

for 'certificate of entry on the register of chartered psychologists';

IDHP (Institute for the Development of Human Potential) for 'diploma in humanistic psychology';

Karuna Institute, (a HIPS, Humanistic and Integrative Psychotherapy Section, member of UKCP) for a 'graduation certificate';

Oxford University for 'certificate of first degree';

UKCP (United Kingdom Council for Psychotherapy) for 'annual registration certificate'.

Results

Ease of contact: only the IDHP posed any problem. They have no address and their contact person changes every so often. Persistent telephoning was needed to get an address. A reply eventually came on a University of Surrey letterhead! The other

organisations are listed in the telephone directory.

Hassle: the only organisation to ask a question was the Karuna Institute which wrote to ask for the year of graduation. The IDHP replacement is signed, but another signature is supposed to be obtained by the recipient themselves.

Speed of Response: all acknowledged the request within 10 days and certificates were replaced within a month.

Cost: only Oxford University made a charge: 'For each certificate attesting admission to any degree £4; hand-written certificates in black or blue ink £7; as above but highlighted in gold or silver £9; official photocopies 50p including p&p.'

Conclusion

If you do lose your certificates don't panic. They are easy to replace.

The Future of Humanistic Psychotherapy

John Rowan

In the *AHP Perspective*, published in San Francisco, the issue of January/February 1995 contains an article by Maureen O'Hara (who will be familiar to some readers because she came to England for our annual conference in 1990), sounding a 'wake up call for humanistic warriors'. She warns in particular of trends in the field of psychotherapy.

In California and New York, and increasingly elsewhere, managed care is

well under way. What this means is that insurers, healthcare purchasers and governmental agencies appear to have decided that in the interests of cost containment they must control therapeutic practice, controlling what therapists can and cannot do, for how long, and for what reasons. 'One managed care company I work with wants a symptom checklist and therapeutic intervention report after *every single session!*' And she says that most hu-

manistic therapists cannot twist their practice to fit into such a mechanistic system.

She tells us that the American Psychological Association has embarked upon a project to create a diagnostic manual of its own, distinct from the psychiatric manual (DSM-IV) which is now so well known. This will enable clear distinctions to be made between acceptable care and sub-standard care. Again this will probably be to standards other than those which humanistic psychologists espouse.

A third threat to humanistic psychology, she says, is the tightening up of accreditation criteria in various states. Increasingly 'graduates from humanistically oriented schools are being refused licensing'. This has bad implications for those who are at present organising humanistic types of course.

And a fourth threat comes from the backlash against therapy which is now going on from the False Memory Society and its associates, from the religious right, from books such as those attacking Freud and from those like Robyn Dawes' *The House of Cards*, which purports to demonstrate that there is no correlation between outcomes in psychotherapy and requirements for training and licensing in clinical psychology. Some humanistic and transpersonal psychologists have already been charged with ethics violations and malpractice for using experiential or shamanistic practices.

Do we have to worry? Is the same thing going to happen in this country? It seems to me that the mental health field is ruled by accountants and attempts at standardisation. There is a version of science, dominated by empiricism and cognitive

psychology, which says that cost-benefit analyses can always be conducted. Everything worthwhile can be measured at the level of ordinary consciousness. There is no need to worry about the unconscious or the spiritual. As for the oppressions of class, race, gender, age, disability, sexual orientation and the like, all that can be taken care of within the standardisation procedures.

The prime example of all this is the movement towards devising National Vocational Qualifications for befriending, advice, guidance, counselling, therapeutic counselling and psychotherapy. By means of a functional analysis all these activities are broken down into elements, which can then be combined in various ways to form requirements for certain positions in employment. The thinking behind this comes from cognitive psychology and empiricist science, which are very limited when it comes to dealing with human beings.

Now there is in statistics a thing called the Gompertz curve, which applies quite regularly to innovative practices. After a slow start, the innovation speeds up and begins an period of exponential growth, such that if the trend continued, the earth would be totally taken over by it. But at a certain points the curve inflects, making it more like an S — in fact, it is sometimes called the S-curve. At that point the phenomenon slows down, and some new innovation comes on the scene. I assume that the process of progressive control and centralisation, of which some examples have been given above, will also go the same way. How far it still has to go is uncertain.

After it I suspect there will be a period

of fragmentation, very much in tune with the post-modern ideas which at the moment are only popular in the universities. In this more post-modern atmosphere, humanistic and transpersonal approaches

would fit very well. In fact, these approaches, with their full appreciation of the multiplicity of things, might be more at home in such a world than most others.

An Interview with Emmy

Emmy van Deurzen Smith and David Jones

David: What difference has the UKCP made to psychotherapy?

Emmy: It has put it on the map. Whereas previously psychotherapy was out of the public eye it is now very much a public phenomenon. This means it can be scrutinised like any other profession. Clients can ask if a therapist is registered and therapists are obliged to work to specific and agreed standards. This also means they run the risk of being struck off the register if they fail to maintain these standards. None of this was possible before the UKCP was created.

David: What problems does the UKCP face in trying to achieve its aims?

Emmy: There are problems arising from the need for all of those with an interest in psychotherapy to broker relationships involving power. Political and economic factors inevitably play an important part here. There is competition and overlap between psychotherapy and counselling,

counselling psychology, psychiatry and psychoanalysis all of which have separate professional bodies. There is a real need for more co-operation between them. Inevitably there has been a tendency for a hierarchy to form. Fortunately the UKCP has always enjoyed a good relationship with the Royal College of Psychiatrists, the British Psychological Society and the British Association for Counselling. The relationship with psychoanalysts and the British Confederation of Psychotherapists is a little more complex.

David: If the Institute of Psychoanalysis applied to be a member again would they be accepted?

Emmy: I hope they do rejoin, though their absence is not crucial and they might have to rethink some of their standards of training and practice if they wanted to come back to UKCP. It is much more likely that BCP and UKCP will work out some mutual agreement on regulation.

Emmy van Deurzen Smith is Professor of Psychotherapy and Counselling at Regent's College. She has just completed a very successful term of office as Chair of the United Kingdom Council for Psychotherapy (UKCP). S&S Commissioning Editor David Jones interviewed her about recent developments.