



# Letters to the Editor

Dear Vivian Milroy,

Self and Society readers may be interested to hear about a fund established by the Reichian Therapist Practitioners in Energy Stream/Post Reichian Therapy Association - an association of people trained in Reichian Therapy based in Leeds.

We were and are concerned that occasionally after a group, or even more occasionally during the course of a client's therapy, a crisis can occur which might result in the individual's hospitalisation. Given the care available in many of our NHS mental hospitals, this is something to be generally avoided.

Often it is clear that the crisis was on its way and that the therapy isn't the 'cause' of the crisis and so the therapist is not 'technically' responsible. However, we feel and accept a moral responsibility and so have established a 'freak out' fund. We each contribute a minimum of £1 per year per group run and a minimum of £1 per client. So a therapist seeing on average 12 clients per week, and running one group a month would contribute a minimum of £24 per year. (Contributions from non therapists very welcome).

This money is available to provide therapeutic care during such a crisis and if necessary residential care in a therapeutic community. So for instance this money could enable the client's therapist to take time off from other work to give such care if appropriate.

If the money in this fund should build up more than necessary, we will give the surplus to any group operating therapeutic communities taking in people in crisis as such communities are vitally needed and need our support.

I recommend other therapists to consider setting up similar schemes. I can supply further details on request.

Best wishes,

William West

---

Dear John Rowan,

Your review in "Self and Society" of Aniella Jaffè's *The Myth of Meaning* was very thought provoking. Shame on me, but this was the first I had heard of Ken Wilber, so your review sent me in search of his books. So far my public library has only produced *A Sociable God* but I have

requested his others. However this book is enough to elucidate the points you were making. Thank you for putting me on to Wilber. He is an exciting writer who clarifies the muddy waters where psychology meets spirituality.

However, I do not think you are being fair to Jung in putting him together with Jaffé ("This is what Jung and Jaffé try to do"), nor in suggesting that Wilber's theoretical work supercedes that of Jung. On the first point: many of the women who surrounded Jung, "the Jungfrau" as they are called, write with ingenuous enthusiasm which often lacks perspective and tends to degenerate into waffle. But the same criticism cannot be put at the door of Jung. The lack of clarity in Jung's writing is because he is often writing directly from the unconscious, so that you have to read him with one eye open and one eye closed (as it were) so that you can follow his intuitive leaps. Jung was an explorer and pioneer; his theories followed afterwards and were constructed to provide a framework for what he had discovered. I strongly disagree with your statement that his theoretical position has no place for the genuinely transcendent and I am surprised that you should say this when it is clear from your review that you are knowledgeable about Jung's work.

Wilber, by contrast, is a theoretician first and foremost. He writes clearly and succinctly and has done for psychology what Thomas Kuhn did for science with his seminal book **The Structure of Scientific Revolutions**. But you can't compare

Kuhn's work with that of say, Einstein or H eisenberg. Kuhn, like Wilber, is an original theoretician who clarifies the nature of scientific discoveries and shows how new ideas emerge and overthrow previous paradigms. But he is not a creative scientist. Wilber has applied the theory of logical types to psychology and has thereby clarified the relationship between psychology and spirituality. But Wilber's contribution cannot be compared to that of Jung. It is not of the same order.

Yours sincerely,

Virginia Routh

---

Dear Editor,

Has anybody ~~ever~~ wondered why there is not a cohesive network of safe places for people to go to? During the last three weeks I wondered about London hopping buses and skipping tubes in what would be seen as an obviously psychotic condition. No money to live on and nowhere to call home, the world fell about my ears as I stood in the midst of a park in Ealing, cold to the marrow. I did not have one number to phone that I could trust would give me comfort.

What I propose is the setting up of a network of real refuge and asylum; an opening into the world of warmth for those like myself, normally bracketed as being in need of psychiatric help. A crisis line could match those in need with those who are able to give empathy, and offer emotional support and/or accom-

modation. The situation is handled outside of the N.H.S. This would enable people to create an authentic helping network. Thus there comes into being a viable option to existing services.

Paul Arathoon

*Would those interested in pursuing this idea please write to me: 27 Whitehorse Lane, London E1. (MIND voluntary writer - Lambeth)*

---

Dear Editor,

Here is a response to David Jones' article in Jan/Feb '86 of 'Self & Society'. I should be delighted - me and others here - if you publish it.

I have been an inmate of the English prison system since February 1981. I felt that I had to make a response to David Jones' article on research in prisons, including a comment on Stanley Cohen and Laurie Taylor's book, 'Psychological survival' which I read a few weeks ago.

Unfortunately, because of my contained situation, I have no current access to this book, nor to 'Human Inquiry' by Peter Reason and John Rowan, although I have had this book on order at the prison library for 4 months. I say this as an explanation of why I cannot be relevant to either of these books; so I shall concentrate on the content of David Jones' article.

I was surprised that David Jones said that it needs to be 'clear whose interests are being served a propos prison research; I thought

and still think that an improvement in the quality of life of one group of people benefits humankind as a whole. It is not a zero-sum game where one person's gain necessitates another's loss.

I infer David Jones' sarcasm demonstrates his position as being in favour of 'vile mechanisms' which crush those who differ from the norms of 'decent behaviour' (and whose value judgements decide what that is?) It is observable that in some cases 'the family' does cause misery to the next generation. There are many examples of it in here. Probably the most compelling are those women who have been sexually abused (often raped) by their fathers: their faces, hands, arms, legs are frequently a mass of scars from self mutilation; they shun any trait of femininity, wear men's clothes, have cropped hair and adopt male mannerisms and an aggressive attitude. They hate men; they want to be men - identity CRISIS. This is only one extreme example of the family destroying its offspring :- there are many others.

I wonder how David Jones would like to be seen simply as a 'potential threat as a rule breaker'? He sensed that he would 'not easily mix' with the prisoners and had a 'feeling of distaste'. If fate should frown on him, he would not just have to mix with prisoners, he would become a prisoner and yet he would not magically change his personality to fit this new role. No, he would be just as intelligent and as prejudiced and as much 'himself' as he is now, and superordinate to all this, he would be a

prisoner, one among a conglomerate of other prisoners. What I am trying to say is that although many of us here are prisoners, we are also individual persons with love, intelligence, and sensitivity. I don't suppose David Jones would have a 'feeling of distaste' for me if his car broke down and I offered him a lift. Prisoners on release become not-prisoners.

The majority of prison officers I have met are ordinary helpful, nice people. Some are extraordinarily concerned, and they exceed the definition of duty to help an inmate by their obviously caring attitude and by giving their time and attention. A few are sadistic: they get pleasure from exercising their legitimised authority and power over another human being, and in using that power to make inmates' lives miserable in various ways. I wonder which of these groups of prison officers David Jones 'feels for'?

I have read an account of the Zimbardo experiment as part of my Open University course, and from my experience the outcome is perfectly credible.

The problem, as I see it, is that people on both 'sides' (ie inmates and officers) view their respective roles as being in conflict, and play the game of being an officer or being an inmate accordingly. It is easy to get caught up in this game, and it has become an important

focal point in my life to remember that first I'm a person, and everyone else here is a person, inmates and staff. To remember that respect and love are primary and that rules and conventions are secondary.

I am a prison inmate with a few 'O' levels: David Jones is a college lecturer. Probably I am conceited but I believe that David Jones - if he allowed himself to - might increase his wisdom if he spent a month of his time here in Styal prison.

This isn't a reply to David's article, but a tangential response, as I took personally his 'feeling of distaste'. We prisoners don't often get an opportunity to put our views across. This has been read by the Governor, assistant Governor, and a few officers and inmates, and the overall reaction is positive.

I enjoy 'S&S' although it is frustrating to read about all the bookshops etc. that I can't attend and books that I order and which never arrive at the library here. But at least 'S&S' gives me some vision of what is happening out there.

Yours faithfully

Jane Carlisle  
Styal Prison.

---