

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear David,

Re: *Self and Society* Jan 1992

I so agree about the drive towards accreditation being a defensive manoeuvre. I think it's a defence of the therapeutic body politic and that ultimately economics becomes the bottom line, the driving force. And in America the insurance companies come to play a large part in the process (cf. medicine). And - diminution of the client base - that's really around at the moment.

It's all too easy for trainee/aspiring therapists or counsellors to 'play the game', to present a therapist self who fits the criteria. I see so many similarities in the teaching profession - it's not difficult to become qualified and no guarantee, in my opinion, of 'ability' - whatever that might be. One thing in teaching that the therapeutic world would do well to consider as we move towards professionalisation is that teaching relies to a large extent on the maintenance of a power imbalance: it can be abusive, oppressive, and into scapegoating in a big way.

Your bit on the rebel position, and the denial in that of adult:adult engagement, is so right. Those of us who reject accreditation have need to examine very carefully the source of that energy.

I agree on your comment about U.K.S.C.P. And I think the rest of us must be so careful not to cast it as the scapegoat. Except that's bound to happen if U.K.S.C.P. doesn't address it's own shadow. Denial of shadow energy will inevitably suck it in from elsewhere.

I feel there is often a lack of awareness among therapists of the political dimension; the acting out in the therapeutic process of what is unresolved in the therapeutic body politic. How many training courses work for instance with group and institutional dynamics, look at the shadow side of the institution? How many trainee therapists have awareness of the political/social dimensions and what process of acting out they are engaged in and colluding with?

Best wishes.

Sue Hatfield.

Dear John Rowan,

I've just finished reading the Jan/Feb '92 issue from cover to cover - something I rarely do with anything else these days.

What came to me after reading the two sharply contrasting articles on Accreditation was a realisation about my own life- search for simplicity, clarity and wisdom. I keep finding my own paradox. David Wasdell's sentence "There is a confusing plethora of schools, beliefs, practices and doctrines - a glittering galaxy of psychoclass fragments gathered collusionally around the memory of charismatic leaders whether dead or alive" is wonderful, isn't it? What a pity he goes on (and on) and drowns his own talent in lengthy technical verbosity. What a relief after that to meet Robin Shohet, read his (her?) first paragraph (maybe it needs to be re-printed) and to laugh and put my folder on accreditation to the bottom of the pile. Thanks to all concerned.

Yours sincerely,

June Buchanan

Selkirk

P.S. Can David Wasdell please note that little Britain has a small upper section called Scotland. To ignore it is an ignorance and arrogance which never ceases to amaze me.