

## FROM THE POLITICS OF TEACHING TO THE PRAGMATICS OF LEARNING: GROUP ANALYSIS' GREATEST HOPE IN TRAINING

*»Group Analysis is not the child of psychoanalysis; that is only historically true. It is, infact, a more comprehensive approach which does or should comprise individual psychoanalysis.«*

SHF, 1969.

The nature of the relationship between psychoanalysis and group analysis, a major of Foulkes' concern which should be as well ours, is particularly relevant to the question of training to be debated at a European Symposium which gathers under the ambitious motto of GROUP ANALYSIS: A DIALOGUE FOR CHANGE. A true dialogue, one leading towards change, between psychoanalysis and group analysis is still pending, and is still pending at an institutional level — that is among the social organizations which sponsor one or the other approach, as well as within the mind of the scientific practitioners who, as myself, have gone through both trainings and practice both modalities of »scientific psychotherapies«.

In 1975, the Group Analytic Society, coinciding with an International Congress of Psycho-Analysis, organized a Colloquium on this topic. Foulkes spoke about the qualification as a psychoanalyst being an asset or a hindrance for the future group analyst. In principle, he came to the conclusion that it was rather a hindrance because of the built-in resistances to group analysis and of how much it takes to overcome them afterwards. However, the most serious of resistances, the one which may do greatest harm to the future development of Group Analysis, was not mentioned by Foulkes in that paper, and, I think, it is the one to which we must address our attention. The most serious risk and the surest way of neutralizing the revolutionary power of Group Analysis is to convert it into just another psychotherapeutic technique, that is in »applied group analysis«. This happened before with the revolutionary discoveries of psychoanalysis initiated by Freud of the training system adopted and the politics followed to secure the prospects of the movement by converting it into a profession. I do not think that this should be the case with the group-analytic movement, the group-analytic principles and method run against it, and this spirit is not in the dynamic matrix of the group-analytic scientific community, this network of colleagues which has been described as a training network in action.

In the institutionalization of knowledge, of which the establishment of a formal system of training and qualification is the most powerful instrument, the tendency is always towards bureaucratization and hierarchization of teaching. This is where politics enter into the organization, local politics, national and international politics within the organization and political relations with other institutions, scientific, financial, governmental and otherwise. I see some trends to-day within the group-analytic community pointing towards this most unwelcome result which I cannot avoid mentioning. In some areas, the concern for recognition and accreditation of teaching programs and organizations and the pull towards a recognized professional qualification is starting to outweigh the concern for standards and quality of learning and for attitudes conveyed through the teaching-learning process. That to me is very serious. The domain of group analysis is change in actual operation. If change, however, is taking a U-turn towards the limitations of our forerunner — psychoanalysis — then that should be considered a symptom, something explicitly to be talked about, translated into sharable and understandable language and treated as a problem to be solved. Those alarming views of mine may well be totally unjustified, just a transposition of local and national circumstances, generalized and projected to a larger, imagined situation. Nevertheless, I feel they deserve being confronted with those other countries and be examined by our community as a whole. It preoccupies me, for instance, that our Portuguese friends, a pioneer group in the formal training of group analysts and the one responsible, back in 1970, for the idea of the European Symposiums and Workshops geared at a »possible international association«, no longer are showing much enthusiasm for our gathering and the communication with them is growing thinner and thinner. I am preoccupied about some Continental susceptibilities regards British Colonialism in other countries, appearing as boundary phenomena. It preoccupies me, that the London Institute of Group Analysis, who recently has invited me to join as an Affiliate Member in order to be recognized to teach in my own country, has established a Sub-committee within its Training Committee in order to deal with international training and to grant a »Diploma in Group Analysis« to those who undertake training under the schema to be considered there.

For what I am calling here at this Symposium is not political action but groupanalytic understanding of that question. In order to do so, I feel the question should be examined vertically, that is historically, and horizontally, that is within context, institutional as well as social contexts.

First, though, let us say something about the spirit and the philosophy of training in Group Analysis.

#### *THE EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY FOR TRAINING OF GROUP BY A GROUP*

The ultimate aim of teaching is always learning. Learning in group analysis always is related to change, change in the learner and in the teacher as well and change in the teaching-learning group total situation which is established in order to make learning and change possible. This refers to change within a system, first order change, and change of the system itself, second order change, change of change, metachange (Watzlawick).

Education in the frame of Group Analysis is based on group training, that is training of a group and by a group, a learning group, in which both

trainers and trainees are included. There is no other leader in such a group, besides its task, which is learning, learning Group Analysis proper if that is the case, of learning the group-analytic way, whichever may be the subject concerned.

Group-analytic education is specially adequate for learning new things and specific skills where a radical change of attitudes in the learner is required, as is the case in most of the helping professions addressed to human beings, like education, health, social services or human individual and collective development and organization. It is specially useful for learning about those aspects of oneself and of group and communal living which remain usually unconscious, as is the case in psychotherapy, sociotherapy in general and particularly in psychoanalysis, group analysis, family therapy and community therapy. In all these activities to conduct a learning group as such or to introduce in them a learning activity so oriented, goes accompanied by resistances against learning, against change, located not only within the individual member of the group but in the group itself as well as its institutional and social contexts which sponsor and implement the experiences. First order resistances, second order resistances, metaresistances and square root resistances.

The conducting of a group analytic learning group is based on what the original etimological sense of conducting means. To conduct, from the old Latin *con-ducere*, means to lead towards a previously agreed upon aim with others. Of course, in a learning group as such there are people with more or less experience and familiarity with the group-analytic way of conducting groups. One of the main tenets of such an approach is that it is the whole group who does the job and operationally for this purpose the first task is to wean the group from its need to be led. Of course, a group cannot do a thing unless it exists as a group and it can neither be weaned from something it has not previously depended on. This is the paradoxical situation in which the conductors of such group-analytic groups are put. They have first to gather individuals together in order to build up a group, then they have to create the conditions for this group to grow into a group-analytic learning group and to instill into it the analytic culture which leads into the destruction of this group as such. Seen that way, any group-analytic learning becomes a temporary institution destined to be dissolved, terminated, once its learning aims are achieved. When it comes down to the proper training of group analysts, group-analytic education is, however, an education which never ends, and besides of not being able to proceed in isolation, it needs a group of colleagues, of group colearners to develop. Here we are heading for a second paradox. The institutionalization of a temporary institution into permanency, and of permanency in the institutionalization of change; a permanent revolution in Mao's terms, or being caught in an ever expanding spiral for change, as Pichon Rivi re would say. That is in the spirit of Group Analysis, however, a philosophical, ideological, scientific and pragmatic position, quite untenable when we get down to the pragmatics of learning. No wonder that analysis is training for uncertainty, as one group analyst has said. S. H. Foulkes was a pragmatic idealist, with faith in the human race and the possibilities for growth of a well conducted group, and his own views regarding leadership are even at present times still peculiar indeed. Neither was he a



run-of-the-mill psychoanalyst. Let us hear in his own words what he had to say in this respect:

»While it is easy to become a leader — in the popular misconception of the term — it is much more difficult to wean the group from having to be led, thus paving the way for their own independence. With both methods one can have success and it is in the last resort a political decision or a question of »Weltanschauung« which one prefers. One way lies fascism, the other a true democracy. Moreover, the latter form is the truly democratic one, the group method pays in fact the greatest tribute to the individual«. (TGA, p. 195)

and regards training...

»... indeed, it is an intrinsic pact of the group-analytic approach that rigid organization and institutionalization are avoided, so as to allow maximum flexibility to ever changing conditions. Arrangements should, as it were, be hand-made and in the closest possible contact with the realities of conditions. (TGA, p. 238)

Let us go with these two ideas in mind back to the two above mentioned paradoxes, and let us see how we get out of them. From the first one, the way out is quite easily found. The appointed conductor, let us call him or them the trainer, the teacher or the group of teachers and trainers, for the time being are recognized as such by the other members of the learning group, and they are in such capacity contracted by the sponsoring institution or directly drawing tuition fees from the students or trainees. Of course, he, she or they »become the most important variable determining the prevailing culture and tradition of the group. He must in turn use his ability in the best interest of the group. He is its first servant. He must follow the group, guiding it to its legitimate goal and helping it to cope with destructive and self-destructive elements, ideally making them unnecessary. It is of the utmost importance for the leader's function that he recognizes and keeps the dynamic boundaries of the situation, that he knows and respects what can and cannot be done or said in the circumstances from which his own mandate is derived and defined.« (MGP, p. 563)

The mandate given by the learning group to the teacher is based on the expert knowledge and in the capacity for helping them to learn the subject that the group of learners, the students, entrust him with. Of course, the students, the trainees, ignorant as they are of what group analysis is about or of how to go on learning the group-analytic way, have to start with an act of faith, a hopeful expectation. This whole situation may easily be perverted by the leader, by the students and or in connivance of both. The teacher may use his supposed knowledge and prestige to gain power, to satisfy his narcissism, to accumulate wealth, to gain followers for a cause or to convert people to his creed, all that at the expence of the group. The trainees, in turn, may join the learning group for purposes not intrinsic to learning. They may for instance aspire at becoming a therapist of others with the intention of avoiding to take care of their own ills; they may wish to learn group dynamics in order to become a group leader who knows how to exploit the needs of other members of those groups; they may, finally, find a group where to fulfill their longings for passive dependency and to satisfy the needs of belonging which are not fulfilled in their families, their social

and work life. All those ever present elements are destructive for the life of the learning group and self-destructive for its participants. It is the leaders' responsibility to help the group cope with them and make them unnecessary. But, who takes care of the teachers temptations? The one in charge, the responsible for, the teacher's tutor and guardian, is this permanent institution, the association of practitioner scientists, the community of group analysts which S. H. Foulkes convened twice in his life. The first time with the foundation, in 1952, of the Group Analytic Society (London), with the purpose of — in his words — centralizing the work of group analysts wherever it was carried out. The second time, in 1967, with the launching of GAIPAC, this large study group, a continuous workshop linked through correspondence — people who co-respond to each other — by writing and periodical face to face meetings, symposia and workshops. The eventual aim always should be to become an international association of group analysts.

The Group Analytic Society (London) has served as the container for the group-analytic work done in Great Britain and by group analysts the world over. It has been, it is and it should be this permanent institution for the institutionalization of change, the umbrella shield under which change, creative change in group analysis takes place, and where change is assured with a group-analytic approach, avoiding rigid organization and institutionalization as to allow maximum flexibility to ever changing conditions which are changing *de facto*.

GAIPAC, in turn, the most innovative and creative of scientific organizational inventions of S. H. Foulkes was thought — as far as I understand — as a safety device in order to resolve the unavoidable problems of institutionalization and bureaucratization which will come as a consequence of the training function of Group Analysis. Let us now examine how the development of this problem is emerging, which takes us to the vertical dimension, to history, and in the last instance to the politics of teaching. As Sir John Robert Seeley (1834—1895) said: »History is past politics and politics present history« (From Growth of British Policy).

### POLITICS OF TEACHING

At the time that the first course in group analysis was announced in London in September 1951, Dr. Foulkes was a well-known and respected Freudian psychoanalyst, a full member of the British Psycho-Analytical Society, author of some articles on group analysis and a book, »Introduction to Group-Analytical Psychotherapy«, and just appointed Consultant Physician, half-time, to the National Health Service's Bethlem Royal and Maudsley Hospitals, attached to the Institute of Psychiatry of the London University. He was the one to teach this course. The announcement of it read as follows:

«... The course is intended to cover both elementary and advanced levels, from a practical-technical as well as a theoretical point of view. It will include small discussion groups under the direction of experienced tutors. If there is sufficient interest, therapeutic (training) groups can also be formed. All help and assistance will be given to research projects. Personal individual supervision or other forms of teaching can be arranged on special terms. As hitherto, group work done elsewhere may be used for supervision. It will, however, be obvious to you that it is most desirable to plan and con-

trol a number of groups centrally — desirable from all points as the scientific. It will therefore be possible to absorb a number of suitable groups. All patients referred . . .«

Let us examine the circumstances under which this first course in group analysis was launched. It must be realized that this was a private initiative, an initiative of a small group of people which together with Foulkes had been willing »to give time and money and to take trouble« in order to develop Group Analysis from the forties onwards. There was no institution backing this program, neither the Institute of Psycho-Analysis and Clinic, nor the University, nor the National Health, nor any public or private foundation. Had it been otherwise, and plenty of attempts to go public had been made and chances did not lack, the destiny of Group Analysis and Foulkes' contribution to it would certainly have been quite different. This was not the first time that Foulkes' way to use the frame of group analysis — the method he had invented and the theoretical and clinical principles from which it derived — for training professionals in the use of group methods. He had done so at Northfield and was doing so at the Maudsley, but, this was certainly the first time that group analysis was used to teach Group Analysis.

Let us imagine what would have happened if in the »Battle of the Channel« which at the time was being waged within the English School of Psycho-Analysis, the Freudians had been the winners and the Tavistock Clinic instead of being turned into the »Kleinian feud« after the »palace revolution«, in Operation Phoenix, Dr. Foulkes instead of Sutherland had been appointed its Director — post for which he had actually been proposed — Let us play still harder at the could-have-been game and be bold enough to think of its impact if the British Psycho-Analytical Society had decided to host such a group program at the London Institute and Clinic of Psycho-Analysis? Let us imagine that Dr. de Maré's application to the N. H. S.'s S. W. Metropolitan Regional Hospital Board of October 1948 or the memorandum for a group-psychotherapy center at the Maudsley of February 1949 had not been turned down. In both those cases, I am sure, Foulkes' administrative responsibilities would have drained much of his time and dedication to Group Analysis and Group Analysis itself under such — outside — institutional pressures would have found still greater pressures than those which came from within: The Group Analytical Society, founded the following year.

In those days, for psychoanalysts it was anathema that psychology or psychotherapy be based fundamentally upon the group, so a vast majority of them use to be little or to ignore group psychotherapy. A most ferocious opposition of organized psychoanalysis was to be expected against someone like Foulkes who had the courage to proclaim so disturbing a thought like this: The antithesis between social and intrapsychic is misleading.« The implication that the individual has a »psy che« which is his innermost private self and possession, and that the social and cultural are outside forces, the individual interacting with them, is wrong, though a traditional notion and still reigning — often quite unconsciously. Under the auspices of the Institute of Psychiatry at the Maudsley Hospital, a group psychotherapy research and training center would not have had much taken this »soft way« of study in action and research in actual operation preconized by S. H. Foulkes and still less his preoccupation with unconscious and multipersonal — transpersonal mental processes.

So looking at it in retrospect, it was quite fortunate that Group Analysis had no other choice but be initiated privately as a »pilot center« at 22 Upper Wimpole Street in the Harley Street district of London. The history of Group Analysis is still to be written and unfortunately the documents to do so are missing. Well, that is our lack and our advantage because that way we do not have a »bible« to go back when our group is faced by the pull towards dependency and tempted to build up defenses against change, against growth and advancement. We have to rely on hearsay of what is floating in the dynamic group matrix of our scientific community, plexus and network. From what I have heard, the idea of setting up a pilot center at 22 Wimpole Street did not come from Foulkes himself. He was rather reluctant about it, as he was years later — in 1965 — when Robin Skinner proposed to initiate a comprehensive course in group work for the Association of Psychiatric Social Workers and he had to be encouraged on both occasions. From the »pilot center« were to spring what are to-day the Group Analytic Practice and the London G.A.S. The course on group work and the Training Committee established in 1967 were embryo of what to-day is the London Institute of Group Analysis.

How to interpret, understand, this imagined or real reluctance of Foulkes to formal teaching and institutionalization of training in Group Analysis is a very tricky thing. The risk lies in using facts and quotes as projective identification of one's own prejudices, biases or desires. Aware that this may well be the case, I don't mind claiming those projections as my own and apologizing beforehand for anything that may sound as a borrowed »authority argument«. I think the Confucius Maxim he chose as a foreword for his Introductory Book, clearly shows which was his departing attitude in this respect. It reads as follows:

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

Those of us who have experienced the pains and joy of being taught by S. H. Foulkes know how accurately that applies to his style of teaching. I do not feel, he derived any special sadistic pleasure at doing so. As he explained:

»I deliberately cut down formal teaching to a minimum and refrain from spoon feeding. While this involved considerable restraint on my part and often produced a sense of frustration on the part of my »pupils«, I think the results, on the whole, justified my approach.« (INTRO p. 20)

These are two points intrinsic to the group-analytic approach to training, coherent with the approach to therapy, which deserve being remembered here: its flexibility and its emphasis on learning from actual experience and the reluctance to formal instruction. May I burden you by reading again another quote:

»The present writer was aware that it was of the utmost importance to make group-analytic principles operative. People would learn more by seeing them in actual operation than by reading (being told) about them.« (Pat's Introd. 1971)

It was of relative importance to apply the group-analytic method and principles in education as long as the subject to be taught was not Group Analysis



itself. The group analysts may remain at the boundary of the situation, being in and being out, sitting on the fence, as the man on the frontier, but, when it comes down to teaching and learning Group Analysis, Foulkes or any qualified group analyst becomes part of the system and, still worse, an authority within it. To abdicate from this authority position would be wrong, to deny it a lie. Nobody can be weaned from his dependency if, transferentially or in actual reality he does not start with an authority to depend on. Remember paradox number one.

Foulkes seems to have known that once institutionalization of knowledge is started and formal training for this purpose imposed, many people are likely to seek training as a path for a prestigious occupational choice, and not just because they are eager to learn or anxious to explain themselves, and worse still, they will be content with the first lesson and will not care to search for the other three corners of the subject. That is why I think Foulkes was reluctant to teach group analysis to anybody because he looked for a group to be his master where to learn from. Group Analysis was still and let us hope will be for ages and ages a scientific endeavour on the making. Foulkes, in consequence, was still so eager to learn, so anxious to explain himself, to find an answer to the riddle of the Sphinx, that what he wanted were colleagues — that is, colearners, co-operators, co-workers, conductors — people with whom to lead together the group in search of human truth.

If we contemplate under this light what had happened before this decision to offer, privately, a course in group analysis, then things start to fall into place and we will understand which had been the politics of training in group analysis.

Let us take a flash-back to its earliest days. Let us take as a start for training in Group Analysis Foulkes' association with Mrs. Eve Lewis at Exeter at Dr. Craig's office and at the Child Guidance Clinic from 1939 up to his incorporation as a Major of the BAMC, specialist in Psychiatry, at the Northfield Military Hospital near Birmingham. Of course, I am aware that means letting aside Foulkes' previous personal training, readings and clinical experiences which led into his discovery as well as his family background and the social and political situation in Europe, the Nazi Regime, the October Revolution and the fact that he was born to be a wandering Jew. All those things were part of his network, part of him, but he still had not yet started to think and to act under group analytic assumptions, which are guided by the insight that neurosis is a multipersonal manifestation, and that the »mind« was based on multipersonal, transpersonal, processes.

Group-analytic education's beginnings are those Foulkes' himself with the help of Mrs. Eve Lewis. I have the feeling she played for him the role Wilhelm Fliess played for Sigmund Freud. She helped him build this minimum group of colleagues, a group of two in that case, which is needed in order to be trained not by himself and neither by somebody else, but by a group. Mrs. Lewis did not persevere as a group analyst and she did not because regardless on how gifted she was and how much she learned together with S. H. Foulkes and in spite of the fact that she continued to practice group psychotherapy with children up to the end of her days, she did so in isolation, she did not have a group of colleagues with whom to think through her experiences, with whom to share and contrast her ideas, with whom to continue their



training after she had started so well. I think, Mrs. Lewis was the first trained group analyst to become a technician, someone who applies group analytic theory and knows how to do work with groups, but lacks the time, the interest or the social opportunity to study in action, to do research in actual operation, to advance clinical and theoretical elaboration on the work done. An example not to be followed. Group Analysis' greatest misadventure and surest way of achieving that group analysis does not change anything. A warning to be remembered by those future group analysts in training who look forward only to graduation day to forget about learning, learning they feel is imposed by the institution on them.

Foulkes, on the contrary, knew that a great discovery had come into his hands and that he would always need a group of colleagues in order to learn group analysis, in order to become a group analyst. So he went to Northfield more eager to learn than to teach. The Northfield Experiment which he followed all the way through was a test bench for the principles he had learned from his group work at Exeter, and he learned from his work and the work of and with other colleagues a lot. At his return to London after the war in 1946 he joined a small circle of psychiatric colleagues who had done group work during the war and still were experimenting with it in their civilian jobs as psychiatrists in different hospitals in the London area and elsewhere. We do not know which role Foulkes played within this small group of forerunners of group analysis. He played host, we know, by offering his home at 7 Linnell Close as a meeting place on Monday evenings. If that group is or is not equiparable to Freud's Wednesday evenings' Psychological Society is difficult to say. Neither kept accurate minutes of the proceedings.

The first thing we know for sure about the task of such a group is the research on communication. The study of communication in a group by a group was presented at the first International Congress of Mental Health in 1948. A paper by the way which should be carefully studied by anyone interested in Group-Analytic group analysis is built. What we know is that it was quite an informal group which took more than four years to raise the question about the need of a more formal organization and not in order to meet their own needs but those arising from external interests in the groups activities. The pressures came from Dr. Foulkes and, I imagine, were related to demands for training and from his own need to produce more concrete work.

Foulkes in this respect took as peers people with less experience in group work than himself and who did not fully share his own views about Group Analysis. Knowing what it means to be in such a position from my own experience after my return home from training with Foulkes at the Maudsley and as an analytical group psychotherapist in New York, I understand what it takes to be in such a role and I cannot but admire Foulkes' merit for coming successfully out of it. March 20th, 1950, when the question was raised by Foulkes, it was not welcomed by the group, most likely a heated discussion followed his suggestion. The general feeling ran counter to more formal organization, the group agreed to continue meeting even though it had to accept that the procedure should be more systematic and contributions read and discussed. By the way, a resistance still to-day persisting within our group-analytic meetings. We love free-floating discussion regardless of the waste of time or how useless. But, what is more important and very significative,

the group decided to give itself a collective name and the one of »Group Analytic Research Center« was adopted.

So what I am intending to say is that Foulkes was more interested in research and theory building than in training. He was to learn the hard way that the analytical attitude required to do group-analytic work in group psychotherapy was not easily achieved by training in individual psychoanalysis, but rather the contrary was the case. Maybe he was mistaken in thinking that those resistances against change, those failures of some psychanalysts to apply to their own person the critical power of analysis, something he commented in his letter to Freud, were rather related to personality problems than to psychoanalytic training itself. May be not. But the social unconscious within the psychoanalytic institution deterred him from saying aloud why he was reluctant to training, and mostly to training analysis.

If we now go back and reread the announcement of the »first course« we will be ready to appreciate the weight placed on the differentials offered in that program.

Practical-technical as well as theoretical viewpoints were to be exposed, I imagine using the class method, the one which Foulkes less liked. Verbal expositions and readings to be discussed in tutorial groups. Training groups (that is experience, therapy groups) were to be formed only if enough interest was found, and supervision, personal individual supervision would be arranged on special terms. This schema did not differ much from the model which Foulkes had already developed at the Maudsley Hospital Outpatients Department Psychotherapy Unit. It was just an adaptation of that model to private practice conditions. The main reason why it was not possible to teach group analysis proper at the Maudsley was because N. H. S.'s patients could not be selected for group-analytic groups. Neither could the therapists in training nor the patients in treatment be allotted enough time for treating them in group analysis. Closed groups of nine months' duration was there the standard practice. Of course, there was no shortage of patients. Private practice had its advantages as well as its shortcomings. Groups could be slow-open and as long as the Group Analytic Practice had enough referrals of adequate patients, as many groups could be formed as required for training. The main inconvenience was the fees required from patients and the tuition fees to be paid by students. For the time being this was of little importance, since, after all, the tutors and competent group conductors were few and by force the program had to be of small size.

Foulkes had by this time proven that psychotherapy could be done at a National Health Service outpatients clinic as long as at the same time the best conditions for teaching and learning and for clinical study and research were created and integrated in the program. Now the challenge was to try to do the same thing in private practice. Of course, the members of the practice had to sacrifice part of their fees in order to pay rent and other expenses and therapy and tuition fees had to be quite high. Prospective students were registrars, house officers and may be some consultants or young psychotherapists in private practice working in the London area hospitals and clinics, National Health Service people with scarce resources. It would have been preposterous to dream that well established Harley Street psychiatrists and psychanalysts were to apply to the program. And, psychanalysts in training, besides those being trained by Foulkes himself, were quite unlikely to join

in without having to abandon their training analysis. So it is not surprising that it took some years before the program could be put into practice. The only result was a weekly seminar to be conducted by Foulkes with the old faithfuls, most of whom had been in individual and/or group analysis with him and still were, and to whom he was united in intimate work, friendship and social relations. Really the thing most of Foulkes' liking.

There is a point I want to underline here, a point which may be missed because of prudishness, but which to me is obvious. The law abstinence within this pioneer group analysts was very difficult to maintain, which, of course, implies a lot of unresolved transference phenomena within the network, transference phenomena which manifest themselves as boundary events and acting out, as conflicts in its development. I do not think this situation is avoidable in the beginning of a group analytic training group learning situation. In psycho-analysis the same happens, but there it goes unacknowledged. The only advantage in group analysis is in the fact that transference is with the group and not, let us hope, with its teachers and conductors. Of course, that is in turn very dangerous because group analysis that way may easily be converted into group brain washing and the group exploited at the service of its leader or of an ideology. That is what happened with Trigant Borrow and his phyloanalytical communities. This point of caution should be well present in our minds, a problem of utmost importance to be carefully studies and provisions taken in order to be avoided.

I think that Foulkes was very well aware of it, he knew the revolutionary ideological charge attached to group-analytic thinking and how easily democratic ideals can be turned into fascist impositions. He had in Group Analytic Society, but how not to fall in that old trap? Let us examine his own political philosophy as it is explained in his address to the first General Meeting of the Society, January 31st, 1955. He spoke about »The position of Group Analysis to-day, with particular reference to the role of this Society«. The decision to enlarge the Society by accepting into it two new categories of members — associates and students — had been taken, and, besides welcoming the newcomers it was just fair to tell them about what they are invited to join. »Our present step — said Foulkes — in broadening the basis of the Society, incorporating friends old and new, goes hand in hand with shaping this Society for its special, actual and anticipated function« (...) In order to explain this better and to make the role they may play more clear, he started by giving a survey of the total field of group psychotherapy up to that day, both at national and international levels.

Rereading this paper, it seems to me that the role he envisioned for Group Analysis is as an agent for cohesion and coherence within the field of Group Psychotherapy, may be extended to the total field of Group Analysis in general understanding by Group Analysis the comprehensive sense comprising individual psychoanalysis and all kind of analytic therapies once the fact that the nature of mental processes is multipersonal has been accepted and recognized that the essence of mental disturbances is dynamically social.

Foulkes had become interested in group analysis not as an outgrowth of individual psychoanalysis or merely as another technique. His interest in the operational and conceptual area of the group was the consequence of his insight that neurosis itself must be seen as a multipersonal manifestation (1969).



He had been impressed right from the beginning by the importance of group-analytic work as a therapeutic and research tool, an educational instrument and a meeting ground of minds. Foulkes was quite convinced that group-analytic work was the best of methods to make effective the revolutionary discoveries of psychoanalysis in a broad form: in education and in psychotherapy. Apart from the value in therapy, group analytic treatment and group-analytic study had proved by that time to be a valuable tool of investigation and teaching. But, has it also proved to be a safe enough environment for a meeting ground of minds? Foulkes thought so and that is to my mind why he allowed himself to be persuaded to found the Group Analytic Society. Psychoanalysis certainly had failed to be a meeting ground for minds. Splits based on theoretical as well as personality clashes have been plaguing the movement right from its inception. Each »neo-Freudian« school of thought which so far had appeared distinguished itself not so much because of its contribution to Freud's work but by what they had left out or distorted. To find out what they have in common and to build a safe enough space where controversy may be carried out with creative, mutually enriching and cross-fertilizing purpose, would be most welcome. Foulkes did not intend to create yet another neo-Freudian school of thought, rather his wish was to count with a space where mutual cooperation on equal basis between different disciplines and schools was possible and where controversy may be faced. He thought that for this purpose the group-analytic group was quite suited. He saw the role of the Society doubly beneficial: because of its way of functioning as well as symbolically by its example. False eclecticism certainly was not the solution. This meeting on the common ground of the group should be understood not as a compromise solution but as a dynamic proposition. As he said, »We are not here to iron out differences but to learn from each other and to test our hypotheses on the grounds of operation«. And, since he knew that in order to acquire such a comprehensive and integrating outlook, an emotional as well as an intellectual task was implied, he thought it could better be achieved by representatives and exponents of such conflicting outlooks actively meeting under the free and fair atmosphere of a forum led by group-analytic principles.

Foulkes' stress on the mutuality and the forum function of the Society may easily be overlooked and forgotten when somebody within it starts to claim: »All this nonsense has nothing to do with group analysis! That is not group analysis!« And this is unavoidable when theory becomes official doctrine, standards for training and qualification procedures are adopted as a requirement for acceptance into membership, and didactic analysts are implanted within the system. When and if that happens, all the revitalizing power of group analysis is lost, scientific freedom of its members curtailed, and the potencial revolutionary element as a change agent for society is cut out from group analysis.

This dangerous point emerges ten years afterwards, in 1964, when the Association of Psychiatric Social Workers approaches the Committee of the GAS asking them to help with their training. They were turned down, as they had been by other institutions of prestige in the city. Robin Skynner, however, insisted and, with Foulkes' reluctance, finally it was accepted to organize for them a comprehensive course in group work inspired on group-analytic principles and adapting its method to the situation. Pat de Maré

and the same Robin Skynner were the Senior Members to be in charge of that course. It was a great success, other professionals joined the course, a sister course was born from it — the Family Course — and soon their teaching enterprise became the main source of income and the principle fountain of recruiting students for Group Analysis. The same way than back in the fifties the Maudsley registrars were the ones to pressure Foulkes to set up the »pilot center« first and then the Society, now it were those same students and associates pressuring for the expansion of training outside the boundaries of the Society. Once that started, Foulkes knew, and if he did not intuitively he behaved as if he did, Group Analysis would be heading for a cross-road: to head towards institutionalization of teaching with all its advantages and inconveniences or to remain just a learned-learning society with all its pros and cons as well.

That is where the creative genius of S. H. Foulkes as a groupanalytic and not formally qualified analysts in years to come would emerge, and he invented a third element for the dispute. In 1967, he sent an S.O.S. to the world community of people sympathetic with Group Analysis to come and help save his work and save the Society: He created Group Analysis, the International Panel and Correspondence, a broader container for the group-analytic group in London who has chosen him as conductor for the development of Group Analysis in theory and practice. But his spirit at rest, he could then leave his own group to develop its own way, and he concentrated most of his efforts after retirement on the last group he had convened and for which he volunteered to act as editor — as a conductor for the time being.

Things in the group of London started to change at a fast rate. The same year of 1967 the Society with the establishment of a Training Committee composed of Senior Members planted the seeds of an embryo Institute of Group Analysis which was going to differentiate itself definitively from the Society by 1971 as responsible for the establishment of a recognized professional qualification in Group Analysis and by assuming the teaching functions of the Society.

Now, the Institute of Group Analysis (London) is one of the most prestigious group teaching organizations in Europe. The Group Analytic Society (London) is rapidly changing thanks to what is left from the old spirit of GIAPAC, whose organization is slowly being dismantled and its remains being fagocitated by both the Institute and the Society. Correspondence — our old yellow bird, changed format and to-day is just another professional journal. The intermediary workshops in between Symposia since the first one in London in 1971 became the Annual London European Workshop of Group Analysis, forgetting Disreel's dictum: »The Continent will not take England to be the workshop of the world«. This activity became both the main source of income of the Society and the main source of recruiting candidates to teaching for the Institute on the Continent.

But, regardless, our social body is a healthy body. Its capacity for change was demonstrated at the International Congress of Copenhagen when, at my suggestion, a joint meeting of subscribers of GAIPAC and UK and overseas members of the GAS was convened. I do not wish to expand on the present politics, since they are very fresh in our minds and we lack perspective to judge them objectively. What I want to stress, and that is important regards

training, is that the whole situation is changing, I hope in the right direction. Whatever the GAS is and will turn into in years to come, it is still a safe environment with enough flexibility to allow space for growth and freedom for any training experience which may emerge.

Past politics, present history may be summed up in a sentence as far as training is concerned: do not let bastard interests interfere with the true destiny of Group Analysis, operative Group Analysis, the one which does its work at change, change for freedom, change for love, change for rationality.

Let us go from here however down to the pragmatics of learning, to the horizontal analysis, the contextual analysis, on how each people does his own thing to learn group analysis best, and let us try to provide for this task a conceptual framework.

### THE PRAGMATICS OF LEARNING GROUP ANALYSIS

Pragmatics is the branch of semiotics dealing with the relationship of signs and symbols to their users. Learning is to come to know, to come to know something or to come to know how to do something. What we want to learn here is how people may learn Group Analysis and learn to practice group analysis.

The descriptive term of »Group Analysis« may be put to many a use and everybody wishing to use it is entitled to do so to suit their liking. The expression is no trade mark nor a registered patent. The concept had been coined by Trigant Borrow back in the twenties and S. H. Foulkes, the man to adopt it for describing his own work with groups on psychoanalytical lines did not claim it as property. Quite on the contrary, he found it more useful to use »group analysis« as a more comprehensive term for various methods and theories as long as they were essentially compatible with psychoanalytical and group-analytical assumptions. That is why within our European community of groupanalysts there is room enough for comfortably working hand in hand people with the most different backgrounds, schools of thought and method of practice. There is something in common, though: A believe in the existence of unconscious mental processes and that the nature of these mental processes is multipersonal and linked to a common mental matrix.

These assumptions, as they apply to *learning group analysis* entail two things: First, that group-analytic education is based on learning in a group, an active learning by experience of a group and by a group, and, second, that education of the group analyst never is completed, and for this he or she need a group of colleagues, a training network in action, to join with once basic training is completed.

It has been said, following the program for this 6th Symposium, that Group Analysis as a frame of reference for training proceeds in a continuous dialogue between the trainee's personal group-analytic experience, his/her cognitive integration of theory and the supervision of his/her own group-analytic work in a supervision group, as well as following a professional development, the parameters of which view the further training of group analysts as a process within the professional network — a training network in action.



Of course, this definition is broad enough as to encompass any sort of training besides the specific one of groupanalysts proper. Although, concentrating on the latter it may well serve us as an outline and a list of problems which arise in relation to each area. The emphasis in this description is on the activities to be engaged in by the individual undertaking training in group analysis. We will start with the most complicated area, the trainee's personal group-analytic experience, to take up afterwards the others one by one, trying, finally, to reach a conclusion or synthesis. The division into activities is artificial and only made for the sake of analysis, since the teaching learning process is a group process and as such includes a certain number of people bound by interaction and communication within some spatio-temporal boundaries. The number of people, the regularity and frequency of meetings, its duration and intervals between group sessions, and the total length of training, all are interrelated and in function of the instructional objectives to be met by that experience. This is of utmost importance, when travelling long distance of the members — either teachers or students — is required in order to attend the meetings, as is starting to be initiated in Europe at national and international levels. If and when it happens that training in Group Analysis requires crossing language and cultural barriers, then this is another added complication which deserves careful consideration and has to be group-analytically examined and researched.

#### *The personal group-analytic experience*

By that we understand what within a whole training situation goes under the name of »personal group analytic psychotherapy«. It is fortunate that the working party's description had avoided the traditional reference to »personal group analysis« or »experience as a full member in an ordinary group of patients« as is customary. Why so?, you will ask. Because the person who joins a group-analytic psychotherapeutic group with purpose of undertaking training in Group Analysis or as a requirement of one of such programs is never to qualify as a full member in an ordinary group of patients. If that were the case, many prospective group-analysts would be cured from their »wish of becoming a professional group analyst« and choose a healthier profession. That could well be a blessing for Group Analysis and for the candidates themselves; our training programs would run the risk of being emptied that way. The same than in a group, the therapist may be easily recognised because he is the only one who never changes, the group-analytic trainee is the one who never gets cured from his odd wish by group-analytic psychotherapy.

So, taking it for granted that the future group-analyst will never have the privilege of being in the position of an ordinary patient and that in a stranger group-analytic psychotherapy group he always will be a deviant, what is the purpose then of being submitted to such undertaking? First and most important, to overcome the resistances against learning and against change which he acquired by group training in life spontaneously. I mean those built into his own personality make-up and those others to which he is bound to because of the family, social, work, religious or political plexus of which he is part. The second reason is to tune his ear, to learn to listen, respond and translate into ordinary and sharable language what is unconscious. Third, to

gain sympathetic understanding with patients thanks to knowing how it feels to sit in the boiling cauldron of a stranger group-analytic group. And, finally, to make his the group-analytic culture and ideologies. There is yet another not so welcome outcome which frequently happens, which is the identification with the conductor's personality and style, and this way, by force of transference modelling becomes imprinting and forecloses reaching his own true self-identity as a professional and as a person.

There are other reasons why joining a group as an ordinary patient becomes impossible. I am thinking of social circumstances foreclosing this possibility when, for example, the peer members of such a group are past, present or future patient of the trainee or either social relations or colleagues at work. Such can be the situation in a small town or social setting where there are not enough well conducted group-analytic groups or the trainee is in intimate relation with the conductor, making it impossible to maintain the conditions of abstinence required for a stranger transference group-analytic psychotherapy group.

In these circumstances the best choice, and that is what usually happens when a group-analytic network is started, is just to accept things as they are and have the personal group-analytic experience in a group of colleagues who join it for training purposes and what is known as a didactic (therapeutic) group. Regardless of the psychotherapeutic effects this experience may have on the participant members, it never will add up to more than an »as if therapeutic experience«, reinforcing that way the negative aspect already mentioned for candidates in a »true group-analytic psychotherapeutic group of strangers«.

I have been so far operating under the assumption that the small group which I am considering can regularly meet once or twice a week for a prolonged period of time. What happens when this is not possible? Mostly with groups of colleagues, and when members have to travel long distances in order to meet, the solution is to concentrate sessions in a shorter space of time, usually as part of sequential intensive workshops and seminars, what is starting to be known as »training in blocks« at national and international level. This to me is one of the most fascinating experiences taking place to-day and which may well imply one of the most innovative experiments undertaken by Group Analysis, and of transcendental importance not only for teaching and training but as well for psychoanalytic psychotherapy.

Let us imagine that we investigate this alternative in depth and that we arrive at the conclusion that group-analytic psychotherapy is possible under these conditions. The same may happen with the taboo about time boundaries as with psychoanalysis when the magic barrier of the number »2« was broken and analysis was possible. This is a fascinating subjects of unforeseeable consequences. If the group process which makes therapy and learning possible is not only not altered but even improved by prolonging the intervals in between sessions, and varying the duration of the latter, then we are heading for a revolution in group-analytic training and therapy. Lacan did so in individual psychoanalysis with far reaching consequences. The humanistic psychotherapists and the movement for human growth and development have done so with their »marathonian sessions«. The MIT people and the Tavistock Group have done so with their respective Bethel's Human Relations Training



Laboratory and with the Leicester and Washington Conferences in Training for Leadership. Why not in psychotherapy or in the training of professionals of the helping professions?

The old dictum that in group analysis therapy is research and research in this field is therapy well deserves being extended to the field of training. A most neglected aspect whose cause is related to the fact that group-analytic training as well as group-analytic psychotherapy are bound by the condition of a free market economy and of private practice.

My reasoning up to here is based on the bias that group-analytic experience so far had been mostly or almost exclusively based only on stranger group-analytic psychotherapy without taking into account that family or network group-analytic therapy as well as large group-analytic oriented therapy exist as well. Both developments may be of tremendous importance in training. The second had already been incorporated in some »introductory courses«. In »workshops« it would have a corrective effect on the negative aspects of identification with the teacher already mentioned. Also the family or plexus therapy may well be of use for both selection procedures and as a safeguard against the tendencies of institutionalization and bureaucratization of power. It could also be a space of evaluation and integration of the whole experience of learning-training as a total situation, in case it came to be systematically applied both to the life social networks of origin of the candidate and to the professional network into which he enters by undertaking group-analytic training.

### *The supervisory group*

The progressive capacitation through skills and attitudes development on the group-analytic work done is the aim of a supervisory group experience. The »experience group« has to do with transference phenomena mostly, on the other hand the »supervisory group or seminar« deals mainly with countertransferential ones — countertransference understood in its true sense, that is personal projections of unconscious conflicts of the therapist into the group situation, and also as a reaction to the group dynamics of the group he is conducting and reactions to the supervisory group where he is implicated.

Ideally a supervisory group should lead to be co-vision, that is a peer group who supervises the work of its members. Here the role of the tutor is of utmost importance. He has a double responsibility, towards the patients being treated by the trainee and towards the group supervision itself. I do not see why a supervisory group as such should not change supervisors periodically or continue by itself once the period of training is over as a self-managed group. I have tried, not so successfully so far, that supervisory groups I conduct meet regularly in between sessions and that may input as a »man on the boundary« be reduced to a minimum by other means than face to face encounter. Long distance phone participation, listening to taped sessions during my absence, reading minutes of sessions and giving them a feed back by phone, by writing or personally when I am present, may be some devices for securing the morphogenetic capacity of the supervisory group mostly when the week to week traditional sequence is not possible.



This is the area in which technical innovations and the use of more modern paraphernalia — audio and video tape, long distance communication, recording devices, standardized taped situations, role playing and other active dramatic methods — all are possible to be used with great effectiveness, saving teaching and learning time.

Direct observation of the group work by more experienced colleagues either in presence or through a one way mirror or recorded and edited sessions, cotherapy with colleagues of lesser or equal experience, etc. are devices extremely useful which have been used at times and are easily forgotten. Originally Foulkes' idea about doing group work was to start as a patient, move up to observer in the group conducted by a more experienced colleague, take over the group on one's own full responsibility, let in as an observer a less experienced colleague or visitor and, finally, move up to conduction supervisory groups oneself. This is still possible in hospitals or out-patient clinics, but with private practice patients it has fallen in disuse. More and more, the work in supervisory seminars relies on the verbal report of the trainee conductor, that may well be justified or rationalized on »theoretical grounds« but again, it should be carefully examined.

As may easily be realized, these ideas relate to a very elementary principle in the apprenticeship system of learning, which is first you watch what the master does, then he tells you how to do it, and, finally, you do it yourself under his watchful eye. All these aspects may be improved and time saved with devices and schemes of educational technology. However, the master, the teacher in group analysis is not a man but a group, and the group leader's greatest responsibility is to wean the group from its need to be led and to be taught. Robin Skynner's idea of »minimal network intervention and support« in family group-analytic therapy is applied here, as well as Foulkes, maxim number 10: »What to do with reactions to the patients' challenge and provocations? A group of patients will put you to a strong test. It will spot your weak points as if it were a collective genius in psychology. You must deal with these hurts and pains by your own mental hygiene. It is not necessarily the best answer to undergo analysis again from time to time. *It may be better to discuss such strains with understanding colleagues mutually, may be in scientific and technical terms, and have a kind of a free group discussion about them.* (My underlining). If you are a reasonably healthy and emotionally balanced person, your life itself and your interests should help you to put these traumas to your self-esteem in proper perspective«. The advice of a man, who having received so many blows from patients, psychoanalytic colleagues and followers, never had to go for a »second analysis«, is worth taking. This is why I make it my philosophy, and I stress in this respect the value of this trustable and trusted group of colleagues as super-co-visors during training, and afterwards, as a main tool for continuous education and as a health preserving device.

I do not want to extend myself here on this subject, since I know that many thoroughly thought out papers have been submitted already to the Symposium. What I just wanted to stress were the two aspects already mentioned: the importance of direct observation and of objectivation of recollection of clinical data to counteract free speculation directed at securing the sympathies and good will of the supervisor and good reports to the training

committee; also, the possibilities of using educational technology devices that go behind just exclusive verbal subjective reporting, overburdened by the »I see«, »I feel it«, »it seems to me« sensitive argot.

### *Cognitive integration of theory.*

I feel this to be the aspect which offers most possibilities for innovation and at the time is the most neglected of them all in most programs. It may well be true that group analysis cannot be learned from books, although reading about the clinical experience of others and their theoretical formulations is absolutely necessary. However, students of group analysis tend to overrate the value of the other two legs of the training platform, personal group-analytic experience and group supervision, at the expense of cognitive elaboration based on study in action, operational research and theoretical conceptualization based on reading seminars and group discussion conducted by an experienced tutor and expert in the clinical, methodological and theoretical conducted aspects of group analysis.

A practical observation on most programs I am familiar with is that students plainly do not read, and, of course they take a very passive role in the discussions, in lectures, reading seminars and group discussion groups. That may well be explained by saying they are overburdened by other attitudes still prevailing in the staff training group and in group analysis in general, an attitude which can have serious consequences. By giving priority to experimental and practical work at the expense of theoretical and research work, we are heading towards an ascientific psychotherapy, training technicians instead of scientific practitioners. Without a coherent and through theoretical frame one cannot do group analysis.

How is it then that we fail to convey to the students a positive attitude towards active learning from literature, from institutionalized teaching. I think when that happens, the teachers themselves are caught in the same trap, the other side of the coin. A teacher may well be very scholastic, know by heart the whole persual of the literature, he may even write and teach brilliantly but he has yet to learn what it is to lead a learning discussion group group-analytically. Teachers go on spoon feeding their knowledge to students as if they were babes who do not know how to read, how to talk or how to think. The important thing here to be taught to the group and to the individual members is how to teach themselves to learn to conceptualize what they are doing, how to learn equally from books, from patients on from colleagues in any situation they are, and how to put this knowledge into words in the discussion group, in writing their reports and when publishing in professional journals.

The dissociation between theoretical formulations, what the teacher does and what he is, is favoured by the fact that attitudes, skills and verbalized knowledge, theoretical and clinical, are taught and learned in different group situations within the total learning situation. In this respect structural measures like those suggested by Fabrizio Napolitani from his experience at the Institute of Group Analysis in Rome may be of tremendous help. I hope we will have the opportunity to discuss these here later.

Unfortunately, in our field there are no exceptions to the rule in professional education that many a teacher does not know how to teach what he does,



while others capable of explaining don't know how to do what they are saying. Some familiarity with educational science and technology would in this respect be of great help. What I want to insist on here is that if group analysis and psychoanalysis belong to the field of scientific psychotherapy, they cannot be a theoretical. We cannot use pragmatic methods which work but which one does not know why they work. A clinician who is not a good theoretician, group researcher and scholar, may be a technician, a professional, but not an analyst. Knowledge which is not advanced, and advanced day by day, by the analyst in his practice becomes stagnated and useless in our field of work.

Transference to the written word of the authorities is repetition compulsion. The group analyst has to find his or her own truth and be courageous in contrasting his ideas with others and for that purpose the best remedy is the group. Even Lacanians who so little think of the analytic possibilities of the group have invented the »cartel«, a small group with a »plus-un« in order to study the masters, but not to copy them, for the purpose of finding each one their own truth and the cognitive integration of theory and practice. At least in this respect we can learn from them and we may learn from the blueprint that Foulkes originally set up for GAIPAC as well.

### *The Integrative Dialogue.*

Within a total learning group situation we have so far spoken of the three main functions at play and made reference to four types of small group situations where these functions are encouraged and activated, namely the *work group* where the students do group analytic work by observing, conducting and studying in action, research in actual operation, the group-analytic situation; the *experience group* wherefrom the student draws his personal experience as a full member in a group, an analytic group conducted by an experienced group analyst; the *supervision group*, and the *discussion group*; reading and research seminars which at times is not so small a group and can take a whole class or even students of different classes at the same time.

All those groups have their own boundaries more or less delimited and special tasks to be fulfilled, but the whole set of groups form part of the same system. Within this system the *group of teachers*, the staff group and coordinating group is of maximum importance. In most programs, and against group-analytic principles, there is no spatio-temporal slot for »all persons involved in the enterprise to be brought together and meet regularly for full and frank discussion and interchange of information and viewpoints... This situation should be explored not as what appears to be, but of how it really is.«

An essential feature of any group-analytic situation is that the conductor is at the same time »in the group« and »out of the group«. He is sitting on the boundary of the group. This function of the »man on the boundary« I discovered while being invited as *reporter* to a London Workshop in 1980. I was freely getting in and out of all the groups, experience groups, activity groups, lectures, plenaries, large groups and staff groups, but I belonged to none. I was the appointed stranger and with no authority, and, of course, I was not being paid either. There should be deeply built in my personality a character defect or excess that brings me no benefit but I think it does to



the group. To be put in such a position, if you are true to the demands of the job, it is a tremendous strain. On discussing with the staff group my complaints, all were listening sympathetically, until Pat de Maré came to my rescue with the interpretation: »Juan, you are the therapist of the Workshop!« I understood and I learned that in order to do that job one should be recognized as such and paid for supporting this function.

Hanne Campos, one of my co-learners, has been working many years on the concept that in institutional development and mostly in health organizations is of utmost importance. She proposes that on the level of subgroups as well as on the level of the total organization should exist »*spatio-temporal units*« where people meet to evaluate their specific objectives or the integral functioning of the whole organization. Some groups, specially on a higher organizational level can meet only three times a year, whereas others will meet weekly, monthly, etc. The importance lies in the following, on the one hand, that the intervals be continuous and regular, and on the other hand, that a professional from outside the system which is meeting covers the »analytical function« as the »person on the boundary«, the one which ensures the functioning of the *work group*.

Both concepts, »the person on the boundary« and »the continuous and regular spatio-temporal units« can be useful in the learning situations with which we are actually experimenting. At a workshop, for example the »reporter« in this new function becomes a participant observer ready to give his feed-back into any point of the situation when he thinks his intervention is needed and the group he is sitting in is ready for it. His written report goes back into the situation and is of tremendous help when, for example, in block teaching the membership remains the same throughout the sequential workshops or seminars. In some of the training experiences in Spain we find the function so useful that it has become almost institutionalized. In our professional group of groupanalysts, Convergencia Analytica Espanola, we have taken to the custom to invite from time to time a group-analyst from abroad to fulfill this function for us during two or three of our periodical meetings, not to talk to us, not to convey to us his rich clinical and theoretical sophistication, but to act as a therapist for the group, to act temporarily as a group-analytic conductor for the network which is our group.

I wanted to share this innovation because I think it can be most useful for any learning group-analytical situation, especially in the training of group-analysts proper and may even be of considerable health prophylactic value for the people who, like ourselves, are dedicated to teaching and learning the most impossible of impossible professions.

I just want to finish with a provocative thought. I would like to take Foulkes' wish that group analysis is psychoanalysis in the multipersonal situation a step further and add that from the present point of view it seems that psychoanalysis is nothing but »operational group analysis« in the smallest of groups, the group of two, or individual group analysis.

Are we not here for a change? May be today is the beginning of the post-Freudian and post-Foulkesian era of analysis. But if we want it to be so, we will have to train future group analysts in a different way.