

The History and Development of Body-Psychotherapy: Part 4: Who, What and Where We Are Now

COURTENAY YOUNG

Abstract

In this fourth essay on the history and development of Body-Psychotherapy, I want to leave behind the factual history and the evolutionary progress of Body-Psychotherapy, its various developments and different modalities and methods, both in America and Europe (Young, 2006, 2008, 2009) and instead examine, somewhat more philosophically, what this branch of psychotherapy might have left behind, or missed out on, in its historical development, and thus where it might, or should, go as we look towards the future. I believe that there is a ‘critical mass’ point approaching, within psychotherapy, whereby the body is becoming included again. If Body-Psychotherapy is not ready to take advantage of this development, then it might ‘miss out on the revolution’ and that would be a great pity.

Introduction

James Hillman wrote about how “*We’ve had a Hundred Years of Psychotherapy ... and the World is getting Worse*” (Hillman, 1993). Despite the provocative title and the (somewhat naïve) assumption that psychotherapy was actually going to save the world, or that what works for individuals can be extrapolated onto the masses (a psycho-social revolution), maybe he is accurate – in certain ways – and maybe psychotherapy has yet not changed people enough, or in enough numbers of people; i.e. maybe it has not achieved its ‘critical mass’ yet. There may also be several other factors at work here as well.

Historians find that there are certain pivotal moments where we can see the many fascinating coincidences and timings becoming very significant: these are where “*If only, ...*” and “*Because of ...*” and “*Just at that moment ...*” suddenly become particularly relevant and poignant, fuse together, and ‘take off’ in some way. One such relatively recent moment was in the period between 1989 & 1991 with Gorbachev’s relaxation of the Brezhnev Doctrine that led to the almost simultaneous collapse of the communist regimes in East Germany, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Romania, and then the break-up of the rest of the Soviet Union. A ‘critical mass’ – of dissatisfaction with political repression and economic stagnation – had developed that was certainly not present in 1956 (over Hungary), or in 1968 (over Czechoslovakia).

There are many different perspectives and versions of ‘truths’, and some are more elusive than others. The theme of this paper is that the current practice of psychology and psychotherapy (and also some aspects of Body-Psychotherapy) might have missed out on, or avoided, some of the essential perspectives or ‘truths’ that lie latent within the body, and latent within our understanding of the mind, the explorations of which we label as ‘psychotherapy’, ‘psychology’ or ‘neuroscience’. My contention is that without these perspectives, without some of the deeper ‘connections’ with the body, or those vital pieces of proprioceptive or somatic experience that we might have overlooked for so long, without these – we humans are mostly living a shallow, shell-like existence with accompanying characteristic emotions that are fragile, stressed, volatile, neurotic, and also quite conformist. This is perhaps not a ‘natural’ form of existence, but it has definitely become ‘normal’. I believe that we are not fulfilling very much of our human potential. We are unique on this planet; the only ‘animal’ that synthesises its body and mind into conscious, dynamic thought and action; a potential that is available to us all the time, at any moment of the day, or even during the long dark nights of the journey of the soul. Yet our uniqueness is failing us – fatally: we are now destroying ourselves, and the planet. If we can make, or re-make, some of these deeper connections, we might be able to find a better way forward, and this world that we are creating (or destroying) might eventually become a better place for us, and for the other remaining species.

But this is not an easy process. It means looking at some of the more unconscious aspects of the mind-body separation, and at some of the lies, fabrications and distortions, both within our families of origin, and within our selves, as well as looking at these collectively, within our profession and within society in general. This ability to perform such an introspective examination is the unique gift of studies like philosophy, or practices like psychotherapy, and, for a variety of reasons, it has not been properly used, nor used widely enough. In this article, I do not offer ‘the’ truth; I only offer my perspective, or my version of ‘a’ truth.

Mind-Body Separation

The title of the 2004 UKCP¹ conference ‘*About a Body*’: *Working with the embodied mind in psychotherapy*, (for which the first essay in this series was originally prepared) affirmed the entrenched, disembodied position of psychotherapy: that the mind has been separated from the body – for more than 100 years. If circumstances were very different, it could have been entitled “*About a Mind: working with the mental body in psychotherapy.*” The separation between mind and body that has severely depleted and disoriented psychology and psychotherapy, and that has separated behaviour and cognition from many of the more subtle emotional senses and finer or intuitive

feelings, actually happened when Freud & Janet were both studying in Paris, with Charcot, in about 1885. So, in an alternative fantasy scenario, if history had taken a slightly different turn at this ‘critical’ point, Freud would have accepted some of Pierre Janet’s contemporary findings and would have collaborated with him, so the future development of psychotherapy would have become a very different one, as there could have been a unification of mind and body at the birth of psychology and psychotherapy. The potential was there, even without Freud getting together with Janet.

Some of the early analysts, particularly Ferenczi, Rank, and Reich, all supported forms of touch or working with the body in their psychoanalytic practice, but Freud’s concern about any form of physical contact within psychoanalysis, or any direct connection with the body, was determined mostly by his desire for respectability and social acceptance from the incredibly prude and conservative society of ‘Victorian’ Vienna for this new ‘science’ that already included the controversy of childhood sexuality. This, and perhaps his own deeper neuroses about the body and touch (Mintz, 1969), eventually caused him to ‘split’ irrevocably with Rank, Ferenczi, Reich and also associates like Groddeck, the ‘father’ of psychosomatics.

Instead, try to imagine a person’s head trying to discover new things about itself without the resources of its attachment to a body: it is somewhat ludicrous! Let me offer an illustration. In C. S. Lewis’s science-fiction trilogy, (written – possibly significantly – between 1938 and 1945), *Out of the Silent Planet*, *Perelandra (Voyage to Venus)*, and *That Hideous Strength*, he depicts the planet Earth (Thulcundra) as cut-off for thousands of years from the natural and benevolent forces of the Universe. The fascination with intellectualism, science and religion that results, destroys all true development, understanding or any access to real (benevolent) power and energy: the true ‘powers’ of the universe had isolated Earth in a form of quarantine. The point is made in the first book where science over-extends itself and breaks the millennia of silence and isolation: it takes a man beyond the orbit of the moon, for the first time, to Mars. This opens the door to the subsequent regeneration (rehabilitation) of Earth. The re-enactment of the Fall of Adam in the Garden of Eden, in the second book of the trilogy, is this time prevented on the symbolized ‘innocent’ watery world of Venus (Perelandra), and this, in turn, eventually allows the true liberation of Earth from these mental & intellectually corrupt forces in the third book. Science and religion have had a huge distorting power (symbolized by the head of executed scientist-madman-murderer being kept alive and worshipped in a university). It is only when the incredibly powerful natural and planetary forces, Mars (male principle) and Venus (female principle), break the quarantine and ‘descend’ on to Earth that “that hideous strength” of science is finally seen as petty, distorted and impotent, and is eventually disseminated. Does any of this seem familiar?

In the 17th century, the philosopher, Descartes, verbalized the existential mind-body separation and in so doing, became, as Demasio says: "... *an emblem for a collection of ideas on body, brain, and mind that in one way or another remain influential in Western sciences and humanities.*" (Demasio, 1994, p. 247) However I maintained (Young, 2006) that this separation was almost certainly happening a long time beforehand, maybe 6,000 years ago with the rise of the first cities in the Fertile Crescent of the Middle East, and certainly since patriarchy (or patrilineal inheritance) 'took over' in about 1,500-1,000 BC and started to shape modern thought and society: in Ancient Greece, around the time of Theseus, and in the British Celtic tribes, possibly around the Bronze Age to Iron Age changeover, about 500 BC, as described in *The Mabinogion* (Frost, 1998).

Whilst this abyssal and abysmal separation between the mind and the body is perhaps now slowly being overcome, possibly at least in psychology and psychotherapy, the mind is still commonly seen as the 'software program' running the 'hardware' of the brain, or that the brain and body are related, but only in a survival sense. It is now becoming not a direct polarity: an "*either ... or ...*" situation: it is now reluctantly acknowledged that the one part can't really function without the other. But what is not being acknowledged is the greater potential of a fuller mind-body functioning. In the first article, I quoted Demasio where he writes about the human mind and body constituting "*an indissociable organism, integrated by means of mutually interactive biochemical and neural regulatory circuits (including endocrine, immune, and autonomic neural components)*" (Demasio, 1994, xviii). This is a 'neuroscience' perspective, but it doesn't touch the greater aspects of fuller functioning.

Here we are missing generations of experience and many important clues, as we do not (yet) know what this full unification, or unified functioning, would look like, or could feel like, nor how it would affect us individually, or collectively, today and in the future. Many non-Western cultures feel that the predominant Western 'dissociated' materialistic, profit-driven, self-oriented culture is actually somewhat insane (McLuhan, 1971). We may need to start addressing this point quite seriously from within psychotherapy, and stop making excuses for those aspects of our ideals, 'democracy', 'progress', 'capitalism', 'civilisation', and 'ideals' that result in chemical and biological warfare, genocide & ethnic cleansing, the devastation of the planet's resources, the spread of toxicity and waste, social violence, and the seeming indifference to millions of suffering people without proper or even basic water, food, housing, or education. And this is just generally; how we actually treat other people, other bodies, on an individual level, as well as our own bodies (starvation & mutilation for fashion; overeating to the point of obesity & death; smoking & drinking; drug addictions; etc) can be even worse.

I feel – quite strongly – that the body-mind separation, as it is currently being played out in psychology and psychotherapy, actually prevents us from ‘legitimately’ addressing these points with our clients. We continue seeing a separation between the pathologies of individual and the collective (or ‘body’ of society). We do not (often) say something like, “*There is nothing really wrong with you: however plenty of ‘wrong’ things have happened to you.*” We focus instead on *the client’s* pathologies or neuroses. This is a legacy of Freud’s hegemony: Janet was really interested in what happened in the body; Otto Rank talked about the ‘*will to health*’ as a reaction to Freud’s emphasis on sickness, pathology and death (Thanatos); Reich focussed on the basic actualities of Freud’s libido theory and the (lack of the) orgasm reflex (Reich, 1971) and envisaged a much better society (Reich, 1951); and reportedly when people came to Groddeck for analysis, he would give them massage, and when they came to him for massage, he would give them analysis. Later Maslow developed Humanistic Psychology and his ‘hierarchy’ of needs or values towards greater human ‘self-actualization’. These are essentially more positive or expansive approaches, more holistic and interactive, inherently attractive, and often idealistically unattainable. But why should this continue to be so? Is it not time to and cannot we move psychotherapy forward in another quantum leap again to make a considerable difference?

In the last 15 years, with the various moves towards the ‘professionalisation’ of psychotherapy and statutory regulation, we have tended to adopt something of the more reserved ‘professional’ approach of the analysts or the more conservative clinical approach of the psychologists. This does not have to be an unfortunate disaster, unless it becomes persistent or even chronic. Body-psychotherapy probably needed to tighten itself up a bit, however, not to the extent that we lose our creativity and cutting edge. A couple of ethical cases, with quite serious implications, on both sides of the Atlantic, might also have made us considerably more cautious about experimentation, which could be a pity, but this could also be a necessary check to some of the more ungrounded ‘research projects’ that have threatened to undermine our reputation as a serious and ethical profession.

Colin Wilson theorises that, in general, the problem with modern civilization is that it constantly distracts us, saps our appetite for life, and reduces our vitality (Wilson, 1985, 16-18). What he does not describe is that it also makes us lose touch with each other: the extended family, grounded in community, is lost in the industrialisation process to become a consumer as a ‘nuclear family’; the telephone, the car, the supermarket, television, mobile phones and the internet all serve to remove us further from real contact with other people. We are fast becoming the type of society envisaged by Isaac Asimov in the “*Robot*” series of science fiction novels; ‘Solaria’ is a sparsely

populated ‘Spacer’ planet where people have become averse to actual human contact and each is served by hundreds of robots.

I believe that the extent to which we are conditioned, or forced, to use our minds and separate ourselves from our bodies, and from other people, is the extent to which we lose our enthusiasm and erode our strength and vitality. Wilson posits, as a solution, something like “*following our passion.*” How can we do this? We are the people who are working at the ‘cutting edge’: we are the ones who may have the passion for helping our clients to make some of these changes, as well as making some of these changes for our self. We can start to implement various changes, to see if they work with our clients, write up records and publish results. Others will follow, if we dare to lead.

Many modern psychological views still retain the basic mind-body separation, so ‘thinking’ becomes the substrate of ‘being’, and our thinking is still largely separated from our emotions. A slightly more body-mind degree of holism is slowly intruding into mainstream psychotherapy, whereby Demasio (and other neurobiologists) are increasingly pointing out that mind and body are functionally interrelated and inseparable, and that any *absence* of emotion and feelings is large dysfunctional, irrational, and somewhat stupid. Body-Psychotherapy had swung the other way, in the 1970’s especially, and whatever was happening in the body had suddenly become “good”. Our bodies began to “speak their minds”, or to “tell the truth.” However this was just a swing still on the essential “good-bad”, “body-mind”, “truth-lies”, bi-polar mind-set. Fortunately or unfortunately things are somewhat more complicated than that.

Candace Pert’s work on neuro-peptides, *The Molecules of Emotion*, (Pert, 1997) presents (for me) an absolutely convincing case that these chemicals are the main carriers of our emotions, with peptide receptors located all over the body. The experience of emotion may well be triggered by a perception, or a thought, or an event, and manifested as an electrical charge, but it is experienced as (a chemical) flooding throughout the whole body. The body and mind are thus functioning as a single indivisible unit. There is even the possibility of one distinct neuro-peptide becoming identified for each emotion (there are a possible total of about 660).

At a 2005 Body-Psychotherapy conference in Cambridge², Nick Totton addressed something of this basic mind-body split and advocated that we try to get beyond the concept of these common polarities. In relationship terms this goes way beyond the therapist-client, beyond the healer and person-to-be-healed, beyond the personification of a ‘method’ to be ‘used’ on a recipient, into a much deeper state of “somatic resonance” with each other, where there is greater authenticity of relationship, with oneself as well as with others.

There is a Japanese saying: “A true man thinks with his belly,” and the Chinese discipline of Tai Chi holds the centre of the belly, the Dan’tien, as the centre of the body, the source of all action. David Boadella writes in his book, *Lifestreams*, of the three main centres of the body: the Head, the Heart, and the Hara, as an essential part of the dynamic morphology of the body, and he relates these to the three main embryological layers: ecto-, meso- and endo-derm (Boadella, 1987).

These latter perspectives, and many others, particularly from Eastern philosophies and practices (like Acupuncture) hold the whole body as the material aspect of a dynamic force, and therefore mind-body indivisibility as central and crucial. We still do not know what might happen after a generation or so of people holding this viewpoint. We have anaesthetized ourselves, for generations, to our own numbness, cut-off-ness and stiffness.

R.D. Laing writes: *“When I look at my body from the outside, it is still there, but it may have disappeared years ago as a real alive experience from within. As we become numb, we are numbed to our own numbness. The less we care, the less we care about caring less. We stiffen, harden, shrivel, become bent, but can’t bend, twist, run, hop, dance and sing, walk, sleep, even. We lapse painlessly into the complacent ease of bodily vacuity. We may have to think about it before we realize how unfamiliar this most intimate of all our feelings may be.”* (Balaskas, 1977, Introduction)

There are many more features of a much fuller mind-body unification: the least of the more recent ‘discoveries’ shows that specific “mirror neurons” in our brains are activated by the body positions of other people we are looking at and they prime our own bodies to “mirror” those positions (Hurley, 2008). We nearly always know almost exactly what emotion someone is feeling when they are speaking with their “body language”. We are only just realizing, as a society, how powerful some of this non-verbal communication really is, and there are now even TV programs showing how to ‘read’ politicians’ and celebrities’ body-language, as if we didn’t know already. Some people claim non-verbal body language is as much as 90% of all communication: so our heads, mouths and tongues, are just the top layer of a massive wealth of non-verbal communication and human interactions: a bit like the visible part of an iceberg being only 10%; the usable part of the DNA sequence being 10% - the rest being so-called “junk”; or like all the visible matter of the universe (stars, planets, suns, galaxies, etc.) being only 10% of the total matter of the universe, the rest being invisible “dark matter” spread between the galaxies. Anyway, our bodies seem to speak much more than our minds!

As a species, sometime within the last several hundred thousand years or so, we ‘miraculously’ developed the power of ‘using’ our minds: we have now long over-used this and our mental faculties can now extend to cut us off from the rest of ourselves, from other people, and from

the planet we live on. We do need to find a new road, not an “*either ... or ...*” polarity. Many people investigating their bodies either hedonistically or from a New Age perspective seem to leave their brains at the door of the gym, or the beauty salon, or to give up the capacity for critical thought to the extent that they meditate or devour the newest alternative medicine ‘fad’ for expensive products or un-researched techniques. It is also more than just a “*both ... and ...*” integration, though this is perhaps a necessary first step. This new direction will be considered again, more fully, when we look more specifically at the future directions of Body-Psychotherapy.

Some people are also advocating greater authenticity in the therapeutic relationship: this would be much better than the current formal separations that are maintained between patient and clinician, client and therapist, recipient and dispenser, seeker and giver, healer and to-be-healed, expert and ‘other’. But this might mean that we would have to step down from our secure position, based on our knowledge, training and experience, and admit some of our human frailties: we might even – sometimes – not know what to ‘do’ with the client or acknowledge that we do not have any ‘control’ of the client’s process.

Colin Wilson also advocates that something akin to Maslow’s ‘peak experiences’ or ‘orgasm’ experiences (in the widest sense of the word) are needed for us to be able to break with our ennui, or the ‘dumbing-down’ of society, and find the real-time mystical or transcendent experiences that we truly identify with and that can affirm our full potential. In these moments, we can experience a “web-like consciousness” or a universal connection. Whilst this is possible, it is also wonderfully idealistic. Reich rightly eschewed mysticism, as did Freud, but he also wove the essence of religion (love) into his work and knowledge and wrote of how the Christ within us can be (and is often) murdered (Reich, 1953). Maybe we need to re-find something of that compassion towards others and towards ourselves.

Most of the time we live as if our ‘batteries’ are only producing 10% of their power; we are alone, confused, stressed and afraid; we are struggling – and I am not just talking about our clients. Staying within these polarities, allowing our selves to be conditioned by them, and flip-flopping between them is now increasingly unacceptable. There has to be a ‘stepping-out’ towards greater sense of integration and authenticity. Body-Psychotherapy can assist here, but only if it incorporates a certain degree of these experiences. This means developing our lexicon, our techniques, our levels of self-criticism, and our willingness to be confused and vulnerable. It means becoming fully human, but maybe also occasionally as inhuman or ‘ruthless’ as a compassionate surgeon has to be.

What is modern Body-Psychotherapy?

With the coming together of people from the different modalities in Europe in the late 1980's, and in America in the late 1990's, and the subsequent formation of the EABP and the USABP³, the concept of a 'field' or 'mainstream' of Body-Psychotherapy began to coalesce. All this coincided with the movement in Europe to 'define' the independent profession of psychotherapy, promoted by the EAP⁴, and thus the various 'types' (mainstreams and modalities) of psychotherapy within these boundaries. This movement has helped establish modern Body-Psychotherapy on a more equal footing with many other different modern branches of psychotherapy.

I have tried to define the history and development of Body-Psychotherapy in the previous three articles (Young, 2006, 2008, 2009), and I was also the person largely responsible for writing the document about the 'scientific validation' of the 'mainstream' of Body-Psychotherapy for the EAP that is available on the EABP website⁵. However, other people are also trying to define this 'mainstream'. Nick Totton has written a couple of good generic books on Body-Psychotherapy (Totton, 2003, 2005), as have others like Staunton (2002) and Ventling (2002). We are all awaiting the English-language version of the massive and definitive *Handbuch für Körperpsychotherapie* (Marlock & Weiss, 2005). Besides all these developments, there are various articles about common factors in different body-oriented psychotherapies (viz: Lachica, 2007) and research projects about the effectiveness of various body-oriented psychotherapies (viz:).

We can also see a parallel growth and development with the extensive series of international professional conferences in "Body Psychotherapy" over the last 20+ years, rather than any specific modality or confined to one particular country, organised by the International Scientific Committee for Body Psychotherapy (Mexico 1987; Montreal 1990; Barcelona 1993; Boston 1996; Naples, 2002; Sao Paulo 2004); the EABP conferences (Davos, 1987; Seefeld, 1989; Lindau, 1991; Strasbourg, 1993; Carry-le-Rouet, 1995; Pamhagen, 1997; Travemunde, 1999; Egmond aan Zee, 2001; Ischia, 2002; Marathon, 2004; Askov, 2006; Paris, 2008); the USABP conferences (Boulder, 1998; Berkeley, 2000; Baltimore, 2002; Tuscon, 2005; Philadelphia, 2008); as well as other conferences on Somatotherapy and Somatanalysis (Paris 1987; Montevideo 1989; Strasbourg 1991; Buenos Aires 1992) and Body-centred Psychotherapy (Zürich 1986, 1989). Many of these conferences have spawned various books (Heller, 2001) (Corrigall et al, 2006) and collections of papers. Many of these, and other writings, are being collated in the EABP Bibliography of Body-Psychotherapy on CD-ROM, which now has over 4,000 entries.

These developments have meant that, not only do the various component modalities exist, as we have already seen (Young, 2006, 2008), but also a wider 'field' has begun to exist, within which these modalities can exist, grow and flourish.

This degree of professionalisation has also been happening with other psychologically-orientated therapies: art therapy has been accepted into the Health Professions Council, as have other similar ‘therapies’. It is worth noting that the ‘profession’ of Dance-Movement Therapy (already accepted in the UK as a profession) has redefined itself recently as Dance-Movement Psychotherapy. Whether this is just a self-definition, or whether the wider ‘profession’ of psychotherapy also accepts this re-definition, we shall see.

Furthermore, the method (modality) of Concentrated Movement Therapy (KMT), largely practiced only in Germany & Austria, has been accepted as part of the wider realm of being a psychotherapy, and indeed it could probably even be considered a body-oriented one. There is also a French-based group of psychoanalytical psychotherapists practising body-oriented psychotherapy (Guimón, 1996). So there is then a further discussion about whole realm of the ‘political’ definitions of what constitutes a therapy and what constitutes a psychotherapy; and whether is any particular method is a ‘body therapy’ or a ‘body psychotherapy’ (Young & Pallaro, 2008), as well as any functional differentiation between a body-oriented method or technique that can be used within any branch of psychotherapy.

Conclusion

As a result, we began to see, for the first time, what the ‘field’ of Body-Psychotherapy might possibly contain. As yet, the doors are pretty wide open. We have previously acknowledged, within Body-Psychotherapy, a mixture of Gestalt psychotherapy, Feldenkrais ‘Awareness through Movement’ and the Alexander Technique being ‘synthesised’ into a new Body-Psychotherapy by Ilana Rubinfeld, and more recently seen Jack Painter’s Postural Integration expand, with the addition of some Gestalt psychotherapy and some Jungian concepts, into Psychotherapeutic Postural Integration, a new Body-Psychotherapy, accepted as scientifically valid by the EAP. These are combinations of different ‘techniques’ with an overall body-oriented psychotherapeutic practice. We may find further forms (modalities) continuing to emerge, or completely new forms, like techniques developing out of the findings of neuroscience. As Lachica (2007) states, “... *and, of course, they need to be described not only by the adherents but by third parties (i.e. researchers, reviewers or professional organizations) so that the substantial differences between them can be known and distinguished from mere ‘brand names’, both by experts and laypersons.*” (p. 9)

Conversely, we have also seen body-oriented techniques that are improper, or unethical, or shamefully exploitative being ‘woven’ into the fabric of a ‘training’ that unfortunately then distorts the soundness of any other techniques as well as betraying the endeavours of the trainees. With this

distortion, the ‘training school’ has become more of a sect, and the ‘director’ of the school, more of a (false) guru. This sort of distortion can raise up some of the analytical fears about the abuse of transference and counter-transference. As body-psychotherapists, we therefore also need to ‘police’ our profession to maintain its integrity.

From another perspective, we now see Cognitive Behaviour Therapy (CBT) beginning to incorporate body-oriented techniques, Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR), and also ‘Mindfulness’ practice (a combination of body-awareness and meditation) are becoming very popular and are being seen as legitimate techniques within the current ‘mainstream’ of psychotherapy. Furthermore, concepts like ‘somatic resonance’ are now considered as a legitimate source of information for the psychoanalyst (viz: Dosamantes-Beaudry, 1997; Wilberg, 2003; Mills, 2005; Kramer & Akhtar, 1992). Allan Schore’s seminal books on ‘Affect Regulation’ are almost obligatory, required reading for anyone entering the profession of psychotherapy, from whatever discipline (Schore, 2003a, 2003b), and the new discipline of neuroscience is becoming more and more significant, not just for Body-Psychotherapy, but also for the ‘mainstream’ psychotherapies (viz: Cozolino, 2006; Folenzbee, 2007; Gazzaniga et al, 2002; Panskepp, 2004).

What I am trying to say is that I believe that the mainstream of psychotherapy is becoming more and more aware of, and accepting of, the body, and is beginning to incorporate it again within the field of psychotherapy, after its 100 years or more of separation and exile. Whilst this is to be commended, and whilst it may give Body-Psychotherapy some more openings and degrees of general acceptability, we will have lost – I feel – a major chance, not only for ourselves, but also for psychotherapy and the world, if we don’t take this chance and use this opening creatively. Instead of just being grateful for the crumbs of acceptance, and without ‘forcing’ our paradigms of practice and our techniques of touch (or whatever) onto others, let us instead focus on trying to promulgate the integration of body and mind in the widest and deepest possible way. Let us all go forward now into these new areas, and see what is to be seen and felt and experienced and understood with the wide-open eyes of newly-awakened. I believe that we may all be pleasantly surprised.

(4,993 words)

Courtenay Young is the past President of EABP, a founder member of USABP, author of several articles about Body-Psychotherapy, compiles the EABP Bibliography of Body-Psychotherapy (on CD-ROM), was a main contributor to the EAP’s requirement for the Scientific Validation of Body-Psychotherapy (accessible on the EABP website: www.eabp.org), and represented EABP at numerous conferences and meetings for over 15 years. He has largely stepped out of political work and currently works as a psychotherapist and counsellor in and around Edinburgh, Scotland. He

helps edit a couple of psychotherapy journals and has just completed a book: "Help Yourself Towards Mental Health (Karnac, 2008). Many of his published articles are available through his website: www.courtenay-young.com and he can be contacted by e-mail: courtenay@courtenay-young.com

References

- BALASKAS, A. (1977) *BodyLife*. London: Book Club Associates
- BOADELLA, D. (1987) *Lifestreams: The manual of Biosynthesis*. London: Routledge & Kegan, Paul
- CORRIGALL, J., PAYNE, H., & WILKINSON, H. (2006) *About a Body: Working with the embodied mind in psychotherapy*. Hove, Routledge
- COZOLINO, L. (2006) *The neuroscience of Human Relationships: Attachment and the developing social brain*. New York & London: Norton
- DEMASIO, A. (1994) "Descartes' Error: Emotion, Reason and the Human Brain." New York, Avon
- DOSAMANTES-BEAUDRY, I. (1997) Somatic Experience in Psychoanalysis. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 14: 517-530
- FOLENSBEE, R. (2007) *The Neuroscience of Psychological Therapies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University
- FROST, A. (ed) (1998) Schreiber, Lady Charlotte (Trans): *The Mabinogion*. Dover
- GAZZANIGA, M.S., IVRY, R.B., MANGUN, G.R. (2002) *Cognitive Neuroscience: The biology of the mind*. New York & London: Norton
- GUIMÓN, J. (ed.) (1996) *The Body in Psychotherapy*. Basel: Karger
- HELLER, M. (ed) *The Flesh of the Soul: The Body we work with*. Bern, Peter Lang
- HILLMAN, J. (1993) *We've had a Hundred Years of Psychotherapy ... and the World is getting Worse*. San Francisco, Harper
- HURLEY, S.L. (2008) The shared circuits model. How control, mirroring, and simulation can enable imitation and mind reading. *Behavioural & Brain Sciences*, 31, (1).
- LACHICA, F.O. (2007) Common Factors in Body Oriented Psychotherapy. *USABP Journal*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 4-12
- KRAMER, S. & AKHTAR, S. (Eds) (1992) *When the Body Speaks: Psychological Meanings in Kinetic Cues*: Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson
- MARLOCK, G. & WEISS, H. (eds) (2005) *Handbuch der Körperpsychotherapie*. Hogref
- MCLUHAN, T.C. (1971) *Touch the Earth: a self-portrait of Indian existence*. New York: Promontory Press
- MILLS, J. (2005). A Critique of Relational Psychoanalysis. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 22(2), 155-188
- MINTZ, E.E. (1969) Touch and the psychoanalytic tradition. *Psychoanalytic Review*, 51
- PANSKEPP, J. (2004) *Affective Neuroscience: The foundations of human and animal emotions*. New York: OUP - USA
- PERT, C. (1997) *The Molecules of Emotion*. New York: Scribner
- REICH, W. (1951) *The Sexual Revolution*. London: Vision Press
- REICH, W. (1953) *The Murder of Christ*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux
- REICH, W. (1971) *The Function of the Orgasm: The discovery of the orgone*. New York: Meridian
- REICH, W. (1979) *The Murder of Christ*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux
- SCHORE, A. (2003a) *Affect Regulation and the Repair of the Self*. New York & London: Norton
- SCHORE, A. (2003b) *Affect Dys-regulation and Disorders of the Self*. New York & London: Norton
- STAUNTON, T. (ed) (2002) *Body Psychotherapy*. Hove, Brunner-Routledge

- TOTTON, N. (2003) *Body Psychotherapy: An introduction*. Maidenhead & Philadelphia, Open University Press
- TOTTON, N. (ed) (2005) *New Dimensions in Body Psychotherapy*. Maidenhead & Philadelphia, Open University Press
- VENTLING, C.D. (2002) *Body Psychotherapy in Progressive & Chronic Disorders*. Basel, Karger
- WILBERG, P. (2003) *Soma-psychology and soma-sensitivity*. London: New Gnosis Publications
- WILSON, C. (1985) *The Bicameral Critic*. Bath, UK, Ashgrove
- YOUNG, C. (2006) One hundred and fifty years on: The history, significance and scope of body psychotherapy today. *Journal of Body, Movement and Dance in Psychotherapy*. Vol. 1, No. 1
- YOUNG, C. (2008) The history of Body-Psychotherapy: The American legacy of Reich. *Journal of Body, Movement and Dance in Psychotherapy*. Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 5-18
- YOUNG, C. (2009) The history and development of Body-Psychotherapy: European Diversity. *Journal of Body, Movement and Dance in Psychotherapy*. Vol. 4, No. 1
- YOUNG, C. (2009) *A Physiological Theory of Evolution*. Unpublished: available on www.courtenay-young.com
- YOUNG, C. & PALLARO, P. (2008) "A Dance across the Atlantic": A correspondence on understanding the difference between various definitions and whether Dance-Movement Therapy is a Body-Psychotherapy. *Journal of Body, Movement and Dance in Psychotherapy*. Vol. 3, No. 2.

Endnotes:

-
- ¹ UKCP: United Kingdom Council for Psychotherapy: the main professional association for psychotherapy in the UK: www.psychotherapy.org.uk
- ² Association of Chiron Practitioners Conference 2005 "*Meeting in the Flesh*": *Embodied Relationships in Psychotherapy*" Robinson College, April 2005.
- ³ USABP: United States Association for Body Psychotherapy: www.usabp.org
- ⁴ EAP: European Association for Psychotherapy: www.europsyche.org
- ⁵ EABP: European Association for Body-Psychotherapy: www.eabp.org