

Open Letter to UKCP Board of Trustees 30.9.09

Dear Members of the Board of Trustees,

I am very concerned as an ordinary member of the Board, as well as Andrew Samuels' nominator for Chair of UKCP, at the direction campaigning within UKCP is taking.

The statement on the election from the HIPS political group is offensive to an open and honest process. Not only does it defame and grossly misrepresent Andrew and his platform - I understand that Andrew has asked for and received a retraction on certain statements - it blatantly distorts and misrepresents the history of the UKCP and its political process, the significance of considerable opposition to HPC regulation among UKCP registrants and the opportunity for a real vote among registrants on the direction of UKCP on regulation that Andrew's candidature for Chair represents.

As far as I understand it it is not true that "the Board of Trustees of UKCP at its meeting this weekend (26-09-09) voted unanimously in favour of supporting Regulation through the HPC."

It is not true that that "the UKCP...s..... aim [of state regulation] has been continually reiterated by all the member organisations through the democratic vote throughout [its twenty years of existence]". It has been consistently critiqued and resisted by many - some of whom have left the organisation over the years for that very reason.

It is not true that Andrew is anti-regulation. He is opposed to HPC regulation, which like many registrants he has come to see to be inappropriate and potentially damaging to the profession.

It is not true that "the UKCP was ready with generic guide-lines and training standards. These are enshrined with the values, principles, theories, philosophy, codes of conduct, ethics and professional practice that have evolved collaboratively, systematically and strategically over twenty years." Many of these enshrined principles, codes etc have been imposed in recent years from the centre of the UKCP and have been resisted and rejected by the CPJA - they are still in dispute.

Andrew's statement for the election represents the views of a significant proportion of UKCP registrants. Over 850 UKCP members have signed the Alliance petition calling for a halt to the HPC regulation process and for space to have a rethink about the appropriateness of this form of regulation for our profession. This is

part of Andrew's election statement. Only 26% of CPJA registrants responding to our section survey supported this form of regulation.

Many of us have called for a poll of membership opinion over the years on HPC regulation, calls which have been opposed at the centre. Andrew has said he will organise a poll or polls, and be guided by the outcome.

For Heward and his colleagues to paint Andrew's programme for the UKCP as in opposition to UKCP policy [a Trojan horse for the Alliance] is an insult to registrants who agree with him and speaks of the undemocratic, bureaucratic abrogation of power within the UKCP that many members of my own section have been pointing out for several years now. This document, which reads as full of panic that HIPS members might not have minds of their own, completely justifies our reading of the organisation's undemocratic dynamics. Opposition to HPC regulation is a significant opinion among UKCP members.

This document cannot be allowed to stand without being made available to public comment by all members of the organisation.

Heward has suggested that it will go on the UKCP website. Can someone please tell me who is in control of this election process? Who is making up these changes in policy as it goes along? Can someone get hold of this process in a transparent way before it becomes utterly devoid of any integrity. Surely we now need as open and interactive a forum as possible. I hear the exec is thinking of using the web for postings and responses for all individual registrants. That would be good. HIPS document must be up there and open for everyone to comment on.

So far the CPJA has wanted to NOT endorse any candidate –nor enter into criticism yet alone defamation of any candidate. We were hoping we could leave it to our members to make up their own minds.

Best wishes,

Paul Atkinson