

COMMENTS ON

A POSTHUMOUS PROLOGUE of S.H.FOULKES WORK



By Juan CAMPOS AVILLAR

This version should have appeared over five years ago. The idea was to make it coincide with the famous VI International Congress of Psychotherapy in Madrid, July 1976, and which eventually took place in Philadelphia one year later. Publishing difficulties and the sad decease of the author, S.H. Foulkes, caused the publication to be postponed until now.

My interest and urgency that the work be published as soon as possible was due to two main reasons. On the one hand, to fulfil the relative void in the Spanish-speaking environment in relation to group-analytic literature and, on the other, to correct some of the misunderstandings due to bad translations of S.H. Foulkes' work. On this subject we held long conversations and exchanged letters. From this correspondence I have extracted a few paragraphs in which I justify my boldness in rescuing from oblivion a foreword which very well he could have written himself. On October 13th, 1975 he wrote to me in one of his letters:

"Thank you very much for your nice letter, and I am particularly pleased that you go ahead with the translation. I don't think there will be any special difficulties from this end.

"As to the foreword, I think it would be very much nicer for you to write this. One point I would be pleased to see mentioned is of course that this opens the book also for South America - and it seems to me that their approach to groups, in spite of certain differences, is in a very similar direction to my own."

At the time I did not understand his reason for wanting me to write the prologue, nor could we foresee his premature death or the circumstances that would make the publication of his book so difficult. In fact, I secretly wished that he would do it himself. There would be time enough to convince him! What's more, I had hoped that the publication of this version would be followed by the book on theory that he was working on. From my point of view, Methods and Principles without its partner is an unfinished work, in spite of its content in theory. Chapter six and especially parts II and III -The Conductor as a Group Analyst and Observations and Maxims- are full of theory, so much so that it will be difficult to really understand for someone who is not familiar with the rest of his work.

To prologue an unfinished work is not an easy task, more so when it belongs to the person who introduced me into the "impossible profession" of psychotherapies. The only justification of such an attempt is the promise I gave the author before his death. Overwhelmed by the responsibility, however, but not wanting to flee from it, I believe the best thing would be to recover what the author himself wished to be said in this first edition of his book addressed to Spanish-speaking readers. Fortunately, I find myself in a privileged position since, apart from the hours spent discussing the subject with him, I recently discovered that in his last letter to me this prologue was practically already

written. I will therefore translate his words, naturally leaving out personal remarks alien to the subject, after which I will add a few comments to facilitate understanding of the text within the group context where it originated and to which it is addressed.

In answer to a letter from me, on October 27th, 1975 I received a long letter with detailed instructions for the foreword:

Dear Juan,

Thank you very much for your letter of 19th October regarding the good progress of the Spanish translation of «GROUP-ANALYTIC PSYCHOTHERAPY: Method & Principles». The Spanish translation of the Pelican book has already been posted to you - it is one of only two copies I have - together with a list of translations of my books to date.

*As to your foreword, I do not think it is necessary to give lengthy tribute to South American work; their bias is as you say, but this may change in time. There is a group of colleagues in Peru (largely due I think to Professor Seguin of Lima) who are positively inclined to us. Feder and others in Mexico are also friendly, having had struggles with their Kleinian colleagues. Miller de Paiva, from the Argentine, writes interestingly, though using Bionian jargon, in **GAIPAC**, and B. Blay Neto who is Executive Director of **FLAPAG** (Federação Latino-Americana di Psicoterapia Analitica de Grupo), based in Sao Paulo, has always been very friendly.*

I think myself that the book by Grinberg et al is not at all bad, though as you say they misunderstand my view. They all were influenced here in London by Kleinians, the Tavistock etc., and I had little contact with them. Their main misunderstanding is that they think we give only interpretations to the group as a whole, and that we stress verbal communication, whereas what I have always said is that, in the typical therapeutic group-analytic group, we treat the individual in the context of the whole situation, represented in this case by the group and its boundaries.

This is by distinction with groups with a task --- what Bion calls work groups --- and I myself have called much earlier groups with an occupation, to be approached primarily as a group in view of their task, or the larger organisation of which they are a part (e.g. in industry). The paramount and first experimental study of this took place in the first Therapeutic Community at Northfield Military Hospital (see my Introductory book). This was quite independent of Bion.

In any case it is perhaps not generally known that I began treating groups on analytic lines two or three years before anyone else here had ever done such work.

In America my holist approach has often been seen as linked to that of Kurt Lewin, as this was the only one they knew when I first visited the USA (1948/49). I on the other hand had barely heard of him, and to my knowledge I have not been influenced by him. I used the term "group-dynamic" in the sense of psychodynamics in the group, whereas Kurt Lewin was I think antagonistic to psychoanalysis. They discovered the therapeutic effect of sensitivity meetings (T-groups) accidentally somewhere around 1946, while with me it grew from my therapeutic experience as a psychoanalyst at the end of 1939. Some affinity between Kurt Lewin's holist orientation and my own may well exist through my acquaintance with Gestalt theory to which I came through my work under the neurobiologist Kurt Goldstein.

We psychoanalysts in Frankfurt also had contacts with some sociologists there, through Max Horkheimer and his circle. Personally I also had fruitful contacts here in London with Franz Borkenau and Norbert Elias and their work, (both of whom have good knowledge of psychoanalysis and group-analysis, similarly with the anthropologist Meyer Fortes. (Borkenau had been with Horkheimer, Elias with Karl Mannheim, both in Frankfurt). What is important is that at that time the sociologists assured me that there was no relevant literature in sociology

concerned with small groups. I have however learned quite a bit from anthropological literature. This is for your information...

Another point of specific significance in my approach was the establishment of a largely unstructured situation, and the discovery of "free-floating discussion" on the part of group members taken together, as an equivalent of "free association". The ongoing work consists in the gradual analysis and mutual de-coding of all observable behaviour, including all symptomatology, so-called psychosomatic as well as intercurrent illnesses, accidents etc. It is all this which I mean by communication. The working through corresponds to the making conscious of the unconscious in psychoanalysis. When this working through has taken place insight becomes possible, together with the capacity to state the problems in verbal terms. Grinberg et al did not understand this at the time, and many, especially in South America, seem to think that what I meant was more or less intellectual interpretation.

Another specific feature of my approach is in relation to the "here and now": though I have not made this into a slogan, it has from the beginning been essential for me to put into the centre of attention the approach to the current conflict situations in life as well as in the therapeutic situation itself. I do however accept recollections and repetitions from the past, when they come into the present context.

You probably already know most of this, and it has partly been said before, but I thought it might be helpful to you to set it down in case you wish briefly to characterise some features of my approach. I hope it will be of some help.

With best wishes, yours



S. H. Foulkes MD FRCPSYCH

POSTSCRIPT TO A PRESENTATION AND A POSTHUMOUS PROLOGUE

There is little I can add to the presentation made by Malcolm Pines, President of the International Association of Group Therapy, co-founder with S.H. Foulkes of the Group Analytic Society and the Institute of Group-Analysis, and one of the most faithful interpreters and followers of his work, as well as the letter by the author that I have just quoted as a foreword.

In truth, very little of what he said sounded new. Except perhaps the detail on his relations with Kurt Lewin, the rest we had already talked over and discussed more than once. It always worried me why group-analytic theory and practice had not been well understood on the other side of the Atlantic, and its scarce acceptance and diffusion in the Americas. During my trips to London and the times I visited him this issue was often the subject of our conversations. I have written on it extensively^{1,2} but in view of this prologue and with the publication of this, his last book, in Spanish version, I believe it is worth expanding on this.

My interest in this subject arose coinciding with the beginning of my formal training as a psychoanalyst and group analyst at the Postgraduate Center for Mental Health in New York. I addressed myself there

¹ Campos, Juan: "Psicoanálisis, Psicoanalistas y Terapias Grupales", en Psicología Dinámica Grupal, Fundamentos, Madrid, 1980.

² Campos, Juan: " La Orientación Grupo-Analítica en la Formación de Psicoterapeutas", Argot, Barcelona, 1979, pp. 23-41.

precisely due to the suggestion and recommendation of S.H. Foulkes since this centre was, at the time, the only psychoanalytical institute offering a formal training program as a group analyst concurrently to the classical training in individual psychoanalysis. To my great surprise I discovered that Foulkes - who had been there only a couple of years earlier and was highly respected - had not been understood at all. Wolf and Emanuel Schwartz had just published the controversial article «*The Myth of Group Dynamics*» considering Foulkes a group dynamicist in spite of acknowledging him as a classical Freudian psychoanalyst. From my position as a student, this false accusation puzzled me. I had been working with S.H. Foulkes at the Maudsley the previous year and he had initiated me in the field of psychoanalysis; with him I had taken my first steps as a psychotherapist and my understanding of group-analysis had nothing in common with what was taught at the Postgraduate Center. It would take me years to understand why it is so difficult to grasp the essence of group-analysis and where the source of the resistance to finding out comes from.

I received the first clue from Foulkes himself in a lecture that he gave on July 27th, 1975 during the *International Colloquium on Group-Analytic Psychotherapy*. Due to the coincidence of the Colloquium with an International Congress of Psychoanalysis in London; it was attended by psychoanalysts from all over the world. The title of the paper he presented there was "Qualification as a psychoanalyst, an advantage and a limitation for the future group-analyst". In it he considered the limitations of the analyst as resistances and the main defence in relation to group psychotherapy is described as an attempt to approach the group-analytic situation to the psychoanalytic situation which psychoanalysts are familiar with and feel comfortable with. After describing how these defences can be applied, he concludes by saying:

*"There is no need for these resistances and defences. If, on the contrary, they are genuinely overcome and partisan attitudes, emotionally maintained, are abandoned, it is possible to reach a truly scientific attitude, a total integration. This is especially true with what begins to be known as "psychoanalytic psychotherapy". In this context, the term psychotherapy is considered equal in quality to psychoanalysis and not as an inferior or cheaper method, as used to be the case. In this sense, I named my own method "group-analytic psychotherapy" and not group psychoanalysis. Classical psychoanalysis should perhaps be contemplated and understood within the conceptual framework of Freud's own time."*³

Two elements stand out in this paragraph: on the one hand, the reassessment of psychotherapy and group psychotherapy as therapeutic methods as valuable as psychoanalysis itself and, on the other, Foulkes' adherence to the scientific method and a correct "analytical attitude". I will comment both aspects later but I would like to underline here that to Foulkes himself, having been formally trained as a psychoanalyst and remaining forever loyal to the International Association of Psychoanalysis and a teacher at the *British Psychoanalytic Society*, these resistances were not alien to him nor was it easy for him to overcome those present in his environment and his time.

From my point of view, the main resistance that psychoanalytic training promotes is in the very theoretical conceptual framework it inserts us into and from which all psychotherapeutic practice is considered. To take the step, which already from the group-analytic situation implies a paradigmatic break not easy to assimilate, is still more difficult when this break is to take place within a social, professional, extremely dogmatic and rigid context, as is the case with psychoanalytic societies to the present. As S.H. Foulkes and E.J. Anthony said in their book «*Group Psychotherapy: The Psychoanalytic Approach*» after its second revised edition of 1965:

"These present writers consider that psychoanalytic concepts, clinical and theoretical, are firmly rooted to begin with in the one- and later in the two-personal situation. There is no intrinsic reason why psychoanalysis should not in the future extend its dimension and claim that group-analysis is psychoanalysis in the multi-personal situation. If and when this should be stated it

³ Foulkes, S. H., "Qualification as a Psychoanalyst an asset as well as a hindrance for the future Group analyst", *Group Analysis* VIII/3,1975.

would become clear, however, that the whole of psychoanalytical theory and practice would have to be changed, and far removed from the mind and intention of its originator... For the time being, we think as psychoanalysts that its discipline has an important function to fulfil on its own grounds. We do not wish to inaugurate yet another neo-analytic school of thought. In the meantime we firmly reject the idea that experiences in group psychotherapy should be limited by present-day psychoanalytical concepts. Group-analysis is free to develop within the greater framework of psychotherapy. Its effects inside this have been described as a revolution."⁴

From the beginning, Foulkes was intimately convinced that for the development of group-analysis it was not enough just to borrow psychoanalytic concepts and apply them to the group situation; rather, starting from the situation itself and in its own right, group psychotherapy should develop its own theory. This belief would lead him to a contradiction that was difficult to escape from.

I would not fully agree with Malcolm Pines that only death prevented Foulkes from writing his book on theory. I would dare to suggest that it was the other way round; it was his intimate conflict between wanting and being able to write it and contemplating the consequences of doing so which would eventually lead him to his death. I am aware that my assumption is risky, but there are biographical elements in his life that justify it. Writing his first book -«*Introduction to Group-Analytic Psychotherapy: Studies in the Social Integration of Individuals and Groups*»-, which he did in three weeks flat, during which time he hardly slept or stopped chain-smoking, led him to his first heart failure, the same lesion which cost him his life during the group session referred to by Pines. However, apart from the accuracy of my interpretation, it is true that Foulkes found it extremely difficult to write theory, as opposed to the fluidity and ease with which he put forth his clinical experiences. As Malcolm Pines said of him on another occasion: "Foulkes was never a formal teacher, his strength lay in the creative discussion with his colleagues and in what I would call "a creative monologue" with himself, during which he developed his ideas and explored en viva voce the new possibilities which opened up."⁵ Obviously, this type of thinking and of transmitting his thought did not find its best vehicle in written language which, perforce, must be carried out alone and not within a communicational context such as the group.

Writing was difficult for Foulkes and reading him is not less so, especially if his work is read in translated form. As an example, let us take the translation of the first Penguin edition, 1957, of «*Group Psychotherapy: The Psychoanalytic Approach*». It was presented with the title «*Psychoanalytic Group Psychotherapy*»⁶, nothing more deceitful or possibly further removed from the meaning and intention the authors had in mind for the original title in English. The translator did not realize that a psychoanalytic approach in group psychotherapy leads to Group-Analysis and not to Psychoanalytic Group Psychotherapy, a name coined by Alexander Wolf and Emanuel Schwartz to define the approach to group psychoanalysis which they practice.⁷

Clearly, the difficulty is not in the text but rather the context -psychoanalytic or groupanalytic- from which it is considered. The translator and the publisher cannot understand, in the Buenos Aires of 1965 -the same date that the English revised edition appeared- that Psychoanalysis and Groupanalysis, although related, are different or, simply, that a book will sell even if its title is not qualified as psychoanalytic.

Foulkes is one of the few psychoanalysts with classical Freudian training who never gave up his condition of psychotherapist nor lost his identity as a psychoanalyst for having dared to penetrate the

⁴ Foulkes, S. H. & Anthony, E. J. *Group Psychotherapy; The Psychoanalytic Approach* (Revised Third Edition), Penguin Books, Ltd. London, 1973, p 17.

⁵ Pines, M. "Farewell", GAIPAC IX/2, July 1976.

⁶ Foulkes, S. H. & Anthony, E. J. *Psychoanalytic Group Psychotherapy*, Paidós, Buenos Aires, 1959.

⁷ Wolf, A. & Schwarz, E. K., *Psychoanalysis in Groups* NY, Grune & Stratton, 1962.

mysterious and obscure field of group psychotherapies. After a time of enthusiasm for the group, many others returned to individual psychoanalysis repenting with a *mea culpa* or simply losing interest and never speaking of it again. Even for him it was not an easy task and the struggle it implied and the contradictions he had to overcome are reflected in the content of his work. The apparent incompatibility between Psychoanalysis and Group-Analysis stems from a misunderstanding as to which are the specific objects peculiar to each. The former is concerned with the functioning of the human mind and the genesis of the normal or pathological personality; the latter is a form of psychotherapy, a mental treatment given within the group context, and it is the group that enables the possible change in the people who submit to it when the group is conducted on psychoanalytic lines.

From my own point of view, S.H. Foulkes' main merit, his most valuable instrument for the task of transformation and change which he initiated in the analytic practice of psychotherapies, lies in the *analytic attitude* that he was able to develop thanks to his personality, his extensive and profound training and experience as a psychoanalyst, psychiatrist and psychotherapist. The main characteristic of this analytic attitude lies in the conviction that "*everything that occurs within a context, everything without exception, is there to be analysed*". The holistic, organismic, gestaltic ideas of his teacher K. Goldstein and the influence of the Frankfurt School of Sociology to which he was closely linked, contributed to developing the scientific and therapeutic attitude with which he confronted his task with groups. Amongst other things, this attitude led him to avoid transferring concepts peculiar to psychoanalysis -the transference didactic situation- to the multipersonal therapeutic situation of the therapeutic group, with the same rigour be it with natural groups or transference groups of strangers. This concern, together with his care to differentiate his functions as a psychoanalyst from those as a group analyst, are partly responsible for S.H. Foulkes' personal style and the incomprehensibility attributed by some to his written work.

Psychoanalytic practice in the Americas, its boom in South and North America rests on the social attitudes of an elitist profession -Medicine- and a middle class anxious for instant happiness and for attaining positions of perfection, power and prestige by means of payment. In these circumstances, it is not unlikely that psychoanalysis becomes a prized market product to be exploited within a liberal system of medical practice. Naturally this would lead to the enhancement of the individualistic versus the group approach and, also to considering the group as a method equivalent to mass psychoanalysis, a conception of "chain production" naturally of inferior quality in relation to the individual "handmade" conception; the group is considered at most as a second best product with which to repair social injustices and to be distributed in psychiatric hospitals.

S.H. Foulkes' approach always was and continued to be radically different. The way his first psychotherapeutic group began gives us an idea of this. Contrary to popular belief and to what most psychoanalysts did, Foulkes never thought of setting up groups as a way of increasing his productivity and performance as a psychoanalyst, or for making psychoanalysis cheap and therefore available to the population at large. Foulkes conducted his first analytic group in the waiting room of his surgery in the small town of Exeter in the county of West Country in 1939. He worked there as a psychotherapist -in the surgery of a General Practitioner with whom he had formed a partnership. As he recalls, on a tape which I keep, his practice as a psychoanalyst in London had been temporarily interrupted due to the war. He was also waiting to join the army as a military psychiatrist, a post for which he had volunteered, and decided to settle down in this small town near the Northfield Hospital to which he would later be assigned. In these circumstances, while he waited, he could not initiate classical psychoanalytic cures. He was also relatively isolated from the psychoanalytic community. He carried out psychoanalytically oriented psychotherapies of two or three weekly sessions. He thus recovered his vocation as a psychotherapist, the practice of which he had left aside during many years due to his exclusive dedication to psychoanalysis and didactic analysis. He felt liberated; it was like a breath of fresh air; he also realized that the analytic attitude developed during his years of dedication to psychoanalysis had enhanced his efficiency as a therapist and refined his capacity for understanding psychotherapeutic processes.

It was at this time that he dared to explore an idea which had puzzled him for some time. What would happen -he asked himself- if I brought together all these patients in treatment with me and we all were to freely and openly discuss what occurs in this situation? And so he did. The experience was a success. Upon his return home he told his wife: "Today a historical event in Psychiatry has taken place, but nobody knows about it." He had put the foundation stone of Group-Analysis. Group Analysis was born and the waves it would produce would not stop on the shore of the group-therapeutic groups. It is clear, therefore, that in March 1943 when he joined the Northfield Neurosis Rehabilitation Center he had already been working as a psychoanalyst with psychotherapeutic groups for three years.

I will not extend myself here on the role played by S.H. Foulkes in the Northfield Experiments, the magnificent adventure of British war psychiatry of which he gives careful account on several occasions. Northfield was the cradle of English social psychiatry, a fascinating subject which I refer to elsewhere⁸. Group psychotherapies, therapeutic communities and therapeutic social clubs originated there. Nevertheless, it is worth pointing out the distinction made by S.H. Foulkes between "*groups with an occupation*" and group-analytic groups in relation to their specific functions; his priority for the concept and, apart from the widespread use he would make of the latter both in the Rehabilitation Wing at Northfield and the organization of different services later, his teaching activities and societies or projects that he inspired or promoted.

When Foulkes' work is seen retrospectively, one cannot but be impressed by the courage of his pioneering effort and the productiveness, efficiency and solidity of the task he undertook. His first book gives us an idea of his ambition and disposition, what he was searching for and towards where he was heading with such an endeavour. The subtitle -"Studies on the integration of individuals and groups"- patently reflects the intention of his «*Introduction of Group-Analytic Psychotherapy*».⁹ An undoubtedly ambitious task, it meant picking up where Freud had left off as a group psychologist and, through the psychology of the Ego, reach Group Analysis. Not content with this, he also wanted to give all this psychology a therapeutic use and a social projection.

The book began with a maxim by Confucius which, from my point of view, constitutes the leitmotiv, the slogan in Foulkes' intellectual development and specifically marks his style of learning and teaching others to do so. The maxim reads:

"I do not expound my teaching to any who are not eager to learn; I do not help out anyone who is not anxious to explain himself; if, after being shown one corner of a subject, a man cannot go on to discover the other three, I do not repeat the lesson."

In this modern version of the game of the four corners, from the couch Foulkes goes on to the circle and once there he seeks to triangle it avoiding it to become a square. Foulkes is a systemic thinker ahead of his time. The first pages of his *Introduction (...)* seem to be written by Bertalanffy even without having read him at the time. He thinks in terms of open systems and his thinking certainly does not lack negentropy. For him, communication, the interaction between the whole and its parts and the relations between the elements -individuals- and the whole -society- constitutes the focus of his group analysis. "*The place where psychology and sociology meet*" is in the group-analytic group made up of a reduced number of people allowing communication and interaction face to face between them to still be socially pertinent. "*Group-Analysis is a method of psychotherapy in small groups, but also a method for the study of groups and the behaviour of human individuals in their social aspects.*" It is at once a research method, a theory and a form of therapy that can be applied both to healthy or ill individuals, to primary or secondary groups, or to more or less complex social organizations with therapeutic, training, learning or simply vital problem-solving ends in mind. S.H. Foulkes' task, his field of application and research is not limited, however, only to the small group-therapeutic type of group. The circle that symbolizes it expands and grows till it becomes a round table which always rests on a tripod.

⁸ Campos, Juan "Bion and Foulkes: Comrades at Arms", in print, 1981.

⁹ Foulkes, S. H., "*Introduction to Group Analytic Psychotherapy. Studies in the Social Integration of Individuals and Groups*", W. Heinemann Medical Books, Ltd., London, 1948.

On a theoretical level, its three legs are the following: the one of the social reticular theory -*the network theory of neurosis*-; the one of the matrix of the group, dynamic of the therapeutic situation -*the group matrix*- and, finally, the one which relates to processes of training, education and social organization of psychotherapists. The latter a theory which, by using one of his concepts, I would dare to call it *the professional plexus*, concerned with how the professional scientist, the psychotherapist develops his analytic attitude, how he conceptualizes, organizes and justifies his practice and becomes an agent of therapeutic change.¹⁰

Foulkes' groups, as we know, began in a psychotherapeutic context. His curiosity as a researcher lay in carrying out a study in action; in collecting clinical data on the therapeutic processes that take place within a group when it assumes *free-floating discussion* as its norm and style of communication and the communications and interactions that take place are received and treated with an analytic attitude. S.H. Foulkes' search was directed towards the elaboration of a dynamic theory of psychotherapeutic processes using operational concepts which would be "studied, elaborated and applied in the actual process of therapy. A theory that studies the processes of change by means of clinical observation within the therapeutic situation, fully accepting the fact and exploiting till its ultimate consequences the idea that therapy is research and research in this field is therapy."¹¹ Foulkes, one of the few psychoanalysts experienced in group analysis enlisted in Northfield, when he dedicated himself to "groups with an occupation", that is, treatment and rehabilitation of neurotic soldiers for their incorporation to civil life or re-enlistment in the army, what he did was to extend the formulation of his experience as a psychotherapist to that specific situation adapting it to the global context and to the specific task of therapy, rehabilitation or apprenticeship of the groups in which he took part. He would do the same later in his work in general or psychiatric hospitals and with *his training project for psychotherapists and groupanalysts*.

S. H. Foulkes' work in small groups and the concept of group-dynamics that he reached are sometimes mistaken with the work of W.R. Bion and the analytic group dynamicists of the Tavistock, and also with Kurt Lewin and the *Research Center for Group Dynamics* of M.I.T. The responsibility of this misunderstanding is partly due to the account of the historical development of group-analysis made by Anthony in the introductory chapter of the first Penguin edition of the book. In later editions Foulkes would correct this misunderstanding though not explain the reasons for it. His explanation in relation to Lewin in the foreword clarifies any doubt about K. Lewin's supposed paternity of his ideas and in the third edition of his book he literally states "We do not believe "group-dynamics" has much to do with the small psychotherapeutic group; in this sense we agree with Wolf and others. If we sometimes use terms also employed by K. Lewin in his work, these have different connotations and dimensions although not necessarily contrasting in their use. In our approach of the hospital "therapeutic community" at Northfield, we realized our group-analytic points of view matched quite well with concepts used in "field theory" and later this aided us in our own outlook. The concept of "social field", for example, pertains to this. After all, we have a foundation as far as Gestalt Psychology" is concerned. However, later he explains "We use the term "group-dynamics" as the equivalent of "group-psychodynamics", in the sense of Freud's unconscious dynamics. So as to avoid confusion, we later adopted the term "group processes" instead."¹²

In relation to W.R. Bion, his small "*study groups*" and his concept of group-dynamics also lead in another direction. Bion is concerned with examining Freud's conceptualization of human groups at the light of "the modern developments of psychoanalysis associated with the work of Melanie Klein."¹³ For this he carried out his experiences with groups. For this he adopted an experimental method and apparently he was never very convinced that his technique would serve for conducting therapeutic

¹⁰ Campos, Juan, "*Foulkes' Network Theory and the Scope of Group Analysis in Family Therapy*" VIII International Congress of Group Psychotherapy, Plenum Pub. Corp, NY 1981.

¹¹ Ibid 4, p. 269.

¹² Ibid 4, pp. 20 y 21.

¹³ Campos, Juan, "Leyendo a S. H. Foulkes con ánimo de entenderlo", *Clinica y Análisis Grupal*, No 20, 1980.

groups.

The attempt to integrate "*group dynamics*" with psychoanalysis was not very successful judging by the results and its projection in the field of group therapies, no matter how much some tried; for example, G.A. Bach with K. Lewin's or Eziel's ideas and the Tavistock groupanalysts with Bion's. The field which has truly benefitted from these ideas is that of "training for leadership within a bureaucratic organization" at the *Tavistock Institute of Human Relations*, or the sensitivity training in human relations of the *National Training Laboratory in Group Development* in Washington. The basic educational element in the Conference Method used by the former or the Laboratory Method used by the latter are the Bionian study group and the Lewinian T-group, respectively.¹⁴

Projection of S.H. Foulkes' work, on the other hand, has mainly focused so far on the field of mental health and training of psychotherapists, though it also has applications in education and organizational problem-solving. Apart from the internal task of research, theoretical development and training of group-analytic therapists carried out by the Society and the Institute of Group-Analysis founded by him in London, I would dare to say that Foulkes is the single person who has contributed most to the expansion of a dynamic and social psychiatry and a group approach not only in the United Kingdom but also in the rest of Europe. In Northfield, at the Maudsley, generations of psychiatrists were trained by him as therapists. When he retired from the *National Health Service* and concentrated all his activity on the development of Group-Analysis he created the Institute. Every year more than two-hundred mental health workers from the *National Health Service* seek to complete their training and competence in their work through their participation in the Introductory Course in Group Work as well as the Course in Family Therapy.

On the international level, apart from having contributed to the foundation of what is known today as the International Association of Group Psychotherapy, he also created *Group-Analysis: International Panel and Correspondence* and the *Annual European Workshops* and the *Symposia* of the Group-Analytic Society, undoubtedly one of the elements that has most contributed to the development of group therapy in the European Continent.

After Foulkes' death, as his collaborators from across the seas -*the overseas members* of the Group-Analytic Society- our concern was the future of the task he had begun. During the *European Workshop* of January 1977 we met in London with his closest followers. For the first time, Foulkes was not amongst us. The environment was charged with grief but, more so, one could perceive a feeling of great anguish during the meeting. There was a feeling of tension within the Institute of Group-Analysis, the most educational institution of those founded by him. The London group, however, was able to differentiate itself without splitting. Shortly after, the *Institute of Family Therapy* was founded, an organism which would allow to assemble the efforts of all English therapists working in this field without causing the founding groupanalysts to lose interest and contact with the development of group analysis. What is more, instead of becoming weaker, the development of group-analysis in Europe was reinforced and expanded since S.H. Foulkes' death. Today, members of the Society teach group-analysis all over Europe and have contributed to the appearance of training centres for group therapists that will undoubtedly change the approach of analytic psychotherapy in this field. The bridge between psychoanalysis and group analysis for which Foulkes struggled so hard is beginning to stand firmly and solidly. In the last International Congress of Group Psychotherapy in Copenhagen, where group-analysis played an important role, another of Foulkes' seminal ideas seemed to begin to take shape. The road to a "unified and comparatively simple theory in the field of all human behaviour which will include psychotherapy, group-therapy or community therapy of any kind" which Foulkes had desired for so many years seems to be clearing up.

Foulkes was hopeful that this book would serve to introduce his thought in Spanish-speaking parts of the world, and he was also convinced that the group approach in South America was heading in the same direction as his own. This conviction differed considerably from my own. My impression was that

¹⁴ Bion, W. R., "Group Dynamics (Re-view)", *Int. J. of Psycho-Analysis*, Vol. XXXIII, p. 2, 1952.

it was headed in a radically different direction. It would take me many years to discover that he was right. It was not until very recently, having contacted with the followers of Enrique Pichón-Rivière of the Private School of Social Psychology in Buenos Aires, that I became aware of the enormous parallelism between the developments of the ideas on groups of these two pioneer psychoanalysts. What they have in common, which deserves to be explored in depth, is that both psychoanalysts -one a Kleinian and the other a classical Freudian- when they enter the field of group experience and small group therapy they do it with eyes wide open, with a mind free of psychoanalytical prejudices and they dare to think anew what the group analytically, scientifically contributes concerning unchanging pathology, and make therapeutic change. There are underlying personal attitudes of ideological nature in both authors that lead them to search for alternatives with a greater social projection than the elitist application of psychoanalysis which, although off the point, may however explain why they dared to do so and carry out serious research in this sense.

Foulkes died as he had lived. Thinking, working and creating from within the group, in what was supposed to be the session before last of a series he had been holding with a group of colleagues. Thus he gave up his last breath. This was probably the only session in his life he did not conclude on time. Although it is true that he is no longer with us, it is also true that he has not abandoned us. That session ended and so did that group. But his work, however, goes on; his contribution is part of and is present in the network of communications and people interacting -in this group matrix, as he would say- which is what essentially constitutes group-analysis. Not in vain he would dedicate his first book *-Introduction to Group Analytic Psychotherapy-* to his "past, present and future colleagues". It is my hope and also my wish that reading this book in the language of Cervantes will contribute to the birth of many future colleagues of this quixotic enterprise initiated one day by S.H. Foulkes.