

## Editorial

KEITH TUDOR, AUT University, Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand

I ended my previous editorial, which introduced the special *festschrift* issue (Volume 17, Number 1) for Nick Totton, with the image of Nick opening his copy of the journal and seeing that surprise. Although personally I did not witness that moment, I can report that he was surprised, and deeply appreciative of the issue and acknowledgement of his work; and so, to all involved, I want again to extend my thanks – and, not least, for keeping the secret!

With this issue, the journal returns to a generic form, with six articles encompassing concerns about and understandings of violence (Morrall, Hazeleton, & Shackleton; Nwoye; Emery) and terror and fundamentalism (Emery); pleasure (Olivier); social change (Morrall, Hazeleton, & Shackleton; Olivier); trauma (Nwoye); race (Gregory); and mourning (Emery); across psychotherapy (and counselling) practice (Olivier; Nwoye; Jenkins; Emery); and education and training (Nwoye; Gregory). The articles reflect different theoretical orientations: Lacanian psychoanalysis (Olivier); a broadly integrative or eclectic approach (Nwoye); and narrative therapy (Jenkins); and continue to reflect a geographical spread of contributors between Northern and Southern Hemispheres (the United Kingdom and the United States of America; and Australia and South Africa).

In the first article, Peter Morrall, Mike Hazeleton, and William (Bill) Shackleton consider the social basis of homicide, which they view as *the* major social and personal problem in the world. They draw useful distinctions between primary victims of homicide (the people killed); secondary victims (their family and close friends); and what they identify as tertiary victims (i.e. the communities and societies of the primary and secondary victims). The authors acknowledge the role of psychotherapists in working with secondary victims but, most importantly and significantly, challenge both practitioners and their professional organisations to take a more proactive role and engagement with the social roots of this manifestation of violence. Their call for us to take “moral action” is based clearly on a perspective which acknowledges psychotherapy as having a moral base and a moral – and political – purpose (see Totton, 2011a). In their article, the authors quote (from the Institute of Psychoanalysis’s webpage “Beyond the Couch” – <http://www.beyondthecouch.org.uk/>), Fritz Perls’ famous gestalt prayer. The original version (Perls, 1969, p. 4) reads:

I do my thing and you do your thing.  
I am not in this world to live up to your expectations,  
And you are not in this world to live up to mine.  
You are you, and I am I, and if by chance we find each other, it’s beautiful.  
If not, it can’t be helped.

\*Correspondence to: Keith Tudor, AUT University, Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand.  
E-mail: keith.tudor@aut.ac.nz

Whilst this “prayer” captured a mood of the moment in which individuality and free expression were being asserted and gestalt and other therapies within the humanistic tradition were promoting the value(s) of independence, and personal autonomy and responsibility, it does – and did – reflect a highly and somewhat aggressively individualistic sentiment and, strangely, a certain fatalistic passivity. Within a couple of years of its publication, Tubbs (1972, p. 5) offered an alternative in the form of a response:

If I just do my thing and you do yours,  
We stand in danger of losing each other  
And ourselves.

I am not in this world to live up to your expectations;  
But I am in this world to confirm you  
As a unique human being,  
And to be confirmed by you.

We are fully ourselves only in relation to each other;  
The I detached from a Thou  
Distintegrates.

I do not find you by chance;  
I find you by an active life  
Of reaching out.

Rather than passively letting things happen to me;  
I act intentionally to make them happen.

I must begin with myself, true;  
But I must not end with myself:  
The truth begins with two.

Throughout the 1970s, a number of other versions were put forward which responded to and took various issues with the individualism of the original (see Dolliver, 1981). Whilst Perls’ version and vision represent a one-person psychology (Stark, 1999) (and between rather separate persons at that), the versions of Tubbs’ and others represent more of a two-person psychology and even a two-person-plus psychology (Tudor, 2011) – both of which provide the conceptual basis for the kind of engaged social, moral and political action for which Morrall, Hazeleton, and Shackleton are calling.

In the second article of this issue, Bert Olivier, drawing on the work of Jacques Lacan, as well as of Giles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, Julia Kristeva, Slavoj Žižek, and Ian Parker, offers a theoretical and thoughtful exploration of the Lacanian psychoanalytic concept of *jouissance*, or excessive enjoyment. Whilst the concept of *jouissance* carries a certain sense of transgression, in a kind of “naughty but nice” way, Olivier argues that, as capitalism offers, indeed, insists on pleasure through the purchase and consumption of commodities, that such pleasure or *jouissance* cannot be transgressive. The article highlights a poignant paradox: the more we enjoy, i.e. purchase pleasure, even that which we might think (or might like to think) challenges capitalist ideology and “straight” society its values, the more we support capital, and its exploitative social relations. In response, Olivier – and others (see Parker, 2011) – argue that (Lacanian) psychoanalysis creates the space for clients to assume their desires (revolutions in and of subjectivity) and to refuse the pseudo *jouissance* that capitalism offers and sells.

The following three articles articulate different forms of theory and practice. The first, from Augustine Nwoye, who, amongst his roles, is one of the Associate Editors of the journal, reports on a workshop/seminar which was designed to train volunteers to work with victims of political violence in Kenya, following the disputed presidential elections of 2007. The article is, in part, an edited version of a speech the author gave as part of the workshop/seminar training. Nwoye frames his outline of specialised clinical practices for trauma work with victims of violence in the context of the violence itself; of an understanding of trauma and trauma work; and of the responses of the public sector institutions in Kenya including, specifically, its universities. Reflecting on the theoretical underpinnings of the training programme, Nwoye makes the significant point that, whilst advocating the importance of “local knowledge” (Totton, 2005), the therapeutic work advocated and implemented drew on *both* Western and African intellectual, theoretical and wisdom traditions.

The following article by Suzanne Jenkins takes a similar “both ..., and ...” approach to Western and indigenous traditions, in this instance with regard to narrative therapy and Australian Aboriginal storytelling. Her article is based on a paper she gave at the World Congress for Psychotherapy (WCP) in 2011, a selection of papers from which formed the basis of a special issue of this journal last year (Tudor, 2012). Jenkins argues that, in some ways, psychotherapy and specifically psychotherapy research, has adopted the methodology – and, I would add, methods – of “natural” science, to the detriment of other methodologies and methods such as storytelling. This privileging of certain forms of ontology, epistemology, methodology, and method in psychology, psychotherapy, and counselling has been an aspect of colonisation. As Jenkins puts it: “psychology has been complicit in the colonising process ... [and] has acted as an agent for assimilation and oppression” (p. 140). Given the dominance and colonising influence of only certain forms of “evidence” in the current obsession with “evidence-based practice” in psychotherapy, I would welcome and encourage contributions on the theme of the politics of psychotherapy research for a future special issue of the journal.

In the next article, written by another Australian colleague and also originally presented as a paper at the WCP in 2011, and inspired by Susie Orbach’s (2000) book on *The Impossibility of Sex*, Kathleen Gregory explores the impossibility – and possibility – of raising issues of race in psychotherapy and counselling and, specifically, the dilemma of whether and when to say something about race – and racism. Gregory acknowledges that both not saying anything about race (which may be more common and more obvious), and saying something about race (less common and maybe less obvious) may be experienced equally as oppressive. In the article, in true storytelling fashion, the author weaves together a number of themes and threads: the ethics of dilemmas, and the responsibility of having and making a response; power and asymmetry in the therapeutic relationship; the place of race, racism and anti-racism; and the dynamics of oppression, to name but some; in addition to which, at several points in the article, she poses a number of useful reflective questions.

The final article in this issue completes not only this issue but also a series of articles introducing the current Associate Editors (see also Fay, 2012; Heuer, 2012; House, 2012; Nwoye, 2012; Pavón-Cuellar, 2012) and, as further Associate Editors are appointed, I will ask them, in turn, to introduce themselves by means of an article. This one, from Edward Emery, provides an overview of the author’s concerns as well as a condensed synopsis of a selection of his previous publications which focus on mourning – at the personal level as well the social, collective level. Like the previous article, this one weaves a number of what the

author refers to as “engagements” with philosophers such as Emmanuel Lévinas, Jacques Derrida, Giles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, and psychoanalytic thinkers such as Sigmund Freud, Wilfred Bion, and Julia Kristeva; through themes of loss and mourning, 9/11, terror, terrorism, and fundamentalism. I particularly appreciate Emery’s scope and range; the article stands, as it is intended, as a great introduction to the author, his work, and his concerns.

Early on in his article, in his “Overture” (p. 160), Emery makes a couple of points about writing style, i.e. that it varies depending on the topic, and that he is drawn to a style that is more free associative than linear. I was particularly interested to read this as it follows on from related points made by two contributors to the previous issue. Reflecting on his own writing, Chris Robertson (2013) linked his experience of being peer reviewed and edited to certain dominant discourses (about writing style and conventions), as well as to the critique of domestication that his article on “wilding” (see Totton, 2011b) presented; and, in her contribution, Priestman (2013) also commented on her choice of a certain style and her adoption of a personal rather than academic convention to discuss Nick Totton’s contribution to and thinking about psychotherapy training. I am interested in these comments, especially in the context of this journal, as I think they represent a view that the journal remains – and, possibly, is more – open to different styles of writing and written form. From my point of view and in my role as Editor, I want to encourage such diversity, alongside the need for the journal to develop, and to increase subscriptions and submissions, and, as part of this, to engage with evaluations about journal impact and quality, all of which, of course, is highly political! I welcome contributions (articles, notes or letter) that discuss this and, more generally, the politics of writing and publishing in and about psychotherapy.

Finally, the focus on race, explicit in the articles by Jenkins and Gregory and more implicit in the article by Nwoye, continues in the first of two book reviews, of M. J. Maher’s book on *Racism and Culture*, reviewed by Isha McKenzie-Mavinga; and this issue concludes with a review of Manu Bazzano’s book *Spectre of the Stranger*, reviewed by Jocelyn Chaplin.

As ever I hope that you, the reader, enjoy the issue – whether your enjoyment is transgressive or not!

## REFERENCES

- Dolliver, R. H. (1981). Reflections on Fritz Perl’s gestalt prayer. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 59(5), 311–313.
- Fay, J. (2012). New directions in international psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy and Politics International*, 10(1), 17–25.
- Heuer, G. (2012). A most dangerous – and revolutionary – method: Sabina Spielrein, Carl Gustav Jung, Sigmund Freud, Otto Gross, and the birth of intersubjectivity. *Psychotherapy and Politics International*, 10(3), 262–279.
- House, R. (2012). Psychotherapy, politics and the “common factor” of power. *Psychotherapy and Politics International*, 10(2), 157–160.
- Nwoye, A. (2012). Psychotherapy, politics, and international: A professional introduction. *Psychotherapy and Politics International*, 10(1), 26–28.
- Orbach, S. (2000). *The impossibility of sex: Stories of the intimate relationship between therapist and patient*. New York, NY: Scribner.
- Parker, I. (2011). *Lacanian psychoanalysis: Revolutions in subjectivity*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Pavón-Cuéllar, D. (2012). Unacceptable complicities and necessary articulations between psychotherapy, politics and internationalism. *Psychotherapy and Politics International*, 10(1), 29–32.

- Perls, F. S. (1969). *Gestalt therapy verbatim*. Lafayette, CA: Real People Press.
- Priestman, A. (2013). The quietly ferocious struggle: A review of Nick Totton's contribution to and thinking about training in psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy and Politics International*, 11(1), 61–69.
- Robertson, C. (2013). Ecopsychology's wilding. *Psychotherapy and Politics International*, 11(1), 52–60.
- Stark, M. (1999). *Modes of therapeutic action*. New York, NY: Jason Aaronson.
- Totton, N. (2011a, December). Psychotherapy and politics: Is there an alternative? *Group-Analytic Contexts*, 54, 16–21.
- Totton, N. (2011b). *Wild therapy: Undomesticating inner and outer worlds*. Ross-on-Wye, UK: PCCS Books.
- Tubbs, W. (1972). Beyond Perls. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 12(2), 5.
- Tudor, K. (2011). Understanding empathy. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 41(1), 39–57.
- Tudor, K. (Ed.), (2012). Political papers from the World Congress of Psychotherapy, Sydney 2011 [Special issue]. *Psychotherapy and Politics International*, 10(2).