
GROUP ANALYSIS SECTION REPORT
TO THE IAGP BOARD MEETING IN CHICAGO
FEBRUARY 22-23, 1998

By its Co-Chairman Juan Campos M.D.

The Chicago meeting is the last chance for the Board to decide if all the members of the Coordinating Committees of Sections or only their Chairpersons should go for election on the next ballot. In this regard, all I stated in my Report to the Bologna Board meeting of last August is still valid and I hope that the same consideration will be given to it than to the one submitted to Earl Hopper, President of the IAGP, on August 19, 1997 by the Ad-hoc Co-ordinating Committee of the Group Analytic Section, originally appointed for the Group Analysis Section. I know mine was circulated to the Board members attending that meeting and I hope, as I recommended, that copies were sent also to the ones who did not attend.

In summary, my views were and are:

1. I think that the concepts of “Section” with which the Group Analysis Section and the International Psychodrama Section operate, are radically different. As I have said on many occasions before, the basic idea of the Psychodrama Section is the establishment of an international association of psychodrama under the umbrella of the IAGP for an orientation and method which lacks such an international association. This is not the case with Group Analysis where organizations such as The Lifwynn Foundation, the Group-Analytic Society (London) and EGATIN have clear international ambitions and projection. In this sense, I believe that the proposal of the Ad-hoc Co-ordinating Committee of the Group-Analytic Section is based on a concept closer to the one of the IPS than to the one I promoted —basically a network of persons and groups of persons, members of the IAGP, interested in group analysis in its broadest sense regardless of qualifications and orientations.
2. In consequence, the Group Analysis Section of the IAGP instituted in August 1989, should keep either the original name under which it was approved by the Board in Amsterdam (**Study Group in Group Analysis**) or the one with which it was renamed by the Board in Heidelberg in August 1993 (**Group Analysis Section**). In no way I find acceptable rephrasing it as Group-Analytic Interest Section —GAIS, which aims at

promoting internationally the development of theory, practice and research of Group-Analytic Psychotherapy, denomination coined by Foulkes to refer to his own brand of Group Analysis. Concepts underlying different names imply different orientations and ideologies.

3. I agree with the opinion of the Governance Committee and the Bylaws Committee expressed by Isaiah Zimmerman, that no amendments of the Constitution are required and that a “code of rules and regulations” for coordinating Sections will suffice as guidelines and will be more expeditive. This decision had already been taken by the Board meeting in Santander in September 1994 when, after long deliberations of the Governance Committee, the opinion of the Bylaws Committee was heard and accepted.
4. The Ad-hoc Co-ordinating Committee has its doubts if the replies to their questionnaire No. 2 with which they support their proposal of bylaw amendments, are “*truly estadistically representative of all IAGP groupanalytic therapists.*” Regardless of estadistical representativity, a serious mistake is made in the choice of their sample since all members of the IAGP —individuals or organizations— have the right to join any Section, regardless of orientation or qualifications. That was one of the basic recommendations given to us already by the Governance Committee in Heidelberg. Further, from the over 100 signed inscription forms as members of the Group Analysis Section collected before the Buenos Aires Congress, only 12 signed also the form of GAIS stating to be or asking to become a member according to the GAIS proposal.
5. The Ad-hoc Co-ordinating Committee includes in its Report a “*draft of additions to the IAGP by-laws formalizing the Group-Analytic Interest Section and its operations*”. Further, they propose to President Earl Hopper, after the Board and the Bylaws Committee endorse their additions, “*to hand over to the Co-Chairmen the task of 1. requesting from all interested IAGP members a more formal and binding confirmation of membership of the GAIS, (our group did not have such a mandate, what we obtained has the character of expression of interests). 2. Calling, preferably at the same time, for nominations for the Committee from among those who confirm their membership. Nominations can be listed by the Co-Chairmen, and used in a mail ballot before the 1998 Congress or, alternatively, election can be finalized of the Section meeting at the Congress. We find it being of primary importance that a definite membership list and a list of nominations for a Section Committee are available by the start of the Congress in*

August 1998.” Seemingly what is implied is that the election is to take place during the Congress.

6. I wholly agree with the importance of this task. However, I seriously doubt that it can be accomplished within the timetable given, at least for this Co-Chairmanship which, when it comes to actual work, depends on me and is run mostly at my own expense. The administrative task suggested implies a lot of correspondence, correlating the lists of membership, and a mailing to the total membership which, to my understanding, should include a joint statement of the Co-chairmen and the Ad-hoc Coordinating Committee or/and the President of IAGP, addressed to dispel all the confusion created since Buenos Aires regards the Group Analysis Section or the Group-Analytic Interest Section, if this orientation is decided on.
7. Once again, I am asking for space for an administrative meeting of the Section during the London Congress which, if possible, does not coincide with major meetings of other organisations to which the members of our Section belong. Also I think it would be to the point to have a joint meeting with the other Sections, but this time I ask to be dispensed of organising it. I understand that the third day of the Congress, Wednesday August 26, which is about our own organisation of the IAGP, also coincides with the day that, as Hans Reijzer tells me, there is more free time for meetings. I wonder if the Joint Session of Sections could not be a Symposium or a Panel which focuses on the problem of identity and diversity in organizations and the potential areas of integration among the sections of our profession. In sum, the question of Sections.