

REGISTRATION OF PSYCHOTHERAPISTS

Self and Society has been telephoning around civil servants about what 1992 really will mean to psychotherapists. We have agreed not to say what information we got from whom - that is the way with the government. The Department of Health is centrally concerned with this issue although in some ways the Department of Trade and Industry is more involved with the actual regulations. Both departments, indeed the whole civil service, assume that psychotherapy means either psychiatry or psychoanalysis. Like everyone else civil servants are influenced by what their relatives and friends have tried out and in some cases by the treatment they have received themselves - for it is OK, at least if you are a senior civil servant, to be 'in analysis' especially if you detail it as Kleinian (Jungian is suspect as being a bit artistic and Freudian is no longer for top people.)

The Dutch government, prompted by its professionalised psychotherapists, are taking the lead in proposing that EC countries register psychotherapists and that it be a profession limited to those trained at a postgraduate level. The British government looked into this and consulted the established bodies in the mental health area such as the British Psychological Society, Social work organisations, psychiatrists etc - about two dozen bodies altogether. They wanted a view of, among other things, the standing of the United Kingdom Standing Conference on Psychotherapy (UKSCOP which emerged from the Rugby conference). Government seems to be persuaded that UKSCOP is competent but comprehension seems to be seriously hindered by the assumption on government's part of medical model of treatment.

Important articles have been printed in the January 1990 and the July 1990 issues of *Self and Society*. In this issue we print some more.

Self and Society will support the view, so long as the present editor has anything to do with it, that UKSCOP is a perfectly valid development as a structure within the mainstream of established society. To the extent that we support organised society and the rule of law then we support UKSCOP - and we do support a participant, organised society, cautiously, for we see no examples of anything better. So, cautiously, we support UKSCOP. But the essence of humanistic psychology is not represented by such an organisation. The principles of humanistic psychology (listed in *Self and Society* May issue page 2 and September issue page 54) thrive in the human potential movement and *Self and Society* tries to be "A channel of communication for the Human Potential Movement". (See the foot of the front cover) The Human Potential Movement cannot be contained in the procedures necessary for committees nor can it flourish with a rule book laying out the criteria for accreditation and practice. Still less can it flourish within the medical model. It has to be free to experiment within its own principles so that it can get on with developing the heart of humanistic and integrative endeavour.

The spirit of the Human Potential Movement can inform the work of UKSCOP in many important ways, making it more human, just as it has had this effect of AHPP. But it exists separately from formally constituted bodies and as soon as psychotherapists as an organised profession show signs of being oppressive, as they are bound

to do sooner or later, readers can rely on the 'channels of communications' opening up in powerful criticism - just as they did in the case of the attack on the Bristol Centre. You can also expect *Self and Society* to express very strong feelings about the right of the individual to practice any skill for another person, with their consent, providing no false claims are made about the outcome. That is the situation under Common Law in this country at the moment. Any attempt by the EC to remove that right will be resisted. This means that the practices and systems which are currently followed within the human potential movement will be able to flourish in the future - though you may have to call yourself a humanologist or a mind surgeon and not a psychotherapist.

David Jones

LETTER FROM ROGER HORROCKS

Dear Editor,

I found Peter Hawkins' arguments against Heron, Kalisch and myself curiously vague and lacking substance. But there is something about the whole debate that is beginning to make me wonder what we are really doing. We are not really trying to convince each other, surely? Both sides obviously have deep convictions, but they are not rationally based - nonetheless we go through the charade of rational debate. Why?

Well, I feel there is something important and useful going on - precisely that the two opposing sides become clearly demarcated - not in order to convince each other, but to allow the conflict itself to appear in its most conscious form. I assume that this external conflict conceals a conflict in all of us - we all have an internal argument between the anarchist and the conformist, the rebel and the bureaucrat. I speak as an unashamed philosophical anarchist, but I am aware that I am also fascinated/horrified by organisations, bureaucracy, and so on, as no doubt those arguing for "professionalisation" are secretly fascinated/horrified by our proposals for unlicensed creativity/chaos.

But what happens when we do establish these opposites, and stare at each other, perplexed, perhaps rather taken aback, at this polarisation? I don't know! What seems to happen traditionally is that there is a split - as all of the therapeutic movements have split repeatedly - vide Anna Freud/Klein; Zurich/London in the Jungian movement, and so on. Are we on the threshold of the bifurcation - perhaps fission is a better word - of Humanistic Psychology in this country? I think this is likely, and it is a matter both for regret and also for excitement and anticipation. Splits are surely a sign of fertility, growth, new birth, as also a time of mourning. I don't think the two sides (or are there more?) can seriously think of persuading each other, but we can go our separate ways surely with a degree of respect and friendship for each other. Vive la difference!

Roger Horrocks.

Roger Horrocks is a college lecturer, author and is accredited by AHPP as an Individual and Group therapist.

WHAT IS HERMES UP TO? Shapes Shadows and Change

by Laura Donington

I enjoyed David Kalisch's 'rebel view' (*Self and Society* Jan90), and I greatly value his contribution to the debate about professionalisation and humanistic psychology. His latest piece ('The living Tradition and the Division of the Spoils' (*Self and Society* July 90) again warns us against losing touch with the spirit of humanistic psychology (he invokes Hermes, the winged messenger of the Gods, as its presiding genius), in the process of fighting over the 'body'. But I wonder what it is that David wants to conserve for, as he says, Hermes is always ready to move on.

I like the way David envisages and describes the relationship between the 'inner' and the 'outer', the link between the imaginal worlds of psyche and society. I agree about the way that impulses towards the new tend to become enmeshed and ossified through the development of formal structures, demarcations, accreditation, professionalisation, the building of churches on rock... however, I sense I am a little less pessimistic about this than he is. In him, there is a clear bias towards the rebel, towards the new, the unknown, the unformed as against the structured, the known, the agreed, the rule-bound. I have strong sympathies with the stance, *and* I also sense that to deny the process of 'taking form' ultimately carries the danger with it of another form of rigidity - the 'rebel' as a permanent fixture - i.e. of being precisely defined and located in reaction against form.

My sense is that both in the inner psyche and in society there is a need for both the known and the unknown, the 'rebel' and the 'norm', certainty and uncertainty. The integrity of both the individual and society is shown by the ability of each to contain many facets of experience, or many forms of expression, and to hold the dynamic and creative tension between them. Just as identifying too closely with one aspect of the 'self' (a subpersonality) leads to rigidity and lack of movement within the psyche, so does believing too much in one mode of functioning or organising too exclusively around one social form lead to stultification and oppression.

Both in inner and outer worlds there is a need for a degree of uncertainty (allowing the impulse towards the new, rejection of old forms, creativity and flexibility, breaking the rules), and also a need for some degree of certainty (norms, identification with common forms) to give a meeting point between individuals and communities, to allow a sense of community to arise at all, to give some sense of definition and shape in relation to the world, to let us play the game at all. The art is not to believe in those forms too much, to be too identified with them (and this includes both identification with the 'normal' and identification with the 'rebel'). What is needed is a creative dynamic between them. This is the deep nature of democratic process and it is this that underlies what Humanistic Psychologists are fighting to preserve.

The one *needs* the other. There is a necessary process of becoming analogous with the inner process of movement from core to periphery - a process of crystallisation. It isn't possible to 'hold onto' newness, by definition. Of course out there, there are the excessive believers and the repressive overidentifiers, just as in the psyche some aspects of the 'self' tend to be overdominating and claim all the territory for themselves. But to seek only to rebel against or destroy those aspects is equally to be defined by them. To allow some reality to those aspects and know them for what they are can release the psychic energy and the life-force, which in turn generates

new forms... and so it goes on.

In terms of humanistic psychology, perhaps to resist the process of formalisation and normalisation too much in itself is to become too closely identified with it as an external 'reality', as a form - becoming a creature of it, tying up the life-energies in it, fighting over it. Letting the process happen to some degree means acknowledging and trusting that in turn other new impulses will emerge, and will in turn be needed to challenge the 'knowns', the agreed, the established and the accredited. There are situations where oppression is so great that the only freedom is to seek to overturn it, the only available statement is one of submission or rejection. But the overturning of old forms can only happen by connecting with the impulse towards the new towards the unknown. It is **this** that seems to me to be the spirit of humanistic psychology. Meanwhile, Hermes is the messenger and the communicator, mediating and linking. Isn't this what we need to be doing? Acknowledging the differences and finding the points of contact, the fertile meeting ground, a creative interaction and a mutual language. Talking to the psychoanalysts, the medical people, the behaviourists, the legislators, letting humanistic psychology be seen and heard and given some shape? Perhaps re-examining the implicit nature of client/practitioner expectations and responsibilities, the terms of the contract, looking at it in terms of process? Even more broadly, asserting this split in the arena of political and environmental debate? The nature of the game itself has already changed in ways we do not really know. Perhaps Hermes has already moved on?

Laura Donington graduated in Social Anthropology and Sociology. She is a Core Process Psychotherapy trainee with clients under supervision.

Don't Cry "Wolf" by Courtenay Young

It is becoming increasingly apparent that I have to break the silence of the last 9 months, hopefully correct some of the misapprehensions that are still floating about, exercise my right of reply and also defend my name somewhat. Let me state it very clearly that psychotherapy (which includes psychoanalysis, humanistic psychology (as it is practised), clinical psychology, behavioural psychotherapy, NLP, family therapy, hypnotherapy and possibly psychodrama and many other psychotherapies) is almost certainly going to become more organised and regulated - **whether we like it or not**. This is a sign of the times. It is happening. There will be a register of accredited psychotherapists (almost certainly). This will have some form of government approval (eventually). It is becoming a (recognised) profession. There are links and reciprocations being formed with other European countries and psychotherapists in them. This is what is happening. So there are a number of responses. We can fight this trend. I have personally not taken this course of action but I encourage anyone who feels strongly enough about it to start up a pressure group immediately and start taking action - demonstrations, letters to the press, an open debate with the "professionals", a good slogan, membership of the pressure group, fund raising, sit-ins at the annual conference etc. are all well-tried and often quite successful ways of counteracting such a trend and getting your point across. We can ignore it and hope it will go away - I don't think. We can sell-out to it and become convinced that this is either inevitable (so why fight it - join it instead and get in on the winning side) or that this will be eventually "a good thing" and ignore some of our more uncomfortable or disquietening pangs of former consciousness.

However the course of action I personally have taken with (I believe) a number of other people [not a "rather small nucleus of people within the movement (many with a vested interest)" as Brown and Mowbray seem to think] who are either actively practising humanistic psychology as psychotherapists or who are training people in it, is a very different one. We have not sold out our humanistic principles as some of the authors in recent editions of *Self and Society* are openly suggesting - which I consider incidentally very insulting. We are actively working within this trend to humanise it. We are applying our humanistic beliefs, our principles and our awarenesses and even methodologies or techniques in the active fight or struggle against some of the more medical archetypes - and having a reasonable degree of success.

It is therefore somewhat galling to be lambasted through these pages by people who may not be doing very much at all as a reaction to this trend and who seem to think that because they consider themselves humanistic and that they don't happen to like something that's going on out there then the perpetrators cannot possibly be humanistic and therefore must have sold out. God's teeth! We are back in the middle ages! I thought humanistic psychology had a somewhat more open-minded set of principles buried in it somewhere - but maybe human nature doesn't change very much after all. I personally am tired of being considered the bogey-man and continually sniped at through these pages - even more recently anonymously and derogatorily by an Earwig! (*Self and Society*, Summer 1990, p39).

AHPP is also coming in for some of this slightly libellous sniping - again some of it anonymous. I suggest that the editors examine their own biases a bit more clearly. AHPP is described as having "autocratic practices" and "bureaucratic procedures" and that it promotes "just the security, finance and career interests of its members" and not the "essence of humanistic personal growth through therapy". (*Self and Society*, Summer 1990, p29) and as not knowing "the first thing about Humanistic Psychology" (p28, in Gale Force 10). This is all bullshit! Can we please have an end to it in these pages.

However a number of the more serious critics of the professionalisation of psychotherapy seem to be quoting two main arguments against it. The first is that in the USA it has led to a horrific situation - which I wholeheartedly agree with. However the UKSCP model is completely different. It is actually unique and I think a great deal of credit needs to be given to it and the architects of it for this fact. It is at present almost totally inclusive of all aspects of psychotherapy rather than exclusive. It has grown organically from within rather than having anything imposed from without it. It is almost totally self-regulating and is totally independent of any vested interest like insurance companies etc. It incorporates nearly all of the possible opposition (Psychologists, Psychiatrists etc) and is working **with** them rather than **against** them. It is resisting strongly any enforced academic bias. Each member organisation largely retains its autonomy as do the various sections within its federal structure. It incorporates all the ethical principles that have been suggested by Brown, Mowbray and others and is thus in all of these points rather amazingly humanistic - as I understand the word. I therefore believe that this USA comparison is invalid and indeed the UKSCP ought to be encouraged rather than condemned.

The second major area of concern is that the Human Potential aspect of Humanistic Psychology is going to get destroyed by any form of professionalism. If this were true, I would agree that professionalism would be a "bad thing". Again (I think)

this concern stems from lack of awareness and a confusion. The activities of the UKSCP are **only** concerned with psychotherapy. There is absolutely no attempt or thought of regulating the human potential movement and all its ramifications - if that were possible. I want thus to clearly distinguish between the two. There is a difference **and** there is, of course, a relatively small overlap. I would like to feel that the human potential movement could actually benefit from this development by having a large deregulated section and also a very small professionalised section as well. I can understand some people's discomfort here and I share some of their concerns, but I do not think the danger very large or I would not be associated with the UKSCP. I also do not feel that the arguments against professionalisation that attack the "protection of the client" rationalisation can just leave it there. There are increasingly complaints about bad practice within humanistic psychology which implies more a social process going on in that the public expect a higher quality of service from humanistic practitioners. No-one complains about the gypsy telling fortunes at the fair, for instance, but the Sheffield case is being widely publicised. Public concern is swinging towards us "putting our house in order" a bit more. The idea of a register of psychotherapists originally arose as a (paranoid) reaction to the activities of scientology. Is this really totally antagonistic to any form of humanistic practice? I am not convinced.

Finally I would say that within the wide field of psychotherapists there are of course many who adopt the medical model, who play transference games, who are after higher fees, who disempower their clients or "patients" etc. etc. and who could benefit in these trends by professionalisation. There are also many others who don't. Please don't get too paranoid about the process of change that is happening! As a humanistic psychotherapist within the Standing Conference I find that those people I have contact with tend to veer towards my (humanistic) views rather than away from them. If humanistic psychology is the force I believe it to be then it appeals to the human in everyone. Perhaps we need to trust our belief systems a little more instead of trying to protect them from any possible threat, which very quickly turns into a slippery slope and we end up with something very unhumanistic like fundamentalism, scapegoating, scisms and the like. Don't cry "Wolf" unless there really is one!

Courtenay Young is Treasurer of UKSCP, was the 1989/90 Chair of AHPP and is accredited by AHPP as a Biodynamic Psychotherapist.

In order to avoid further accusations of bias, the Editor (only one!) decided to print the integral version of Courtenay's letter.

LETTER FROM ANTHONY CROUCH

I have been reading with interest the accreditation debate. An interesting point of commonality between David Kalisch and Peter Hawkins is their emphasis on the importance of relationship between mentor and trainee - both seeing this as central. You ask for suggestions as to the "how" of accrediting and together with this focus on relationship, might I point to the Eastern situation where highly disciplined, highly structured, apparently dogmatic and authoritarian systems of training, have as their foundation the demand that all trainees accept nothing that their teachers say (without first testing it out at great length through contemplation and experiential practice). Within this framework the whole thing is seen differently and, perhaps most importantly, the modelling of a highly structured yet beautifully open way of life is "taught". I believe that it is that sensitivity and nurturance of structure, of the skeleton in the path, that has traditionally been missing in humanistic/transpersonal psychology in the West.

Glastonbury,
Anthony Crouch

STOP PRESS:

The British Psychological Society has published a policy statement "Psychological Therapy Services: The need for organisational change". Senior members of the BPS and UKSCOP will comment on this document in the March issue.

A NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON ACCREDITATION

for psychotherapists and counsellors

organized by

THE NORWICH COLLECTIVE

at

THE UNIVERSITY CENTRE, UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

FRIDAY SEPTEMBER 27th 1991

Accreditation confronts all psychotherapists and counsellors with personal, professional and political issues. It raises questions not only of how we practise but of how we relate as human beings.

This open forum will provide an opportunity to come together in an attractive setting in the hope of clarifying our confusion by exploring, through a series of experiential workshops and plenary sessions, the feelings and tensions inevitably evoked by this challenging subject.

For further details contact: Jill Hall

20 Unthank Road, Norwich NR2 2RA
(0603) 626614