

increasing the number of practitioners who might be associated with our humanistic aims and beliefs. If we gain collegial membership of BAC, I think we have a great opportunity to attract more counsellor members. The discussions of the Core Beliefs Working Party showed a strong interest in keeping a broad spectrum of practitioners in the accreditation of full members.

We are an association in good professional standing. We offer something quite different from other agencies in the field. We are independent from any particular 'school'. We enjoy both the shared philosophy of beliefs and practices that hold us together as well as the differences we bring from our various backgrounds. Some of these ideas we have in common with other organisations, but we are answerable only to ourselves — the membership. Apart from Ian Doucet, our administrator, who puts in more work than he is paid for, the officers, members of the board and committees give a lot of their time and thought to the wellbeing of AHPP. Let's hope that what we do is of increasing benefit to the

membership as a whole. I welcome the moves to forge closer links with other agencies. AHPP can play a significant role within the wide spectrum of humanistic practice. The human potential movement has spread into many spheres of work, and it is important that we seek recognition for AHPP.

We can build from our strengths. At the same time we can pay attention to where we can improve. One of the features of AHPP which I have admired is a willingness to be open and to look at itself and change. In setting up the Core Beliefs Working Party, we have initiated a process of self-critique about how we can apply our humanistic beliefs more effectively. For me one of the touchstones of being humanistic is enrichment. As a board member, I have experienced both warmth and positive criticism and I look forward to continuing to make the business both enjoyable and rewarding. And hopefully we will be able to share this sense of belonging to an association which values encounter and fulfillment in our work.

---

---

## Letters

Dear S&S,

The November Ethical Issues pages raised a question that has long interested me. In my own practice I have never found that a client who is paying nothing, or a reduced rate, takes the therapy less seriously or benefits less from it. I have often wondered why some other practitioners (like those who responded to Philip's story) report a different experience.

Some of what Andy, Maxine and

Caroline say has helped me understand this. It seems as though it may be differences in the practitioner's attitudes that set up different responses in the client. Personally, I do not feel, as Andy does, that paying and receiving money is more 'adult'; in fact, I think it's a rather infantile way of constructing social relations! Nor do I agree with Maxine that the money nexus brings with it 'dignity and self-respect' —

very much the opposite, its main role in the world is to degrade and humiliate.

My hypothesis is that if the practitioner's sense of self worth is bound up with being paid for their work, it will be hard for them to work well with clients who don't provide this boost. I recommend to people I train and supervise that they make sure to charge enough so that they can feel relaxed and comfortable about doing the work; anything else will be against the clients' interests. But this is a — perhaps unavoidable — make-do arrangement, working around the practitioner's neuroses about money and status, neuroses which, of course, are established and fed by society's attitudes. (I'm not of course claiming to be without neuroses in this area; it's just that mine happen to be different ones.)

It's interesting, though, to find that even given the dominant social attitudes towards money, what research has been done on this question supports my own experience. Pope, Geller and Wilkinson (*Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 43, 1975) found no correlation at all between fee status (from full self pay through third party to no fee) and therapy outcome. In other words, clients who don't pay seem to benefit (or not) from therapy just as much as those who do pay.

Here in Yorkshire we've recently set up a 'Low Cost Psychotherapy and Counselling Scheme', with a very simple structure: anyone enquiring is referred to practitioners in their area who have offered one or two such spaces. If accepted for therapy or counselling, they have exactly the same arrangement as other clients apart from the fee. Interested readers can phone and fax me on 0113 275 5984.

Nick Totton

Dear S&S,

Your magazine should be aware by now that a motion has been proposed at the AHPP annual general meeting, seconded by the AHPP General Secretary, that, if passed, would enable AHPP members to not subscribe to and receive *Self & Society* as part of their required AHP membership. This proposal has been presented as a 'right to choose' issue, given perhaps that the financial saving for presumably earning AHPP members would be paltry (though in aggregate it might not be paltry for *Self & Society's* finances).

I would put a different interpretation on the intent of this misconceived initiative. *Self & Society* remains a significant forum within which issues of professional politics can be aired and debated. Perhaps the proposer and seconder of the motion are expressing those tendencies within AHPP which support the wish not to know and the wish not to make known. Proponents of these same tendencies have sought to deprecate the critique in report form of the AHPP's board level functioning, posted to all full members at the point of my resignation from the board, as the work of a 'paper tiger'. A case of ostriches versus tigers perhaps?

This apparently trivial subscription issue should be reflected upon in terms of the longstanding tension between the inclusive tendencies of AHP and *Self & Society* as organs of humanistic psychology and the exclusionary tendencies of its practitioner wing, the AHPP, now busy more than ever pursuing its closed shop (professionalising) and, it would seem from the motion, closed mind agenda. Whatever wishes AHPP expresses through its vote, AHP and *Self & Society* should have none of it.

Guy (Tiger) Gladstone