

she really wanting to start training soon, and you are clearly not in the process of ending in therapy, then she could continue in therapy with you and train elsewhere. If she doesn't want to train elsewhere, but only with you, then you

need to explore all the related issues within the therapy. If it's adult to adult then the only solution is for her to defer training until she's completed her therapy with you naturally, and ideally even then I feel there should be an interval between the two.

David is a director of training at a humanistic psychology centre in Devon

Letters

Dear S&S,

I find David Kalisch's letter (S&S, May) puzzling. I was on the Board of AHPP for six years including one year as Chair from about 1988 onwards. I cannot recall anyone ever speaking in favour of any register of psychotherapists with the UKCP, statutory or otherwise. What we did decide was that it was better for humanistic psychology to be involved in the developing debate between psychotherapists rather than maintaining the 'outsider' position of the seventies. Having read much of the debate, I still think this was and is the right decision. The solitude, purity, creativity and independence of the wilderness can, in time, lead to isolation and marginalisation. Our voice needs to be heard.

Martin Jelfs

Dear S&S,

It was with some dismay that we read the AHP/AHPP advertisements for Alvin Mahrer's May workshops, where we read in the small print for his 'Experiential Supervision' workshop the phrase 'accredited registered practitioners only.' What is particularly ironic is that earlier in the same issue the AHPP Board stated publicly that they are 'opposed to statutory registration'. Just how such a position can be

reconciled with the *de facto* exclusion of unregistered non-accredited practitioners is quite beyond our comprehension. That a humanistic organisation can come up with such an exclusionist restriction adds further weight to the concerns of those of us who are highly sceptical as to whether any professionalisation process can stay true to the core values of a humanistic worldview. We would welcome a response from whoever took this extraordinary decision.

Tim Broughton, Juliana Brown, Uwe Bull, Cal Cannon, Lindsay Cooke, Jill Davies, Mike Eales, Carol Ferguson, Hélène Fletcher, Jutta Gassner, Guy Gladstone, Jill Hall, Marion Hall, Sue Hatfield, Richard House, David Kalisch, Richard Mowbray, Carol Newell, Drue Nottage, Clive Oxford, Keith Pearce, Denis Postle, John Talbut, Nick Totton and David Wasdell

Dear S&S,

I loved Alvin Mahrer's workshops, and would like to thank AHP and AHPP for putting them on. My only regret was that not enough people heard about them, and though I loved the workshops being small it was a shame that more people didn't benefit from them. Could AHP not find a way to advertise its events more widely?

Dina Glouberman

Dear S&S,

We would like to invite any counsellors who already work with people affected by visual impairment or those who are interested in working in this field to join a London network of counsellors co-ordinated by the London V.I. Forum. The London V.I. Forum is an informal group of representatives of voluntary associations for visually impaired people in London. Also included are representatives from national organisations active in London. Please write for a questionnaire enclosing a stamped, self-addressed envelope to Christianne Heal (ref: VIF) 9 Cannon Place, Hampstead, London NW3 1EH. Many thanks.

Christianne Heal

Dear S&S,

The various responses to my letter questioning the humanistic ethics behind the Earwig column, in its present form, have made my objections even clearer to me. I feel that I also need to be clearer.

I am not against a satirical column: I'm all for humour and sarcasm, a place to raise questions and controversy. What I'm against is the anonymity of this column and its inclination to speak in code that only a few will understand. This has the potential for misuse, so it is the form of the column I'm against, not the column itself.

I do not, as Patricia Welles' somewhat patronising letter seems to suggest, feel excluded from the rest of the journal, and in the main I feel it upholds humanistic values. Ironically it was when I knew exactly what was being referred to in the Earwig column that my eyes were opened to the potential for abuse. At that point my objections became strong enough to write; previously, like Angela Cooper, I had

thought my 'not getting the joke' was my 'fault' for not being active enough. This then changed to a fear of being thought of as someone who can't take a joke, until I saw the power game involved that could lead me to silencing myself.

This is not about my personal feelings; it's about a point of principle, and as such I'm concerned about this being left to the readers to pick up. I would also query the notion of a 'pro' and 'anti' vote. Where is the editor's responsibility for humanistic principles, and what is this attempt to manipulate the interpretation of the responses received so far? How is Shirley Wade's letter 'iffy' when she says she is strongly against anonymity? Denis Postle says in his article on statutory registration (May 1997), 'the problem lies with individuals and groups of people who are significantly unaware of the extent to which they enact power over attitudes to social organisation and relationships, while claiming to represent good practice.' This seems to me to be a clear example of just that.

In the latest edition I'm delighted to see Earwig fully displaying his apparent underlying grandiosity. Does he really see himself as a great comic talent; is the use of 'we' to mean the 'royal we' or are there a group of people hiding behind the name; does his belief in his own potency mean no one can make a difference to him? Well, given the way the editors have gone for a reader's 'vote' which they've then tried to rig, maybe on this last point he's right.

As Earwig won't tell his real name he will have to be known by what he calls himself, and this is very interesting. Given its coded nature we've been told all along what the purpose of this column has been. *Collins English Dictionary*: (Archaic) Earwig. To attempt to influence (a person) by private

insinuation (from old English superstition that the insect creeps into people's ears).

Nuff said!

Mandy Bowden

Dear S&S,

Has anyone else noticed that there may be a sexual politics issue within the debate between Earwig and his detractors? In your last issue you printed three letters all from women, only one of whom, Patricia Welles, was unabashedly in favour of Earwig's unstinting mask-shredding. Ms Welles may not be a typical woman anyway. As there is no actual proof of Earwig's gender (nor name, which might be a clue) he could be a she, although this is unlikely as he seems to get up only female noses. In order to create a balance in what is rapidly becoming what used to be called 'the battle of the sexes', perhaps you might consider another column, Earmuff. Then, possibly, men would write to S&S with their various

complaints about Earmuff's secrecy, in-group jokes, and reverential comments on the fact that women — be they members of AHP, IPN, BAC, WAC, SACK, UKCP, AJA, BAP, SAP, or even RAP — be they Psychoanalysts, Lacanians, Winnipottians, Kleinians, Centaurians, Chironians, Transpersonalities, and so on, make better counsellors/therapists than men because of their birthright of intuitive powers.

Earmuff

A short editorial response! By 'iffy' we only meant 'somewhere in-between', and we do welcome this ongoing debate, since it raises important issues like integrity and the role of humour in the therapeutic transaction. The editorial injunction to uphold humanistic values is one we take very seriously, though Earwig has always been something of an exception and s/he has been hard to hold down. Potential Earmuffs, Eardrums, Eardrops and Earaches will all receive a fair hearing.

AHP Page

Ruth Finer

Take a piece of paper and a pen and draw the person who's posing in front of you. It sounds quite a reasonable instruction until you know that the paper is about an inch square, you have one second to do the drawing, and the person is moving round the room. Thanks to Colin McGee for facilitating our pre-AGM workshop, for helping us explore space and time. No one boldly went where we had never gone before during the AGM. We carried out the usual business things, said

how wonderful S&S is, and voted in the new committee. The new AHP committee consists of June Green (Chair), James Mackenzie (Treasurer), Adela Austen, John Buckle, Marolyn Burgess, Ruth Finer, Sue Mickleburgh, Julian Nangle and Margaret Novakovic, with Judith Furner co-opted onto the *Self & Society* subgroup. Eric Whitton also attends committee meetings, as Chair of AHPP (and June will attend AHPP board meetings). Any AHP member who would like a copy of the Chair's