

# Letters to the Editors

## Dear Editors

Congratulations to the editorial staff for the last two issues! I thought the magazine looked really great and was packed with interesting writing. I opened the next one with delight – in fact my wife and I tussled over the copy when it arrived. This is excellent. But I do also have some feedback that I withheld last time, not wanting to dampen enthusiasms; now I think the time may be right.

I want to encourage our editorial triumvirate, because, as I reader, I want them to do a little more old-fashioned editing. In the previous issue, for example, there was one article that read more like an 'advertorial' than a paper. Perhaps because it came from across the Atlantic, where styles are different, pointing this out perhaps did not seem evident. But on re-reading the article it sticks out and jars.

In the current issue, much of the engaging energy is in the more inter-active parts of the magazine, the letters, the dilemma, the book reviews – as is right. But here is where I want the editors to come in more. For example, is it really OK that Catherine Llewellyn (in Ethical Dilemmas) changes the gender of the practitioner, clearly a HE but rendered here as SHE? This should have been picked up. Or does it make no difference to others? I know as a male practitioner I need to be *doing* something physical to balance out the therapising I do, like gardening or building, that rest on other, more obvious laws than psychological ones. Otherwise, I would go nuts. In fact, in the replies, I missed mention of the fact that therapy is a bit of a 'mad' profession, one that makes it impossible to work a normal 40-hour week, talk about your work at social settings and forces us to keep company mostly with other therapists.

And again, although I mostly agreed with John Rowan on the *humanism versus humanistic* debate, the inclusion of his second letter was embarrassing, and simply handed the moral high ground to James Hansen unnecessarily. We don't just want 'Newsnight' style adversarial debates – we want richness, I propose. Surely, in this case, the editors might have more profitably insisted that John

answer the question and stick to the point?

That debate highlighted another issue, and one that concerns our new look magazine. Am I alone in thinking that the title's strapline is beginning to sound out of date? In fact, isn't it a bit misleading these days? If you look to the content, it is not *psychology* but *psychotherapy* that is being discussed, and it focuses on the kind of psychotherapy that is not primarily psychodynamic. This is so evident in the Dilemmas column. It is always about psychotherapy.

I think that the already embodied notions of *Self and Society* need bringing out and strengthening, and the notion of *humanistic*, which has a very narrow reference, solely within the field of psychotherapy, may have outlived its time – unless we change the title to specify psychotherapy. The link with AHPP is of course a valid one, but for me the magazine's focus needs to be clarified.

I'd like to hear what others think. 📧

**Nick Duffell**, [genderpsychology@btinternet.com](mailto:genderpsychology@btinternet.com)