

UKCP ELECTION FINAL MESSAGE FROM ANDREW SAMUELS (October 13th 2009)
please circulate

Dear All,

You have heard enough from me! Most of this final message was written by others. Some of it is very hot stuff indeed. I realise that some of you may find this mass of material too much, and you are obviously welcome not to read it or to read only the bits that interest you. However the situation is both so complex and so crucial that it unfortunately cannot be understood without a lot of background information. Freedom of information is one of the principles on which my candidacy is based.

Thank you for all the support. When voting, I recommend the on-line method because of the postal strikes. I have asked for the election period to be extended but been turned down. I'd just like to repeat my promise that, if elected, I'll organise some kind of reconciliation process with good facilitators. Please do send this message on to fellow registrants as I know I am not reaching everyone; I just don't have the resources I need.

Good wishes, Andrew

STOP PRESS: BACP REJECTS HPC PROPOSALS

Just as I was about to send this election message, information came through that the British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy has announced via its magazine *Therapy Today* (p. 56ff) a point by point rejection of the HPC's Professional Liaison Group proposals. BACP is rejecting the HPC proposals on the grounds of, amongst other things, "the implicit medical model of the HPC's generic and proposed psychotherapy Standards of Proficiency", "the integrity of the process; there appears to be an underlying assumption of difference and hierarchy in the HPC and PLG", "lack of evidence" in a number of areas, "HPC's anomalous position with regard to setting academic threshold levels", "lack of any consideration of the impact on the delivery of services", and creating: "a division in the therapeutic field that does not exist in the workplace. BACP believes this is in the interests of power and status rather than the public good". BACP also openly questions the PLG Chair's "capability to be unbiased" given that she is already an HPC registered art therapist. BACP say that it is "understandable" that the proposals have caused many members to join the Alliance for Counselling and Psychotherapy.

[BACP is a well-organised professional body that fights hard for the interests of its members. If they can do this, then one wonders why it has been stated so passionately by my opponents as out of the question that the UKCP might? Most of the BACP's points are identical to what I have been saying for many months and in all my election messages.]

In this message please find:

- (1) *statement from Lord John Alderdice;*
- (2) *statement of support from former UKCP Chair Michael Pokorny;*

- (3) *election statement from the UKCP Council for Psychoanalysis and Jungian Analysis;*
- (4) *statement of support from former UKCP chair Lisa Wake;*
- (5) *protest and complaint about HIPS to UKCP from the Association of Humanistic Psychology Practitioners (an MO of HIPS);*
- (6) *press release for the Maresfield Report on the Regulation of Psychotherapy;*
- (7) *press release for a book of papers critiquing the HPC proposals;*
- (8) *letter on IAPT sent by me to the Observer;*
- (9) *editorial from Therapy Today, magazine of BACP;*
- (10) *explanation of why some of you get these messages from a computer that is not mine.*

1. LORD JOHN ALDERDICE: In my February 2007 debate in the Lords I made clear that I do not regard the HPC as the best way of regulating Psychological Therapists, including the psychotherapists, and my view has not changed. ... I am also happy to repeat what I have said on a number of occasions publicly recently: "While this Labour Government, with its over-centralizing approach, is committed to the HPC as the regulator, it would in practice be very difficult to get this on to the statute book before the upcoming election in 2010. It is entirely possible that a new incoming Government could be prevailed upon to take a quite different approach, and so those who do not want to have regulation through HPC ... should be lobbying their political representatives now, rather than simply assume that nothing can be done. Democracy is after all supposed to be about engaging in the debate."

2. FROM MICHAEL POKORNY: Dear Andrew,

I have followed the arguments about statutory regulation and the HPC with mounting alarm. Although I had resolved not to get involved in UKCP politics and process, I now feel that it would be wrong of me to remain silent.

I fully endorse your candidacy for election to the Chair of UKCP, I sincerely hope that you succeed and rescue us from the heavy hand of the HPC whilst there is still time to be effective.

I have always strongly and actively campaigned for regulation of psychotherapists, but the present proposals for HPC are entirely unacceptable. By contrast you are putting forward other options that would be much better geared to the needs of the psychotherapy profession, both its practitioners and its clients.

Please make my support for you known to all the UKCP psychotherapists, and if I can be of any help to your election success please let me know.

With all best wishes,

Michael Pokorny
Honorary Fellow UKCP

3. Council for Psychoanalysis and Jungian Analysis

UPDATE ON UKCP ELECTION

There have been rapid and controversial developments in the election of the new UKCP chair. Sally Forster has withdrawn from the race, presumably to avoid a split vote for the current UKCP leadership. This leaves two candidates – Andrew Samuels and Carmen Ablack. Read their election statements on the UKCP website: http://www.psychotherapy.org.uk/ukcp_elections.html

The mail out of ballot papers to individual registrants has been delayed. Papers should be posted on 7 October and so should arrive by the weekend. See the UKCP website for an explanation for the delay and what to do if you have not received papers by 14 October. For some of us the voting period may now be two weeks, including half-term, rather than a month, for those living abroad even less.

The CPJA executive has been pressing for the UKCP website to be opened for Q & A's between candidates and registrants, and for an open forum of debate among individual voters. Given the imbalance of support for candidates at UKCP central, we have argued that open access to the website for candidates and registrants is the only guarantor of a level playing field. It looks likely that this will happen soon. Please keep checking the UKCP website for information on this, and contribute to the debates as and how you wish.

Despite the fact that several other section chairs have clearly made a collective decision to attack the integrity of Andrew Samuels' credentials and his motives for standing, we stand by our decision at our last section meeting to neither endorse nor criticize either candidate. Andrew's and Carmen's election statements offer a clear choice of vision for the future direction of the UKCP. Website access will hopefully allow you to put your own questions to each candidate. Make up your own mind how to vote.

At the same time, in the light of attempts to imply that Andrew's platform is a 'Trojan horse' for political opinion alien to the UKCP, we feel we need to make clear:

- 1.** Our section has always represented a plurality of opinion on the nature of regulation appropriate to the profession of psychotherapy. In what is still the only attempt among therapy and counselling organisations to ask individual practitioners what they think about regulation through HPC, the survey of CPJA- as you will see from the statistics – a high proportion of respondents returned a substantial majority against HPC regulation. 48% of respondents votes against regulation by HPC, 27% were for and 25 % did not know, with 25% of the membership returning the survey
- 2.** Our section has consistently resisted the bureaucratic and centralist policies on codes of ethics and complaints procedures, training standards, CPD, supervision qualifications etc originating from UKCP central and designed to prepare UKCP for HPC regulation.
- 3.** Our section has consistently argued against the erosion of democratic processes within the UKCP.

The CPJA website is now a resource for information and discussion on the election. We will be adding documents to the library as we receive them, so please make use of it. Andrew Samuels has added to his statement, responding to reactions and questions about his election platform . For the library of documents relating to the election click on this link:

http://cpja.org.uk/Election_2009/

There is now also an open discussion forum for CPJA members available on the section's website. You need your login details to access it. Click this link <http://www.cpja.org.uk/forums/login.php> and log-in to access the forum on **UKCP election of chair 2009**. Please contribute! And please vote!

JANET WEISZ
Chair CPJA

4. FROM LISA WAKE: Dear Colleagues

I have put together some thoughts regarding the future of UKCP and the upcoming election for Chair.

I offer these thoughts in the spirit of placing some objective facts, historical data and my own views to other Registrants who may be feeling somewhat confused by recent emails that have been circulated regarding the Chair and elections.

I consider that Andrew Samuels has laid out clearly his intention in standing and also has outlined his views on regulation, including presenting some viable alternatives to the HPC. I have also discussed with Andrew some of the discussions that he has had with the 3 parties and there is clearly a move within the parties to listen to these alternatives.

Some of you may recall from my own tenure as Chair of UKCP that I worked and fought with a number of people within Whitehall and the Lords for a stand against the HPC as regulator for psychotherapy. I am delighted that Andrew reports that all 3 parties are now having second thoughts.

At Government level and in my discussions with Tim Loughton, Shadow Secretary for Health, he could see no other option to the HPC and said that psychotherapy would be regulated before the Tory party came into power and his energy would not be focused on undoing the regulatory regime that Labour had set up. However it should be recognised at the time that this was pre the Tory's rise in popularity.

Rosie Winterton, the Secretary of State for Health attended one of the AGMs and was quite clearly a pawn of the DH and reiterated the principle of Henry Ford, you can have it any way you want as long as it is HPC. She was not for moving and was ably supported by Ros Mead at DH – who was the real power behind this drive towards the HPC. Ros Mead is no longer on the scene at DH.

It might help the debate if I were to lay out the route and processes since 2002 that UKCP has gone through to this point.

When James Pollard was elected as Chair in 2002, UKCP was in a bad state. The organisation had not had a Chair for sometime and Alan Thompson from Ex Cons Section had done a sterling holding position as Acting Chair.

James laid out very clearly a strategy and plan to move forward building on Lord Alderdice's work and by the time I joined him as Vice Chair in 2003, he had opened up

dialogue with DH and, albeit uncomfortable for both parties, BACP.

Over the next two years James and I worked very hard, along with the rest of the Executive to challenge the DH's position on the HPC as the only regulator. We opened up the Professional Liaison Group to include all parties and began to see a joining of forces against the HPC and the drive of the DH and Whitehall. We met with Julie Stone of Commission for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence (who at the time oversaw the HPC), who also had written widely on a form of regulation for psychotherapy that was different to that provided by the HPC and was similar to Andrew's concept of the Psychological Professions Council.

When I was elected as Chair in 2005, I continued James' hard work and began a process of ensuring that UKCP had a place at the table of the IAPT group, sessions with Lord Layard, meetings with Marc Seale at HPC, regular and very uncomfortable meetings with DH, sessions with Mark Lyall at Skills for Health. We also managed to get representation with some of the NICE committees. All along the message that was consistently relayed back to the above groups was that the HPC was not an option and that UKCP were committed to some form of statutory regulation. We held regular meetings with BPC, BACP, BPS and BABCP to look at alternative regulatory processes and were starting to get a real impetus up to the point that the Section 60 was issued to bring Psychology into the HPC. This was the point that my term of office ended.

Many hours were provided by a highly committed Executive and Board to look at the wider issues of representing psychotherapy within the drive being taken by the IAPT programme, and we managed to get the IAPT programme to agree to look at other modalities of psychotherapy other than CBT.

We also had a committed group of well known leaders in the psychotherapy research community who contributed time, energy and research to counter the push by IAPT for a CBT monopoly on psychotherapy – individuals such as Michael Barkham, Peter Stratton, Chris Evans amongst others met with me at a specifically set up group to drive this forward. BABCP were also holding the line that CBT through the Government's proposals was not a viable option.

Andrew Samuels has presented some alternative options to regulation via HPC and I find it refreshing to hear from a candidate who appears to uphold the principles that brought UKCP together respecting the diversity, ethics and principles of psychotherapy. I intend to support Andrew and at the same time I also recognise that individual registrants will make up their own mind on the best candidate.

With this in mind, and for what it is worth from my experience - the role of Chair is incredibly demanding both personally and professionally and it is important that the right person with the right skills is elected at the right time.

I would urge UKCP registrants to consider the following questions:

1. What kind of skills and attributes within a Chair does UKCP need at a time of political change in the UK?
2. Of the current candidates, who is the most appropriately skilled person to take this forward as psychotherapy faces it's most critical time?
3. If there is the possibility of finding an alternative form of regulation for psychotherapy than the HPC, are psychotherapists willing to live with their decision to either pursue it as an option, or to turn it down?

Best wishes

Lisa

5. FROM THE BOARD OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR HUMANISTIC PSYCHOLOGY PRACTITIONERS (MEMBER ORGANISATION OF UKCP TO THE CHAIR AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE: *Dear James/David*

The UKAHPP Board is sorry to burden you with this e-mail at such a critical time in the development of the UKCP.

I have been instructed by the UKAHPP Board to formally lodge with you concerns about e-mail communications about the forthcoming UKCP election for a new chair. These e-mails have been communications under the banner of the UKCP:HIPS Executive. The UKAHPP Board is astonished at the content of these communications, which seem to be intended to pervert the electoral process by undermining the professional integrity of one of the candidates.

Although Heward Wilkinson, Ken Evans, Tricia Scott, Angela Cotter and Jo Quennell are members of the HIPS Political Group, this group reports to the HIPS Executive and does not have a mandate to unilaterally set HIPS policy or procedure without formal consent from HIPS delegates via the HIPS Executive.

As UKAHPP delegate to HIPS and member of the HIPS Executive as Treasurer, I can assure you that the HIPS Executive or delegates were not all consulted about these briefing statements and the views expressed within. The HIPS Executive did not give implied or expressed permission to any individual or group of individuals to formulate these statements and for them to be disseminated through the UKCP:HIPS infrastructure.

In summary, the UKAHPP Board was not consulted over these briefing papers and therefore they do not represent the views of UKAHPP. The UKAHPP believes that the position adopted is not entirely representative of the will of HIPS as a whole, its member organisations or their registrants. It would seem that UKCP and HIPS office and structures have been usurped so as to advance the personal views of a few and as a consequence they have been misleading and compromised the good standing and integrity of UKCP:HIPS.

The UKAHPP Board recognises the complexities associated with statutory regulation and has endeavoured to give a platform to all positions. Similarly, the UKAHPP has no intention to favour any candidate above others. In the event of any of the other candidates being undermined in the manner expressed, the UKAHPP Board would adopt a similar position.

Kind Regards

Derek Lawton

*On Behalf of the Board of the UK Association of Humanistic Psychology Practitioners
UKCP:HIPS Executive Member as Treasurer*

**6. Press Release
October 7 2009**

The Maresfield Report on the Regulation of Psychotherapy in the UK

A new report to be published this Friday delivers a devastating critique of the Government's flagship Health Professions Council. HPC are vaunted as the most efficient and robust route to protection of the public in the health sector, yet the report finds persistent failings in public protection, excessive and wasteful expenditure, and evidence of a policy of privileging employer complaints over complaints from members of the public.

The Maresfield Report, which focuses on the proposed HPC regulation of counselling and psychotherapy, finds that:

- * Since 2006, around 30% of complaints made to HPC each year have not been processed, creating a growing backlog and placing undue stress on all parties involved.
- * Although its complaints expenditure is the largest part of HPC's budget, with £4.66m spent in 2008-9, only 17 complaints from the public heard by HPC were deemed to have a case to answer.
- * Of all complaints to the HPC from the public, more than 70% are deemed 'no case to answer' by HPC, compared with only 10% deemed 'no case to answer' by the UK's largest psychotherapy umbrella organisation UKCP.
- * Employer complaints about employees constitute the largest part of HPC complaints hearings, yet these are financed by registrants of the individual health professions that HPC regulates. Registrants are thus effectively financing employment tribunals that ought to be funded by NHS Trusts and other employers.
- * In 2008-9, more than 80% of complaints from employers were deemed 'case to answer', compared with only 22% from members of the public.
- * All HPC hearings take place in front of a public gallery, depriving complainants of the confidentiality that the details of psychotherapy cases may require. The formal and adversarial parameters of HPC hearings will discourage potential complaints.
- * HPC does not offer any mediation or informal processes of complaint resolution, in contrast to the psychotherapy organisations which resolve more than 60% of cases via mediation.
- * Most forms of psychotherapy do not fit the criteria of health professions set out by HPC and cannot be made to fit them without changing the very definition of psychotherapy itself.
- * Although there have been several projects to ensure that therapists are registered and subject to complaints procedures, Britain is the only European country to propose regulation for the actual content of therapy sessions.

The report will be a major embarrassment to HPC at a time when it has begun actively lobbying both Conservative and Lib-Dem policy makers, anticipating a change of government before the proposed legislation can be introduced. It will be particularly embarrassing to HPC's CEO Marc Seale, who is trying to push through this controversial regulation while many politicians are becoming critical of the once received wisdom of the

project.

You can read the Maresfield Report in full on www.pschoanalysis-cpuk.org

7. Press release 11th October 2009

Compliance? Ambivalence? Rejection?

Nine papers challenging the Health Professions Council July 2009 proposals for the state regulation of the psychological therapies

Edited by Richard House and Denis Postle

This book to be published at the Alliance for Counselling and Psychotherapy Conference on October 11th, presents 9 critiques by practitioners from across the spread of the psychological therapies that are highly critical of the July of 2009 Health Professions Council [HPC] recommendations to the Council from the Professional Liaison Group [PLG] and the Council's draft Standards of Proficiency for counselling and psychotherapy.

The HPC can be expected to put these critiques in their 'ignore and move on' bin as they have done with such submissions previously. However the book's contents are like to prove seriously embarrassing for the leading accrediting bodies in the UK such as the UKCP, BACP, and BPC who continue to diligently protect their registrants from the bizarre and incongruous demands that the HPC seeks to impose on counsellors and psychotherapists, not least that these roles are claimed to be fundamentally different.

The book is available for purchase from <http://www.lulu.com/content/7709462> or from Arthur Musgrave: a.j.musgrave@freenet.co.uk price £7.85+ postage.

8. Letter to the Editor of the Observer, October 11th 2009: Psychotherapists and counsellors will be sceptical that the collapse of the Improving Access to Psychological Therapies scheme is entirely due to financial or administrative pressures (Cutback in therapists treating depression. 04.10.09). Many senior therapists, myself included, warned that the 'science' upon which the IAPT scheme is based is unreliable and the idea of pushing young graduates through very short trainings and then expecting them to work with seriously disturbed people was unconvincing. It is an open secret that the outcome results of IAPT are terrible.

Now we have it confirmed that IAPT is going to mean less rather than more therapy and it is psychodynamic counselling in primary care that is under the cosh. We shouldn't be too surprised at this because, as long ago as his Depression Report of 2006, Lord Layard was contemptuous of GP counselling, rejecting any therapy that inquired into the causes of someone's problems by talking it all over in detail as 'endless' and 'backward looking'.

It seems that the Government makes a mess of it whenever it addresses the nation's need for therapy, a crucial need now we know how ineffective the psychiatric drugs are. The crackpot scheme to 'regulate' therapists via the Health Professions Council is just the latest such idea and it will assuredly collapse, just as IAPT has done.

Andrew Samuels,
Professor of Analytical Psychology, Centre for Psychoanalytic Studies, University of Essex

9. September 2009/Therapy Today 3

Sarah Browne
Editor

People are up in arms over the Professional Liaison Group's (PLG) draft consultation on the standards of proficiency for counsellors and psychotherapists. In this issue we present a range of responses to the proposed differentiation of the titles counsellor and psychotherapist. We talk to service managers and practitioners about how, if the proposals go ahead, these changes might impact the profession in different settings from the NHS to university counselling services to EAPs. What services would call themselves under the new legislation is the least of their problems. How would the processes of referrals and assessments be affected? One service manager regards as 'impossible and ridiculous' the suggestion that only those trained and registered as psychotherapists could work with more disturbed clients. Others anticipate confusion not only for practitioners but more worryingly for the public who have come to accept the concept of counselling but for whom psychotherapy might signify something different, more associated with the medical model. We have a large postbag on the same subject. Paul McGahey writes: 'Many therapists know that at the level of practice there are no meaningful differences between psychotherapy and counselling... any attempt to separate them will be arbitrary and contrived... political and economic manoeuvring.' But others welcome the proposals, arguing that although there is a big middle ground shared between counselling and psychotherapy, there are extremes that are very different: counsellors, for example, are not diagnosticians, having no legal basis to provide a mental health diagnosis. (Do psychotherapists in fact have such a legal basis or licence, I find myself wondering, and if so what does this look like?) The main concern expressed in readers' letters, however, is not with the specific standards of proficiency but with the draft consultation as a whole. Practitioners will not recognise themselves or their work from this document. The profession is being forced to fit into a paradigm that is completely wrong

- the regulatory structures of the HPC.

10. I have had a great deal of trouble in getting these election messages out. I don't want to cast aspersions but CPJA's election statement refers to 'the imbalance of support for the candidates at UKCP central'. So I decided to use the administrative facilities I am very largely responsible for building up myself over some time (long before this election) for the Alliance. But I could not solve the technical problems of getting the address list out of other people's computers and into mine. That is why some messages come and will come from someone else's computer. That's all. The Alliance hasn't said 'vote for Andrew'. The Alliance has a lot of UKCP people in it. The conference on October 11th was attended by 220 people and about 40% were UKCP (around 90 people). Over 1000 UKCP registrants have signed the petition against HPC. CPJA's election statement rebuts in considerable detail 'attempts to imply that Andrew's platform is a "Trojan horse" for political opinion alien to the UKCP'.