

side of the training. This was the case in both trainings I have undertaken. While acknowledging that I did learn something important about myself, I feel that the degree of regression evoked in me (as for Mary 'reliving the experience of being abandoned and alone in a group that I first had at nursery school') was deepened by this dual role because more of myself was at stake. My whole self was on the line both professionally and personally, before I could build up any internalised sense of my own power with a person who had far more power than me. I fully acknowledge that the trainers' openness to and acceptance of me and their own process were the growth-inducing factors for me, but in both cases it was an exceptionally painful process. It took me a long time to recognise that unintentional hurting was a very different phenomenon from intent to abuse.

Jill is an infant teacher, a private counsellor, and a course tutor for Cambridge University Board of Continuing Education.

I have been strengthened by staying with my training. I have learned to 'trust the process'. Now that I am a trainer myself, however, I am wondering whether to avoid providing the complex and possibly overwhelming experience of my students experiencing me as both therapist and teacher. Do I take responsibility for ensuring there is a separate arena for trainees to undertake group therapy, especially in the delicate initial stages of training? Do I establish a form of experiential group that is painstakingly negotiated so that all trainees are clear about their responsibilities as learners as well as being aware of the limits of the trainers as therapists? Or will lack of trust and a sense of being outside the group culture always occur in some form for some people, a necessary response to an unfamiliar and risky experience which needs to be acknowledged and valued?

Letters

Dear S&S,

Roger Horrocks' 'A Fresh Look at Freud' (S&S, May 1993) chooses to ignore the fact that Fliess was simultaneously abusing his own son. This was exposed by Richard Fliess when he started his own analysis and training. Why does Horrocks choose to ignore this important fact? Would you go to an analyst who . . . ?

John Ridpath, Crediton

Dear S&S,

I don't understand John Ridpath's letter. What relevance does Fliess's abuse of his son have to my article? Ridpath leaves us with unspoken sinister inferences which he doesn't spell out. What does his final rhetorical flourish, 'Would you go to an analyst who . . . ?' mean? He can't be referring to Fliess, since he wasn't an analyst. Does he mean that Freud as an analyst was tarnished by Fliess? Or does he mean that I'm compromised as a therapist by a cover-up?

Is he saying that Freud's 'proto-analysis' is invalidated because Fliess was a psychotic child-abuser? Or that Freud's rejection of the seduction theory was designed to let Fliess off the hook? Freud later became estranged from Fliess, and talked to Robert Fliess about his father (see Masson's *The Assault on Truth*, p.141). What has all this to do with the development of the analytic space and therapy? One might as well argue that Klein was a lousy mother and that Jung slept with patients. This is the tabloid view: demonise Freud, then we can all feel pure and virtuous.

Roger Horrocks, London W14

Dear S&S.

I can't resist replying to the statement made by Michael Harding in the May issue of S&S. He says: "Therapists with long memories will no doubt remember the furore which greeted Eysenck and Wilson's impeccable research into the efficacy of depth psychotherapy. This research, which has been replicated in a variety of conditions, concluded that there was absolutely no evidence whatsoever that psychotherapy contributed to any curative process."

He doesn't seem to have heard of Eysenck's reputation as a devious person who only quotes research favourable to himself. Anyone who wants to know the balanced position should read the excellent summary by Michael Barkham in *Integrative and Eclectic Therapy: A Handbook*, edited by Windy Dryden and published by the Open University Press in 1992.

As for the 1952 Eysenck research, the

decisive refutation of his conclusions was given by Cheryl McNeilly and Kenneth Howard in a paper which appeared in the official journal of the Society for Psychotherapy Research (1991, 1/1, pp.74-78). They went back to Eysenck's original data and analysed the improvement rates by time, which Eysenck never did. When this is done, it appears that Eysenck demonstrated that psychotherapy was much more effective than spontaneous remission. According to his own improvement estimates, psychotherapy accomplishes in 15 sessions what spontaneous remission takes two years to accomplish. To use Eysenck's own data to show that psychotherapy can clearly accelerate improvement is a very elegant kind of comeuppance.

John Rowan, London E17

Dear S&S,

Like Alan Byron I was hurt and offended by S&S engaging in crude attacks on the royal family in your March issue. How can sneering at people for their personal difficulties possibly be regarded as in accordance with such values?

A psychic told me recently that she had picked up that the younger members of the royal family were performing a useful service in making us face up to the unrealism of the romantic view of marriage. I am inclined to think that this is an unpleasant but probably very necessary message; however we achieve nothing constructive by avoiding the issue and dumping our resentment on the messengers.

Shirley Wade, Colchester