientific points of view in Psychoanalysis and source of future schisms. Naturally, Adler could not do anything but resign as President of the Society, although he continued as a member till the end of that academic course, and when summer arrived, with four other members, he founds the *"Society for the investigation in free psychoanalysis"*. When the course restarted, the Psychoanalytic Society of Vienna, with 11 votes in favour and 4 against, decided democratically as incompatible to belong to both societies. Consequence: five more members resign. Of the 9 then left, not everybody was in agreement with Adler's doctrines, but yes with his ideas on academic freedom, and all were socialists. Others, like Max Graf, the father of Little Hans, disillusioned, abandoned what he called "the Church".

That way, by democratic vote, was settled forever the false problem of the antithesis between the social and the intra-psychic or, in other words, "the acceptance as a dogma of faith and unquestionable scientific truth that the individual has a mind that constitutes his innermost self and his more valued private possession, and that the social and cultural are external forces with which the individual interacts" (S. H. Foulkes, 1969). This procedure for me is equivalent to submitting to democratic election if the sun revolves around the earth, if the man descends from the monkey or of the rib of his companion, or if the unconscious exists or does not exist, This way, the possibility was barred to keep on trying to resolve this problem analytically, that is as a fact of observation, in the future. Perhaps this explains how the psychoanalytic community lost interest in the group therapies as Balint pointed out.

Unfortunately, the method had to be perfected to be able to apply it to the psychoanalytic organization as a whole and this way get rid of the President of the International Psychoanalytic Association and the Editor of the Internationale Zeitschrift. At the request of Ernest Jones, the true political genius of Psychoanalysis, Freud accepted gladly that a small committee was established, of six members who would care for doctrinal purity. All they commit themselves not to publish anything new without the approval of the rest. Freud himself voluntarily does so. The Ego Ideal, the leader, is substituted by the idea leader, the psychoanalytic doctrine, the revealed truth, and from the cult of the man one passes to the cult of the idea.

The problem for me is not only scientifically but also ideologically very serious. It takes us directly to the most difficult question of psychoanalysis still pending resolution: The one of Freud's Lamarckism, that is, the one of the inheritance of repression from generation to generation which makes possible at one and the same time Civilization and Neurosis., The way Freud gets away from the subject is neither satisfactory nor at the height of his talent. It is with the silliness of a little boy who cries because he believes that his parents are not taking him serious when replying to his questions of the hen and the egg. Freud should have known by then that the boy was not asking about eggs and hens, neither about the enigma of his personal origin, but about the origin of the species! But, his fidelity to the teachings of Helmholtz did not leave him another way out. *Hier tut sich die Kluft auf zwischen dem realem Individuum und dem Begriff der Art...* (It is here where opens the chasm between the real individual and the concept of species...) Perhaps after all it is not a question of penetrating more deeply into the abyss, the *Abgrund*, but to be well alert when crossing the deep waters.

Let us remember that the consolidation of Psychoanalysis begins not so much with the recognition from the Burghölzli and the University of Zurich but with the Five Lessons at the Clark University and the endorsement of the university establishment in American. During that journey Freud, Ferenczi and Jung analyzed mutually their dreams. For all intents and purposes this was a groupanalytic group. When Jung asked Freud for more details about one of his dreams, the latter refused by saying: *"This way I would risk my authority"*.

It is worth remembering that one of the difficulties Freud foresaw in the analytical treatment of cultural communities was how to diagnose these as neurotic if we lacked a normal background with which to contrast them and from where to procure the necessary authority to impose the treatment on these groups. The spectacle offered by the internal fights of the Society of Vienna and the International Association with the Zurich group, without doubt for somebody not enmeshed with them but narrowly linked with psychoanalysis like Burrow, this must have been most distressing. From 1913 he is obsessed trying to solve the problem. To him it was proof that he was not wrong in his theories about the universality of the "social neurosis" and it reinforced his suspicion that analysts were not immune to it for however much personal psychoanalysis they would undergo. The very same titles of his papers, the majority read in yearly meetings of psychoanalytic communities (the American Psychoanalytic

Association and the American Psychopathological Association) give us an idea: The method of psychoanalysis, The psychoanalyst and the community, Conceptions and mistakes in psychoanalysis, The sense of psychoanalysis, culminating in 1917 with Note in regard to Freud, Jung and Adler where, although he reiterates his adherence to Freud's teachings for reasons of scientific credibility, he does not hide his points of dissidence with the latter, insisting that the points of view of the dissenters are complementary. He points out that the cause is not so much in scientific discrepancies than in the personal equation, this personalistic vision of things that depends on the observer's personality and his group, and these in turn not so much on the personal neurosis of the individual but of the social neurosis of man as a species.

At the end of 1918, Trigant Burrow was offered the opportunity to experiment in himself the mentioned social neurosis. Curiously, it was interpreting a dream of his disciple and assistant Clarence Shields, when the latter, rebelling against the authoritarianism of Burrow, showed disagreement with the social theories the latter was preaching, and to prove his point challenging him to change their roles in analysis. Burrow, was not intimidated in front of the risk of losing his authority. This way they came upon the philosopher's stone that would enable Burrow to discover the Group Method of Analysis. The problem was not in the backdrop, but in the social neurosis of which autocracy and possessive and competitive attitudes of our society are the symptoms.

In the mid twenties, S. H. Foulkes came up against a couple of articles of Trigant Burrow and decided to use Burrow's Group Analysis for therapeutic purposes. This was probably before working with Kurt Goldstein and, without doubt, both facts happened before beginning his psychoanalytic formation. This point is important, because it clarifies some of Foulkes' intuitions and a way of understanding Psychoanalysis, since both imprintings are noticeable right from his first articles. Most probably, Foulkes had to dissimulate his familiarity with Burrow since that latter, Ex-President of the American Psychoanalytical Association in 1925, was completely ostracized by the psychoanalytic *establishment*. By 1939, once Freud had died, S. H. Foulkes could finally put his project to test, from where present-day Group Analysis was born. In 1967, the fact that his followers wished to establish an Institute of Group Analysis in the image and resemblance of the API, he considered uncontrollable. He then created GAIPAC as a preventive measure. This has been the institution that has served as continent to European Group Analysis.

In 1950, the same year of the death of Trigant Burrow's, John Rickman writes an article about the psychology of one, two, three, four or more bodies. In 1951, he writes another article about the psychology of one, two, three or more persons. By then, Foulkes had already published his introductory book, subtitled "A study on social integration of individuals and groups", where he exposes for the first time his "model of three", fundamental beginning of all group psychotherapy and the only way to get out of the impasse between observer and observed. This is the equivalent of what Bion calls binocular vision, the one of the Sphinx, the one of scientific knowledge.

I shall close my exposition about the professional Plexus stating that the analyst's professional plexus has different characteristics throughout his professional life and, in consequence, varies in function of the needs of the members and of the group as a whole. You will remember me saying that, first he needs a group of colleagues from whom to learn the craft, and with whom to identify, then he needs a group to belong to which supports and accredits him and, finally, he requires a group of colleagues he has confidence with sufficient conditions of psychological and material security where to refer and go on processing his experiences and contrasting his ideas, in other words, groups of identification, of pertaining, and of reference.

If we compare the Berlin Model, the classical for instituted analytical training, with the one we arrive at adopting a groupanalytic frame of reference, this is to say the "Training Network in Action", we observe that both rest on the same fundamental tripod: personal analytical experience in the method which one pretends afterwards apply to others, application of the supervisory method by more experienced people, and theoretical and technical transmission and progress. What is radically different is the model of professional development with which one operates. The first is based on the "model of two" described by Freud in *Mass Psychology*, totally in consonance with the structure of the patriarchal family or the primal horde prevailing in a cultural community whose neurosis is expressed in competitive, possessive and egocentric attitudes and in which order consists in ascending the hierarchic ladder. The second, on the other hand, is a democratic and evolutionary model based on cooperative action and where the needs, the dependencies of the analyst are satisfied guided by that principle of progressive "decrecendo" of Foulkes.

You will ask me, how does one translate this into practice? Very simple. The group of identification, the one in which the pupil learns and identifies himself with his craft should be a temporal institution and not permanent, for the students as well as for the teachers. The group of pertinence (of pertaining) in turn is the one that supplies the precise cooperation between colleagues in the relations with society in the widest sense. The group of reference, on the other hand, is the one which permits the analyst to keep on advancing in his own science, it is the one that radically applies to it the principles it preaches. If we make use of the old *alma mater* of Psychoanalysis, Medicine, the first would correspond to the Faculty, which bestows the right to practice and teach the profession, the second would correspond to the Professional Associations or Medical Orders and, finally, the third would correspond to the Laboratory and Academy of Medical Sciences

On various occasions Freud has identified Psychoanalysis with the impossible professions. It may be valid to ask if the impossible is not to try that Psychoanalysis be a profession. After all, as Bernard Shaw said so aptly, all profession is a conspiracy against laity. On the other hand, if humanity is neurotic, neurotic will be the psychoanalytic community. But, in case we follow the advice of "group, first cure thyself" and to have the misfortune of achieving it, the fate of a healthy psychoanalytic community is the one of the Lifwynn Foundation: The most absolute ostracism. On the other hand, in a scientific community with these characteristics perhaps we would not have to worry about the problem of priorities, principal vice that Psychoanalysis drags with it from its very beginnings, neither would it be necessary to resort to *criptomnesias* when they catch us wanting. Perhaps as a motto the following verses of Goethe could serve us well:

"Was in der Luft ist und was die Zeit fordert, das kann in hundert Köpfen auf einmal entspringen, ohne dass einer es dem andern abborgt." (What is in the air and what the times demand, can sprout from a hundred heads at the same time, without one having to borrow it from the other).

ⁱ NOTE

1. The group approach requires a change of paradigm which on an organizational level presupposes regular and continuous spaces of reflection within the institutions ... and the possibility of continuous training within them ...
2. Choosing this approach does not mean that any other is less close to reality or is less true. If it was chosen it was because it had been considered that at that time it was the best instrument of analysis for a reasonable and reasoned participative change...
3. It was confirmed in the work of the Collective itself as well as the group experiences examined that there exist considerable resistances to group work on an individual and institutional level, and the health system itself ... similar to the defences of pairing and fight-flight... or, the tendency to relegate the group work to a mere technical-therapeutic function applied to very specific groups and this way controllable on the individual level as much as the social. Another systematic resistance was not to foresee the aforementioned spaces of critical reflection or, in the case of being foreseen, not to use

them for this purpose but for the resolution of urgent problems according to well known models, this way avoiding the possibility of change...

4. Since a concept very much related to the group approach is change, we proposed to the SEPTG to undertake an institutional analysis. This was accepted, carried out and presented to the following two yearly Symposiums. It represented an important progress for the aforementioned Society...
5. We arrived at the conclusion that a group approach turns around the following central ideas: 1) The non-directive aspect of the experience, 2) the emphasis on the relational, and 3) the conviction that there exists a latent structure in any group phenomenon which, when it becomes manifest, induces creative changes in the group and in the members that integrate it ...

