

Letters

Dear S&S,

As a long-time colleague, particularly involved with AHP international activities some years ago, it's great to receive your letter regarding renewed status of *Self & Society*, its editorial team and approach.

I continue to receive copies and probably have a complete set of this publication from its beginning. I want to congratulate you and your colleagues for maintaining its viability. *Self & Society* certainly provides a worldwide presence to AHP-B.

Let's continue to be in touch; perhaps I will propose doing an article with a 'view from abroad' sometime in the future. I have enclosed a small check as an indication that I care for *Self & Society* and for our international work together.

*Professor Fred Massarik,
University of California*

Dear S&S,

I smell the blood of a patriarchal editor. The use or non-use of capital letters has a subtle but pervasive effect. In the short piece I wrote for the last issue I deliberately chose not to give capitals to the words war and christianity. I am angered by their insertion. There were other mistakes/omissions (have you been pregnant? If not, how do you know that it feels like fluttering, not flutterings?) that were irritating but not fundamental.

This is what the whole damned argument is about. I would not expect to be interfered with in this way by an organ such as *Self & Society*.

Sarah Inman

The editors reply:

It's hard to know where and how much to edit contributions to S&S (we're much more often editing to excise patriarchal usage; perhaps we shouldn't . . .). For both clarity and space's sake we have to do some editing, and we're really sorry that uses of the language which are important to you were unnecessarily 'tidied up'. What we would like to say to any contributor is that if, when writing for the magazine, you feel we might not acknowledge the importance of such 'non-conventional' usages, please make it clear that if your piece is printed you want them to remain as you have written them — we will always respect your wishes.

Dear S&S,

My reaction on seeing last month's review of *How To Get More Clients* was 'Oh, No, how did this one slip through the net?' Please don't buy this book. If you have bought it, please ask for your money back. It is the subject of legal action between me and the publisher, Brainwave, since its first appearance last September. One of the reasons is that all the 'ethically loose' suggestions which Nicholas Albery's review highlights were not written by me.

I was not given the opportunity to read the final proofs, and was not consulted about the many changes, cuts and additions. Almost all the chapters and ideas for counsellors and psychotherapists were cut, making the edited version more relevant to body therapists and small

businesses. There is much more I could say about how I was taken for a ride by the publisher, and I do wish that Nicholas Albery had, like some other reviewers, phoned me and said 'This book is full of errors and inconsistencies, confusing and nothing like your usual work — what's up?' Then I could have told him. Though it is certainly not his or the magazine's fault, just reading his review makes me cringe, as it gives a very seriously inaccurate and possibly damaging impression of me, my work, my standards and my personal and professional ethics. This is my main argument with the publishers, and in this I am supported by the National Union of Journalists and their solicitors.

Many of you will know that I changed my name a year or so ago, hoping to be able to get on with my psychotherapy work with women and writing about meaningful subjects for professional publishers. The whole business of this book fills me with sadness, particularly since it was a 'friendly' agreement with a supposedly humanistic/New Age publisher.

I hope that your readers will understand that I have only written this because of the review appearing even though the book has been withdrawn and is the subject of legal proceedings. The good news is that another publisher has asked me to come up with a new and updated version, which will truly represent my work and thinking.

Val Falloon

Dear S&S

I am not qualified to comment on Hans Eysenck's personality (John Rowan, *Letters*, July 1993), but a general reading of

his works suggests that he appears to quote from research which draws different conclusions than his own. For example, in *The Decline and Fall of the Freudian Empire* he refers — albeit critically — to Bergin and Garfield's claim that spontaneous remission occurs in only 30% of cases as opposed to the 66% Eysenck found. Here one can also consider the 43% (Lambert, 1976) quoted in Dryden's *Individual Therapy* (1992), which contains a useful overview of research into psychotherapy. If one accepts this median figure one is effectively saying that nearly half of those having some form of psychotherapy would improve equally well without having it.

I fully recognise that there are enormous practical and philosophical problems in conducting such research, which in any event may always be of dubious value. However, I was merely trying to point out that the basic claims of astrology have replicated with odds of up to 5 million to one. In fact, since the article was written Suzel Fuzeau-Braesch of the Department of Biology and Physiology at the Université de Paris-Sud, has published research into twins (*Personality and Individual Difference*, Vol. 13 No. 40, October 1992) which claims that the moment of birth was the deciding factor in determining character difference, with odds against chance higher than a billion to one.

Working both as an existential psychotherapist and as an astrologer I am aware of the irony that my 'unrespectable' astrological self appears to have the better credentials when it comes to making general, overall claims.

Mike Harding

Dear Sir,

I was interested to read Laura Donington's piece (March 1993) on The Squiggle Foundation. Although there is much that I agree with in her recognition of Winnicott's contribution, I would like to comment on some misrepresentations of the Foundation's work that she makes.

The Squiggle Foundation was set up fifteen years ago in response to a felt need that more than anyone else, young family care workers and nursery workers found almost no provision, either support, education, or training, in their care and development of children and their families. We turned to Winnicott's work because of his extraordinary range and unique understanding of mothers and their children. Over the years we have offered annual series of developmental courses to people, both professional and 'ordinary devoted parents' in his style and tradition. We seek particularly to reach out to those whose paid employment makes it unlikely they will be encouraged or able to afford developmental courses of the kind we offer. Bursaries and grants are found from our charitable status for this purpose.

The annual series of Public Lectures are given by distinguished individuals who have been influenced by Winnicott's work. These are often analysts but have also included art historians, musicians, sociologists, individuals from the world of theatre or developmental psychologists. We seek to bring in people from as wide a field as that which Winnicott himself addressed with such particular richness. Our audience reflects the same varied milieu.

It is quite possible that Laura Don-

ington personally gained little from the one lecture she attended and I am sorry for this. Her piece, however, cast a very limited and personal slight on the work that we at The Squiggle Foundation continue to try to do.

Nina Farhi

David Jones replies:

I think you are cross with Laura Donington because she wrote that the Squiggle Foundation is 'deeply old-fashioned' in ignoring the spiritual dimension and body-sense, both of which are 'embedded in Winnicott's work, and are central to it'. She appreciated the celebration of Winnicott and the commitment and continuity involving the distinguished people you mention, but suggested that there was something odd about the speaker who talked about working with clients regressed to the peri-natal period. Putting a blanket over a patient was presented as a novelty requiring caution and justification by reference to someone who did it fifty years ago (Mott perhaps?).

Since the 1970s many psychotherapists have worked with regression which is active, dynamic and subtle, extending far beyond the use of a blanket. Those who pioneered this work — William Emerson, David Wasdell, Richard Mowbray and Juliana Brown, Courtenay Young, Stan Grof and John Rowan (and the late Frank Lake and Bill Swartley) — all acknowledge the importance of Winnicott. Given this context you can perhaps understand why the Squiggle Foundation, for all its excellence, might be seen by the more up-to-date practitioner as 'in a time warp' — good on celebration and theory, but out-of-date in practice.