

Guest Editorial

Jungian analysis and humanistic psychotherapy: critical connections – past, present and future

Ruth Williams MA

Jungian Analyst, Integrative Psychotherapist and Supervisor, Private Practice, London, UK

I am grateful to the *Self & Society* editors for the honour of inviting me to guest edit this edition of the journal, which follows on from the Confederation for Analytical Psychology (CAP) conference held on Saturday 25 October 2014 (reviewed by *S&S* co-editor Richard House in *Self & Society*, 43[2], 2015, pp. 158–165). The conference was offered as the 5th biennial Andrew Samuels Lecture. Andrew was the founder chair of CAP, which is an organizational member of the United Kingdom Council for Psychotherapy (UKCP), and the biennial lecture honours his unique contribution to our field.

The genesis of the 2014 conference was as far back as 2002, when a conference between CAP and the Humanistic and Integrative Section (as it then was) of UKCP was proposed. This was stymied by professional politics on both sides, but the idea never completely went away. This unique and innovative conference was the first to openly celebrate the fact that humanistic psychotherapy and Jungian analysis have many features in common.

As someone who is trained in both humanistic psychotherapy and Jungian analysis, this was an event with great personal meaning to me, as it brought together the twin poles of my own training, something many of us have undertaken both formally and informally in our own unique journeys, combining strands of so many different theories, philosophies and spiritual paths to create integrative models of psychotherapeutic practice.

Andrew Samuels has, of course, spent almost 40 years of his own professional life evolving a unique clinical blend of post-Jungian, relational psychoanalytic and humanistic approaches to therapy work.

The links between Jungian analysis and humanistic and integrative psychotherapy have been known about for some time, though, as became clear during the conference, never before openly presented and discussed. For example, the idea that all elements in a dream are part of the dreamer's personality or psyche is found in Fritz Perls and also in Jung. Maslow's hierarchy of needs and Jung's ideas about individuation have similarities.

As far as therapy work is concerned, common features include trust that the patient/client knows at depth what is needed from the therapy, a recognition that the therapist is in the process as a person, and that therapy needs to struggle to maintain a distance from the conformist and materialist values that are present in contemporary society. Both traditions have pioneered the exploration of a variety of collective approaches to psychology, ranging from the transpersonal and spiritual to

the socio-political. Yet both traditions have had to revise and develop the seminal insights of their founders, and problems of mourning – for Jung, Rogers, Berne, Perls, Maslow, Reich and others – are freely acknowledged still to be there.

These clinical and intellectual overlaps were not the only basis on which the conference was structured. CAP thought long and hard about who to invite to present at this landmark conference, in order to achieve a balance in terms of both gender and theoretical orientation. There are a number of psychotherapists qualified in both Jungian and humanistic and integrative approaches. Virtually all the conference speakers fitted this description, and so a huge amount of ‘compare and contrast’ went on. Prior to the conference, it may well have been the case that some Jungian analysts saw themselves as ‘superior’ to their humanistic and integrative colleagues. If this was so, the experience and process of the conference suggested that equal relations could quite easily be established, and mutual learning take place.

Inevitably there was much that remained to be said, so perhaps this will be the first step in opening an important conversation between and within modalities. There was a time at the UKCP when these used to be referred to as ‘modality wars’! The very fact that this conference finally came into being seems to indicate that there is interest in exploring our similarities and differences without the need to kill each other off.

In the pages that follow, you will find the transcript of an interview – or a conversation – with **Andrew Samuels** and **Brian Thorne**. Although Brian Thorne has now retired from professional practice, including conference presenting, we managed to persuade him to meet with Andrew to film the conversation reproduced in this issue, which covers many areas of interest to practitioners and people interested in the history of our field. It is always such a privilege to hear from people who met with the founding thinkers, and who can report in such a uniquely informed, personal way.

Helena Hargaden, who in collaboration with others has developed a model she refers to as ‘relational TA psychotherapy’, poses a fascinating ethical dilemma in her article for us all to think about from our differing psychotherapy models. In particular, she contrasts Jung and Buber. **Birgit Heuer** gives us a window into her doctoral research on what she has called ‘sanatology’, which moves us from a hermeneutic of suspicion to one of what she calls ‘deep positivity’. It ‘induces relational sensibilities, which are informed by love and its transformations’. Her approach can of course be employed across therapeutic approaches.

Deirdre Johnson then takes us on a journey looking at gender through the different lenses of her original orientation in Psychosynthesis, which she has gone on to develop in her practice as a Jungian analyst and writer. Gender has been a tricky area in Analytical Psychology in that Jung’s own formulations have needed deep revision by contemporary feminist thinkers to move us away from essentialist ideas.

Dale Mathers and **Chris Robertson** presented a joint paper which has been turned into an article for this theme issue, on their respective interests in the radical edge to our field. They encourage the reader to argue with them as you read their piece. Their hypothesis is that ‘there is an alternative to scientific materialism as the dominant discourse in psychotherapy’. **John Rowan** grapples with the differences between self-actualization and individuation. He regaled us at the conference with a brief history of the humanistic tradition, and his article is a veritable treasure trove of references tracing different strands of the movement.

Steven Smith discusses the ontological nature of change, looking at the pivotal role of the relational approach as it is being incorporated into humanistic and psychoanalytic thinking. He argues that the client's 'inner healer' and the therapeutic relationship need to be held in a creative dynamic as a vital source for change.

I hope you will agree that the papers presented here are high-quality, deeply thoughtful and emotionally congruent contributions to an important subject.

Notes on contributor



Ruth Williams is a Jungian analyst (Association of Jungian Analysts), supervisor and integrative psychotherapist (The Minster Centre). She is Chair of the Confederation for Analytical Psychology, and was the conference chair. www.RuthWilliams.org.uk