

Let's Talk Violence

by Priscilla Jana

We are pleased to present here excerpts from the keynote speech given on 4 July 2002 at the Utrecht conference by Priscilla Jana, Ambassador from South Africa to The Netherlands. We appreciate her permission to reprint some of her comments and hope to publish parts of other keynotes in the future.

To me violence is not just an esoteric subject for debate. Violence is real: I know it, I have witnessed it, I have experienced it, I am a victim of it. I have seen how it maims, kills, and destroys people. But I have also seen and learned the magnanimity of forgiveness in the process of finding peace and seeking reconciliation, a process that



gives me the confidence to engage in this discussion with the singular pride of being a South African. As the new century continues to roll out a shameful catalogue of violence—be it political, criminal, or cultural—we need to talk about violence.

I will focus on state-sanctioned political violence in apartheid South Africa with an overview of the work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Political violence in South Africa had the following characteristics: It was largely covert, planned in secret, and not open to public scrutiny. It was systematic rather than spontaneous. The pattern of violence also had a particular relation to the law. It either operated outside of legal processes or was sanctioned by the legal system, such as in the case of bannings, banishments, arrests, detentions, and mass removals. It was unconventional. It violated established norms, values, and social patterns. It was frequently clandestine and perpetrated by anonymous

"The Truth and Reconciliation Commission would break the culture of deafening silence that had developed in South Africa during the apartheid era."

actors. The root cause of political violence was located within the social context and the long history of oppression, unfair discrimination, poverty, and exploitation. The apartheid state used vertical institutional violence to maintain the status quo and to ensure racial inequality and control. Arbitrary arrests and detentions, assaults and torture, and assassinations were all perpetuated by the state.

The victims of this systematic violence were also subjected to structural violence, such as inflicted poverty, emaciating malnutrition, inferior education, forced mass removals, and social strife in the areas where they lived. The diabolical combination of both types of violence had a devastating effect on the black people of South Africa. Structural violence is often expressed as economic power, which kills more slowly as it corrodes the bases for self-reliance and aggravates vulnerability. It is not exerted willfully or intentionally by a person but by a structure created and perpetuated

ABOUT THIS ISSUE

This issue of *The Script* speaks in a variety of voices and reflects deeply diverse frames of reference. It also reflects the hard work of leadership, of social and organizational life, of scientific and political debate, and of membership in a group. Everyone will find something in this issue with which to disagree. It is my hope that everyone will find even more in this issue on which to reflect and from which to learn. It is definitely a *Script* that warrants more than one reading.

In her article about organizing and running the Utrecht conference, Marijke Wusten writes of the many "little violences . . . of discounting, judging, ignoring [that] can and will in the end add up to big violence." I hope that this issue of *The Script* is read with an attitude of personal accountability, respect, and self-examination, the best antidotes I know to the little violences that Marijke so vividly describes.

—Bill Cornell, Editor

by a custom or law. Structural violence is aimed at not giving citizens equal power or opportunities.

In response to protracted violence by the state, liberation movements were forced to resort to armed struggle. A culture of violence became the norm for the majority of South Africans. Only the minority white group was isolated from the effects of political violence. Their artificial protection was ensured by the state, the same state that was perpetuating violence against black citizens. This culture of violence in the political arena permeated the social and civil domain.

Morals, values, and interpersonal relationships were defined by prevailing and all-pervasive

continued on page 7

Little and Big Violence

by Marijke Wusten

Why did I promise to write something about the Utrecht conference when I feel like doing nothing as I try to recuperate from long months, even years, of hard work organizing it? Because Robin Fryer asked me to do it and I like her. Attachment and bonding, simple as that. But attachment and bonding are, at the same time, the reasons why I may be the least likely person to write this commentary. I was so attached and bonded to this conference on "Violence, Let's TALK" that it was a bit like my child. Is a mother the best evaluator of her child? She knows the good and the



ITAA President Gordon Hewitt and a traditionally dressed Utrecht Conference Coordinator Marijke Wusten

less good sides of her child and just loves it, right?

Those of us involved in putting on the Utrecht conference worked hard and in the process learned a great deal about ourselves. During these last two years I became very aware of violence in my and our daily lives. I am happy and grateful that in my life I do not know by experience about big violence. So it was a shock when I realized that there is, indeed, a lot of small violence happening in and around me.

For example, I always thought that people who use transactional analysis would play fewer games, be nicer, and keep their contracts better. Secretly I thought that we TA people managed a little better, were a bit more OK than others. So I found the way in which some presenters or participants shouted at us, blamed us when we made a mistake, or started nagging us when we could/would not meet their demands pretty amazing and disappointing. We, the organizers, called each other and complained: "Would you believe it, listen to what *they/she/he* said; isn't it awful?" It took me some time before I realized that we were playing the game too! Thinking that TA people are a little bit more OK, thinking that blaming and complaining TA people are less OK, talking about people instead of to people—it all comes

"More than ever I am aware of how the world outside me reflects the world inside me."

down to judging and thinking in terms of "they are not as OK as I am." One of my former teachers told me, "You know, Marijke, there are also doctors who smoke." So I forgave myself and others for that kind of smoking.

So this is what helping organize this conference did for me. More than ever I am aware of how the world outside me reflects the world inside me. If there is violence in the world outside of me (and there is!), I must go inside and look for the violence (small, medium, or large) inside and start changing and healing there. Because all the little violences (in thinking) of

continued on page 7

The ITAA Makes Major Changes

by Gordon Hewitt, PhD, President

INTRODUCTION

At its meeting in Utrecht in July 2002, the Board of Trustees decided to implement some bold new moves for the ITAA. These moves are aimed at decreasing costs and improving services for members.

MEMBERSHIP FEES

The Board decided to introduce three different membership fees. These are:

- Associate, Student, and Retired Membership: US\$ 60 (previously \$85)
- Certified Membership and Regular Membership: US\$100 (previously \$105 and \$145)
- Teaching Membership: US\$150 (previously \$245)

These changes will reduce ITAA income by about \$46,000 a year. We aim to make this up over the next few years by increasing membership. The purpose of this change is to reduce fees, particularly for advanced members. The Board considered that people should be encouraged to attain advanced membership and that the present

higher fees for advanced members was inconsistent with this intent.

ACCREDITATION OF COURSES AND LICENSING OF TRANSACTIONAL ANALYSIS PRACTITIONERS

Following a motion by Jim Allen, the Board has set aside US\$30,000, which is to

be made available to organizations seeking accreditation of transactional analysis courses or licensing of transactional analysis practitioners. People will be asked to apply for these grants through their regional representatives.

The Board considers that official recognition of transactional analysis is a major priority for many of our members and wishes to provide as much assistance as possible for activities related to this recognition.

In addition, the Board intends to prepare a list of countries that presently give official recognition to transactional analysis courses and information on how this recognition was achieved. We also want to include information that others have used as evidence in this process.

continued on page 3

"The Board believes these new initiatives should produce a significant increase in membership, retention of members, and sales."

EDITORIALY YOURS

by Bill Cornell



With Respect

A number of letters in the Members' Forum of this *Script* and the two previous issues have raised questions and challenges to the editorial policy of this newsletter and my personal motivations as editor. I will attempt to address these issues here as clearly as I can.

The opening paragraph of Taibi Kahler's letter in this issue captures well my experience and intent as *Script* editor. While there are certainly those who think I've failed, I have made every effort to carry out the spirit of editorship that Taibi outlined and have tried to sustain the highest level of debate and discussion.

The formal *Script* editorial policy, in effect for many years before I became editor, is as follows: "We welcome Letters to the Editor. In editing for taste, accuracy, and length, our intention is to retain the author's meaning. Opinions offered in the column do not necessarily represent the views of the editor or the ITAA. Readers are invited to digest letters within the framework of transactional analysis theory." Editorial policy for communication about members is based on Item 11 of the ITAA Code of Ethics: "Members of the ITAA shall in their public statements, whether written or verbal, refrain from derogatory statements, inferences, and/or innuendoes that disparage the standing, qualifications, or character of members, bearing in mind their respon-

sibility as representatives of the ITAA and of transactional analysis."

I want to be absolutely clear that in my editor's note that accompanied Steve Karpman's letter in the May-June *Script* I was endeavoring to maintain and articulate the editorial policy of *The Script* while publishing a letter that I thought deviated from that policy. The deviation, as I saw it, was in the tone of the letter, not in Steve's right to express his opinion. I welcomed the content of Steve's letter and the debate that has ensued, though the tone of the

**"I do not write for or edit
The Script as an American,
but as a transactional analyst,
a psychotherapist,
and a teacher."**

subsequent discussion has been difficult to navigate. The reference to the ITAA Code of Ethics in my editor's note was to clarify the basis of the original editorial policy. I meant no implication whatsoever that I considered Steve's letter to be unethical. I do not think that at all. While I do wish as an editor (and as a person) that Steve had allowed some alteration in the tone of his writing, I have no question about his position belonging in the pages of *The Script*.

My editorship began in January 1998. And it started with a bang. *The Script*, then in response to Ted Novey's "Dear Santa" column, was immediately taken up in issues very similar to those being discussed now. I wrote at that point, "Numerous people have asked if I, as editor, had seen and 'approved' Ted's column before publication. I did not. If I had, I'd have asked him to delete 'icky,' 'yuck,' and his post script; I would also have asked him to consider his tone a bit more carefully." *The Script* published numerous, lively discussions about Ted's column, all edited for tone and clarity of expression. This debate was accompanied by a rich discussion of ego state theory, all letters again edited for tone and clarity.

Subsequently, in response to the tone of discussions on the ITAA Internet discussion list, I wrote the following in my November 1998 column: "It is important, essential I believe, that we can disagree about ideas and argue forcefully when necessary. But too much of what I am seeing on the Internet amounts to attacks and counterattacks on people rather than discussion of ideas. I hope that people will take the time for self-examination and question their own heat and self-righteousness before attacking colleagues under the guise of challenging ideas." That has been a guiding principle for me as editor.

Although Robin and I frequently seek out articles and interviews for *The Script*, letters in the Members' Forum are never solicited. And while many submitted letters are edited for tone and/or length, as far as I know, all (save one, whose author preferred to withdraw his letter rather than have it edited in any way) have been published. Robin and I make every effort to focus the debate on issues, not personalities. We edit out personal attacks and attributions of motive by one author toward another. This is not an easy job. No written editorial statement and guidelines can cover all the dilemmas and decisions that face an editor. There is no perfect judgment. I can only hope that I have made a good-enough series of judgments in good faith over the course of my tenure.

In my January-February 2002 column, "The Hollow Victories of Violence," written in conjunction with the then upcoming transactional

analysis conference on violence in Utrecht, I wrote: "I have written here in a strong and personal voice. I do not expect readers to agree with me. I do expect people to think, talk, argue, and act. I hope the readers of and the writers for *The Script* will continue the dialogue and debate and that the Utrecht conference will be political as well as psychological in its reach." In fact, many of the articles and interviews carried the past few years in *The Script* have addressed political and social concerns. And frankly, I think these principles and my editorship have created a vigorous, informative, professional newsletter.

I think it is important to say here that I do not write for or edit *The Script* as an American, but as a transactional analyst, a psychotherapist, and a teacher. Over the years I have heard some complaints that *The Script* has published too much material from US members and about the United States, that we do not represent a broad enough international perspective. In fact, about half of the material published in this newsletter last year was from members outside of the US and about transactional analysis activities throughout the world.

It is, of course, of continuing concern that both *The Script* and the *Journal* reflect the reality that the creativity and vitality of transactional analysis is worldwide and that citizens of the United States are now a minority membership of the ITAA and an even slimmer percentage of the transactional analysis community around the globe. So, it seemed impossible to avoid a discussion here of the events of 9/11/01 and the subsequent political and military responses—especially given the outpouring of concern and strong feeling expressed to

us by transactional analysts from around the world. And when we published a follow-up issue in April 2002 highlighting post-9/11 stories from some of our members in New York, as I wrote in a personal letter to Maurice Vaughn (whose letter appears on page 4), "As editor, I've tried to focus the articles and discussion [regarding 9/11] on the emotional and psychological impact and response needs in the face of such disaster."

From my viewpoint, the political dimensions of our work belong within the discussions in our newsletter, journal, and conferences. One cannot remove social and political perspectives from a social psychiatry or from the daily lives and struggles of our clients. It is not the issue of politics that is creating the controversy reflected in recent letters to *The Script*, but the tone of the discussion.

And, in closing, I might mention within the context of Frank Morris's letter in this issue that I prefer Scotch, Lagavulin whenever possible.

Bill Cornell can be reached at
36 Corbriwood Lane
Gibsonia, PA 15044, USA
or at bcornell@nauticom.net

ITAA The Script

The Newsletter of the International Transactional Analysis Association
436 14th St., Suite 1301
Oakland, CA 94612-2710, USA
Phone: 510-625-7720
Fax: 510-625-7725
Email: itaa@itaa-net.org
Website: <http://www.itaa-net.org>

Editor: William F. Cornell, MA
Managing Editor: Robin Fryer, MSW
Desktop Publishing: lockwood design
Printing: MarinSun Printing

Subscription Rates:
\$10 as part of all ITAA membership dues; not available by separate subscription

Advertising Rates:
Classified Ads: \$5/per 80 characters/spaces
Display Ads: Copy should be camera-ready

Ad Size	Rate	Width	Height
1/16 pg	\$50	2" (5cm)	3" (7.6cm)
1/8 pg	\$90	4" (11.5cm)	3" (7.6cm)
1/2 pg	\$170	4" (11.5cm)	6" (15.2cm)
3/8 pg	\$250	4" (11.5cm)	9" (23.5cm)
1/2 pg H	\$330	9" (23.5cm)	6" (15.2cm)
1/2 pg V	\$330	4" (11.5cm)	12" (32.4cm)
9/16 pg	\$370	6" (17.2cm)	9" (23.5cm)
Full pg	\$625	9" (23.5cm)	12" (32.4cm)

Deadlines for copy and advertising—first of the month prior to the month of publication. (*The Script* is not published in January, May, or September.) Deadline: October 1 for November issue; November 1 for December issue.

Note: Publication of advertising in *The Script* does not imply endorsement by the newsletter, the Editor, or the ITAA.

The Script (ISSN 0164-7393) is published monthly except January, May, and September by the International Transactional Analysis Association. The subscription rate is \$10/year as part of dues for all classes of membership. For information on dues rates for various membership classifications, contact the ITAA office at the above address. Periodicals postage paid at Oakland, California and additional mailing office. POSTMASTER: send address changes to *The Script*, 436 14th St., Ste. 1301, Oakland, CA 94612-2710. © 2002 International Transactional Analysis Association, Inc.

Published on recycled paper

Old T&C Council Records

To simplify procedures and delete old records, the T&C Council has approved the following plan:

1. The basic data for all T&C Council contracts, exams, and TEWs will be filed electronically, which makes it possible to remove paper files.
2. If you have a contract on file with the T&C Council and want it back, we will send it to you with other papers on file. We ask for your cooperation in paying the postal fee.
3. Please inform T&C Council by 15 November if you want your records back: T&C Council, 436 14th St., Suite 1301, Oakland, CA 94612-2710, USA; email: itaa@itaa-net.org; fax: 510-625-7725.
4. After 15 November your file will be sent back to you or destroyed.

—Servaas van Beekum, VP Training & Certification

Changes for Certification Exams

In July 2002 in Utrecht, the Training and Certification Council (T&CC) and the Professional Training and Standards Committee (PTSC) passed the following in the joint session of the Transactional Analysis Certification Council (TACC):

1. Revised examination evaluation forms for the counseling and education special fields were adopted. These are congruent with the core competencies published earlier. T&CC thanks the counselling task force, headed by Heidi Brechter, and the education task force, led by Trudy Newton, for their hard work.
2. Section D of the CTA psychotherapy written examination has been rewritten and will become the official version. Trainees will follow this mandatorily one year from the date of publication in *The Script*. Meanwhile, trainees may begin using this immediately for their CTA written exams.

The full text of the revised examination evaluation forms for the counseling and education special fields and Section D of the CTA psychotherapy written exam will be published in a future issue of *The Script*.

Correction

We regret that a name was left off of the list of successful examinees we received for the 9 November 2001 exams in Tokyo, Japan. Our apologies and belated congratulations to Takayuki Muroki, who passed her exam as a Certified Transactional Analyst (psychotherapy).

Translators Help Utrecht Participants Say "Hello"

by Grace Slottje

"International conferences are fascinating, with the hustle and bustle of many people talking in all sorts of languages," I thought to myself. But coming out of my dreamy world I started looking more closely at the faces. Sure, they wore different expressions and were of different types, but some of them looked quite lonely and ill at ease, some of them definitely lost—much as I probably did during my first days in Kuwait, where I lived for a while a number of years ago.

The Utrecht Conference last July had some 500 participants from more than 30 countries. English is the working language in the trans-

The idea of the translators pool for Utrecht was partly an outgrowth of the 2002 Paris transactional analysis conference, where some participants complained that the two or three available translators were not enough and that the languages they could translate were not always the ones requested. As an expatriate (a lucky one, indeed, as I have learned several languages), I know how easy it is to feel left out if one cannot communicate. I had the thought that it would be useful to create a pool of interpreters for the Netherlands conference, which was enthusiastically supported by conference chair Marijke Wusten. Notices in the *EATA Newsletter* and *The Script* brought many interested responses.

Thus, in Utrecht, nine courageous volunteer interpreters speaking five languages between them were available to provide the "missing link" for those who needed it. They translated workshops, sometimes whispered to two or three participants, and sometimes simply helped participants to connect.

Translating is difficult; misunderstanding someone is all too easy even if you speak the same language, and it is easier still to add to the misunderstanding by incorrectly translating the sense of a word or a phrase. For all of those who worked as translators it was an



adventure; for most of us it was a first and there was some apprehension: "I think I can do it, but will I be good enough?" Manon, for example, was full of doubt, but at the end of the last day she said, "I had a fantastic time—I can DO it!" Some of the team felt underused, and all of us have ideas about how to improve the translation program for future conferences.

We are proud that the feedback we received was positive, and in some gardens in France, Germany, Holland, and Italy some lovely Dutch yellow tulips will be flowering next spring to remind us of the rich and enjoyable time we had as members of the translation pool. (Along with the tulips, translators received free conference registration in appreciation for their hard work.) We also hope that people who may not have attended international conferences because of language problems will decide to come in the future knowing that help is available. For upcoming conferences we now have a pool of 32 volunteers who speak English and can translate to/from most of the European languages, including Croatian, Russian, and Serbian. We are delighted about this since the 2004 European International Conference will take place in Romania.

"We hope that people who have not attended international conferences because of language problems will come in the future knowing that help is available."

actional analysis community, and it is important to have one. Without a common language, learning and sharing is impossible, and that, after all, is why people come to international conferences: to learn, to share, and to say "Hello." However, it is a discount to believe that "everyone speaks English" as a first or second language since it is only one of about 4000 languages spoken the world over.

ITAA Makes Changes

continued from page 1

TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION

The board approved:

1. A change in the bylaws of the Training and Certification Council, by which the autonomy of decision making by the T&C Council is guaranteed, following legal requirements
2. A new contract for the services that T&C Council delivers to ITAA members. As part of that contract the Board has set a formula for payments to the Training and Certification Council. From now on the Council will receive \$10 for each member of ITAA and 50% of advanced members' fees over and above the fee for Regular Members. This money goes to the Training and Certification Council to allow them to keep their fees for training contracts and examinations as low as possible.

3. Non-ITAA members seeking a contract with T&C council will be charged a higher rate so that the ITAA subsidy only applies to ITAA members using these services.

4. A plan was agreed on to remove the T&C Council files from the office and keep the relevant data electronically. (See the T&C Council notice on page 2 of this *Script* for instructions on how to claim your file if you wish to keep it.)

MAJOR WEBSITE DEVELOPMENT

The Board agreed that Elaine Francis in our Oakland office should spend half her time on developing our website. This development will include posting a list of those members who have asked to be publicly listed and exploring the development of e-books (books that can be downloaded over the Internet and printed on the buyer's home computer); web-based courses in transactional analysis, which in some countries will qualify for continuing education credit; and other projects. The Board sees our website as a major resource and wishes to make it as useful as possible for our members. See it at www.ita-net.org.

In addition, it was decided that our web presence is now so important that we should move to appoint a Vice-President in charge of Internet Activities.

TRANSLATION

The Board considers it imperative that transactional analysis resources should be available in translation wherever possible. We will be asking regional representatives to identify people in the major language groups who would be willing to do translations for us. We wish to make our website available in several different languages, we would like to provide subtitles to our videos of transactional analysts demonstrating their skills, and we have also had requests for more translation from other languages into English. We hope to use our large, multilingual membership to find volunteers to undertake these translation tasks.

MARKETING AND SALES

We have had significant increases in sales of our videotapes and books, particularly over

our website. The Board has approved increased funding for marketing our products. It was decided that only one new video would be made this year, and Carlo Moiso was chosen.

CONFERENCES

The Board confirmed that the 2003 International Conference will be held in Mexico from 6-10 August 2003. The conference site is Oaxaca, and we are told this is a wonderful town with many interesting archaeological sites nearby. Members are encouraged to put these dates in their diary now (see page 8).

The 2004 International Conference has been confirmed for Bangalore in Southern India, a wonderfully colorful region where members are assured of a fascinating time.

It has been agreed in principle that the 2005 conference will be held as a joint conference for ITAA, EATA (the European Transactional Analysis Association), and ITA (the UK Association) and will probably be held in Scotland.

THE COSTS OF THESE INITIATIVES

These various initiatives will be expensive. We will need to use about \$200,000 of our reserves to embark on these new activities and expand previous ones. The Board decided that we could only maintain our reserves by drastically cutting services to members and reducing staff still further. It seemed that this was not likely to be a winning strategy. The Board believes that these new initiatives should produce a significant increase in both membership, retention of members, and sales. Provided it does so within three years, ITAA's future will be assured. If it does not, then the ITAA will need to consider drastic restructuring. So, please remember to support your association by maintaining your own membership, encouraging others to join, and visiting our website and purchasing the various products that we have available.

BYLAWS AND GUIDELINES

It is, of course, important that the association act legally, and this means following the guidelines and bylaws that it has itself

TRANSACTIONAL ANALYSIS CONFERENCES WORLDWIDE

November 13-17, 2002: Perth, Australia. Sixteenth Annual Australasian TA Conference. Contact: Kate Meredith, 10a Itea Place, Mindarie, W. Australia phone: 6030; 08-93051160 fax: 08-93051150

February 4-12, 2003: Frenchman's Cove, near Port Antonio, Jamaica. USA-TAA Gathering. Contact: Diane Maki, 973-763-7973; email: makisethi@aol.com

April 11-13, 2003: Swansea, Wales. Institute of Transactional Analysis Conference. Contact: Doug Hampson, dhampson@glam.co.uk

August 3-5, 2003: Oaxaca, Mexico. Redecision Conference. Contact: Janet Lee O'Connor, 2012 South Augusta Place, Tucson, Arizona 85710, USA; phone: 520-360-0007 or 520-886-0176; email: southwesttraining@yahoo.com

August 6-10, 2003: Oaxaca, Mexico. International Transactional Analysis Conference (designated ITAA conference). Contact: Instituto Mexicano de Análisis Transaccional, Agrarismo 21, Col. Escandón, México, D.F. C.P. 11800; fax: (5255)52-71-52-04 email: information@taconference.com

July 30-August 1, 2004: Bangalore, India. International Transactional Analysis Conference (designated ITAA conference). Contact: C. Suriyaprakash, email: iitac2004@hotmail.com or child_asha@hotmail.com

approved. By the time you read this, you should have received voting papers for the changes to the bylaws. The Board spent considerable time at the Utrecht meeting in considering revisions of our bylaws and guidelines, which had been drawn up by Robin Maslen, Chair of the Bylaws Committee. It had become clear that both our bylaws and guidelines were now well out of date.

In addition, new procedures for the Eric Berne Memorial Award, prepared by Claude Steiner and the EBMA Committee, were approved.

FINALLY THE CONFERENCE

After all the hard work of the Board and other business meetings, it was a joy for me and many board members to attend the conference itself. For me it was one of the most impressive I have attended (and I have attended many). The standard of presentations was high, and they encouraged excellent debate. In addition, the organizers are to be congratulated for a superb social program that gave participants plenty of opportunity to get to know each other and to sample the delights of Utrecht.

CLASSIFIED AD

Straight-shooting computer repair guy.
Jim Cooley/Computer Closet.
415-642-1651

Important Change in Berne Award Process

Those making nominations will no longer be required to designate a category for the work being nominated. In the past nominations had to fit a category: theory, application, research, or other. This change should help make the nomination process clearer and easier. Remember that the next deadline for EBMA nominations is 1 December 2002. For detailed instructions on submitting nominations, please contact the ITAA office or see our website at www.ita-net.org.

2004 INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONAL ANALYSIS CONFERENCE

"Celebrating Differences"

Bangalore, India
30 July - 1 August
Preconference Institutes:
28 July & 29 July

Sponsored by the
Centre for Holistic Integrated
Learning and Development

For more information, contact
C. Suriyaprakash at
iitac2004@hotmail.com
or child_asha@hotmail.com

Many of our regular *Script* columns and features as well as other material submitted for publication have been postponed until future issues due to the volume of mail we received for this Members' Forum. The letters in this Forum are printed in the order in which they were received.

COMMENTS ON 9/11 COVERAGE

Dear Editor:

In relation to the New York 9/11 April 2002 edition of *The Script* and Steve Karpman's letter in the May-June issue condemning the newsletter as left wing and anti-American, I wish to submit the following observation. While recognizing the disaster and horror of the attack on the United States and the resulting loss of life, I thought that by devoting almost an entire issue to this disaster without any corresponding comment from Arab or Palestinian interests or the disasters that have befallen them with the support of US military might, was by omission extremely biased. From my perspective, *The Script* was intensely political by expressing American pain and suffering while almost totally ignoring the why question: Why do some people hate the USA so much that they would be driven to do such a thing? The articles lacked the political context and international analysis that would promote a greater understanding of the wider issues, remembering that this is an international newsletter, many of whose readers may not be comfortable with American foreign policy. My immediate response on reading the April edition was to draft a letter, which on reflection I did not send. Now that the debate has been opened up, I submit these observations from a part of the globe that watches American foreign policy and the rhetoric of George Bush with some concern.

Maurice Vaughan,
Armidale, New South Wales, Australia

Editor's Note: We agree that it would have been preferable to publish perspectives from members from other countries impacted by the events of 9/11 and similar terrorist attacks, and, in fact, we contacted some members in the Middle East for their input for the April issue. Unfortunately, we did not receive any responses.

MY TWO BITS

Dear *Script*:

In late July 2002, US conservative columnist Charles Krauthammer explained the difference between Republicans and Democrats in the *Washington Post*. He wrote, "To understand the workings of American politics, you have to understand this fundamental law: Conservatives think liberals are stupid and liberals think conservatives are evil." He pointed out that nice liberals think everyone else is nice also because "liberals believe human nature is fundamentally good" and that if we but change social conditions, everyone will be happy. "Accordingly, the conservative attitude toward liberals is one of compassionate condescension." Those are his first three paragraphs. The subsequent eight paragraphs reveal how liberals cannot understand how "evil conservatives" can also be pleasant.

Since 1964 I have used transactional analysis to understand the difference between Republicans (Rs) and Democrats (Ds). I see Ds as Child contaminated and Rs as Parent contaminated. In a way, I agree with Krauthammer: Democrats are softer and Republicans are harder. My 38 years of research reveals few Rs who have gone the distance in dissolving the internal

Critical Parent. Accordingly, they think repressive options work (it did with them!), use shame in attacking their opponents (it worked with them!), and rely on force (W. is "strong") rather than negotiation. Their choice point in value decisions resides around what will aid big business and the rich plus having a judiciary that is repression oriented (so they can bring along the religious Right vote). While Krauthammer was quick to say that liberals believe human nature is good, he does not admit the reverse, namely, that conservatives think people are fundamentally sinful. Republicans win elections by contriving grand "Ain't It Awful" schemes that gain the votes of the despairing, who are seldom helped by those they elect.

The Ds rescue entirely too much, believe in forgiveness despite a criminal element that does not respond to kindness, and tend to get lost in intellectual complexity that leads to inaction. As Krauthammer indicated, Democrats simply cannot understand why anyone with a brain would choose to be a Republican. Ds are dreamers, are scared of confronting straightforwardly lest they hurt the feelings of Rs, and frequently come up with logical positions that go straight over the head of the listening public (think Al Gore). Democrats tend to look to the future "as to what might yet be" and, in so doing, fail to bring the populace along with small, incremental steps.

Lest I get too serious in this regard, my experience is that Republicans drink scotch while Democrats are bourbon bound.

All this is to say that Eric Berne's fond hope of political Adult-Adult transactions is still far from being realized. The difficulty is in personality orientations and fundamental value sets. It behooves those of us who value transactional analysis to keep the dialogue alive.

Frank R. Morris, Battletown,
Kentucky, United States

MORE COMMENTS ON NOVEY'S RESEARCH

Dear Ted:

I think the sampling procedure you used in your research studies on the effectiveness of transactional analysis (Novey, 1999, 2002) needs some rethinking.

It is important to distinguish the differences in the sampling methods used in Seligman's study and the methods you used. Seligman sent out his questionnaire as part of the annual survey that goes out to the readership of *Consumer Reports*. Of the 180,000 surveys sent out, 2,900 respondents reported seeing a mental health professional. These responses were from clients of the five different categories of therapists as defined by Seligman: psychologists, psychiatrists, social workers, marriage counselors, and physicians, with 37%, 22%, 14%, and 9% of the 2,900 representing each of the first four categories respectively. About 1,000 saw physicians. Thus, the sample size (*N*) for all five categories was large.

What is not mentioned in the study but is important to note is that there is a strong likelihood that the number of therapists represented by the number of clients (2900) is most likely about the same number. I am assuming that the 180,000 *Consumer Reports* readers are randomly distributed throughout the United States, and thus the sample is randomly distributed. This would leave, on average, about 2900 divided by 50 states, or 58 clients per state. Therefore, the chances of any two clients having the same therapist are minimal. So the selection of therapists to be evaluated by the

clients is implicitly random and most likely no two clients have the same therapist.

The purpose of the study is to evaluate the effectiveness of various types of therapists so that the population to be studied is the population of therapists. For the statistics to be valid, the selection of therapists to be studied must be random. In Seligman's study it is.

With regard to bias, Seligman wrote:

It cannot be ignored that CR [*Consumer Reports*] is about as unbiased a scrutinizer of goods and services as exists in the public domain. They have no axe to grind for or against medications, psychotherapy, managed care, insurance companies, family doctors, AA, or long-term treatment. They do not care if psychologists do better or worse than psychiatrists, marriage and family counselors, or social workers. They are not pursuing government grants or drug company favors. They do not accept advertisements. They have a track record of loyalty only to consumers. So this study comes with higher credibility than studies that issue from drug houses, from either APA, from consensus conferences of the National Institute of Mental Health, or even from the halls of academe. (Seligman, 1995, pp. 970-971)

And, I would add, or perhaps from transactional analysis.

In your original study the number of clients was 248. However, the therapist-client ratio is quite different than in Seligman's study. There are five therapists evaluated rather than approximately 2900 as studied by Seligman. While the selection of therapists in Seligman's study was implicitly random, having therapists volunteer filtered the selection in your study. This would seem to bias the results both because the selection was small (five rather than approximately 2900) and the selection was not random. Those who volunteered would have motivation to do so only if they suspected a high likelihood of a positive result, whereas the therapists in Seligman's study were essentially volunteered at random by bypassing the therapists and going directly to the clients. In your study the therapists were filtered in nonrandom fashion first and the pool of clients was subsequently selected from those therapists' pool of clients.

For the results to be comparable, the selection of clients from transactional analysis therapists would need to be done in a similar fashion to Seligman's study. If he had proceeded as you did, he might have taken any one of the groups—say psychologists—and solicited them directly to pass out questionnaires to their clients. However, I think his results would have been quite different in that they would contain bias since the group had a vested interest in showing positive results.

There is a second difficulty with comparing the data from the two studies. Seligman's results show the relative effectiveness of five different categories of mental health professionals. For the data to be comparable, transactional analysis therapists should be divided into the same five categories. This would result in data that would compare psychologists at random to transactional analysis psychiatrists at random, and so on. Without differentiation, the transactional analysis sample could be favorably weighted in a profitable direction by excluding the two categories of Seligman's original five that did not do as well as the others.

A second option would be to do a study similar to Seligman's but instead of using the five different categories he used, subclassify the thera-

pists into schools of therapy, transactional analysis being one of them. In fact, Seligman included some questions related to modality of therapy (psychodynamic, behavioral, cognitive, feminist). Although transactional analysis was not included in this list, Seligman's conclusion was that "no specific modality of psychotherapy did any better than any other for any problem. These results confirm the 'dodo bird' hypothesis, that all forms of psychotherapies do about equally well (Luborsky, Singer, & Luborsky, 1975). They come as a rude shock to efficacy researchers, since the main theme of efficacy studies has been the demonstration of the usefulness of specific techniques for specific disorders" (Seligman, 1995, p. 969).

Your results seem to contradict Seligman's with regard to modality.

So, I think your sampling procedure yields the following results: It is possible to find five transactional analysis therapists who will volunteer information that will show them in a favorable light compared to Seligman's selection of therapists at random. While this may provide good marketing for those five therapists, it does not say anything about transactional analysis in general because the sample of therapists and clients is not a random sample from the population of transactional analysis therapists and clients.

Thus, I am suggesting that it would be possibly more profitable to change the sampling procedure to exclude bias that seems to be evident in the current procedure.

Chris Boyd, San Francisco,
California, United States

REFERENCES

- Novey, T. B. (1999). The effectiveness of transactional analysis. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 29, 18-30.
- Novey, T. B. (2002). Measuring the effectiveness of transactional analysis: An international study. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 32, 8-24.
- Seligman, M. (1995). The effectiveness of transactional analysis. *American Psychologist*, 50(12), 965-974.

NOVEY'S RESPONSE

Dear Editor:

I have some limited comments to make in response to recent *Script* letters by Mervyn Hine and Ken Woods and a message from Chris Boyd [reprinted in this Members' Forum], all of which related to my research on the effectiveness of transactional analysis (see the January 2002 *Transactional Analysis Journal*).

I appreciate the care and energy that Mervyn, Ken, and Chris put into their analyses of the effectiveness research. I have particularly appreciated the assistance that Mervyn has given me in both the statistical analysis of the data and his more recent analysis of the data to look for inconsistencies or consistencies in the data collected in various ways and in various countries and languages around the world. As I understand Mervyn's conclusions, the data is quite consistent and did not disclose any strange or large effects that might indicate sampling problems.

All three of these writers posed a number of possible sources of systematic errors that could distort the stated results. Many of these conjectures parallel those in letters published in the *American Psychologist*, in which a number of authors question the results from original effectiveness measurements made by the staff of *Consumer Reports* magazine with Martin Seligman as a consultant.

With regard to the validity of these conjectures, it is generally understood that one can never prove a negative. That is, it will be impossible to prove that there are no systematic errors that disprove the stated results of an experiment. Clearly, if one set of conjectures are disproven by data, then another set can be proposed, and so on ad infinitum. This generally understood impossibility of proving a negative is generally handled by researchers by organizing experiments and stating results as positives. Experiments can be set up to support a hypothesis or to contradict a hypothesis or just to look for some new effect. Statistical evaluations are set up to state the probability that repeated measurements will agree with the stated results, within experimental error.

That is why it is so important that experimental results be repeated by a variety of researchers using differing methods to see if results reproduce or not. Single measurements are always looked at with some skepticism. The source of validity in science is reproducibility. My results should be considered in the same way.

Do the results absolutely prove that transactional analysis is a superior approach to psychotherapy? Of course not, and I do not state so in my papers. I learned early on in my research career that the best thing that a scientist can do is to describe what he or she did in detail, explain how the analysis was done, and state the results of the analysis, taking into account statistical reliability and any known systematic errors. Then leave it for others to confirm or contradict the results. This was my aim in the published papers.

I can say that none of the present or past authors of conjectures about possible systematic sampling and other types of errors have presented any experimental data to support their statements. Thus, while I can never disprove that any or all of their conjectures are wrong, neither can I give them any validity without the presence of experimental data. In the *Consumer Reports* publications, Seligman's related papers, the publication of results of similar research on the effectiveness of psychodynamically oriented therapy by the New York psychoanalytic group, as well as my published research papers, we have described various tests of the data looking for such systematic errors. (For references to these papers see Novey, 1999, 2002.) None have turned up. How come such experimental verification of the results is not considered relevant and unverified conjectures are given such weight by their authors?

Of course, there have been many other publications on research on the theory and effectiveness of transactional analysis therapy, including one made very early on in California by collaborators of Berne who compared the results of transactional analysis psychotherapy with behavioral therapy in two California schools for delinquent adolescents. Similar positive effects were found for both approaches. This type of research has been repeated many times since, with varying levels of validity. Why do we have such a difficult time in accepting that the transactional analysis approach is also a high-quality psychotherapy? As Ken Woods writes, "We already know this in our hearts." Why are some still convinced that transactional analysis is a fringe and pop psychology and is still not OK?

Now my research papers have been published; the studies they report on utilized another approach to measuring the satisfaction of clients with the therapy provided by well-trained transactional analysts. Once again the data supports the effectiveness of transactional analysis as being at least comparable to other effective modes of therapy and other therapist

trainings. I recommend that these new results be added to the results of earlier research in this area. I invite those who do not consider these results to be valid to undertake research that can support or contradict these results. In this way science progresses. To paraphrase Yogi Berra, transactional analysis therapy will be accepted when it is accepted.

To be specific about Ken's letter, there is an error of fact. As described in my papers, the therapists did not have the choice to select clients for the questionnaires. They were instructed to send the questionnaires to all clients seen in the previous five-year period. If they had seen more than 150 clients during this period, they were instructed to select 150 at random. Also, the process of therapist random selection was clearly described in the papers.

With regard to Mervyn's letter, his suggestions for further expansion of the studies and the use of other data from the questionnaires that was not utilized by the *Consumer Reports* staff are good ones and may well provide further useful data. However, after five years of work on the research that I reported, I have completed the program that I had planned and hope that others will continue new research studies that can support or contradict the results of the studies that I have done.

Personally, I am glad to have had the opportunity to follow up on the *Consumer Reports* research to carry out this research on the effectiveness of certified transactional analysts. I remain satisfied with the research design and am pleasantly surprised at the positive way the results turned out.

Ted Novey, Glenview, Illinois, United States

A RESPONSE TO KARPMAN'S LETTER

Dear Editor:

When reading Stephen Karpman's response (May-June 2002 *Script*) to Frances Bonds-White's letter (April 2002 *Script*), I became more and more dismayed. The tone and content of Karpman's letter reminds me of the late sixties in Germany when the right-wing conservative politician Franz Joseph Strauss called the young people guilty of fouling their own nest when they finally dared to ask the older generation of their responsibility concerning the Nazi regime.

As you may know, about 90% of Germans agreed with the Nazi regime or behaved as supporters or at least bystanders. After 1945, all too often the responsible generation refused to discuss their recent past with their children. We, the next generation, urgently hoped to hear comments such as, "I agreed, but now I regret it." However, most individuals from the older generation refused this gesture. Moreover, they tried to prove to us why we could not understand them. Only since 1968 have the children forced their parents to answer necessary questions, although then they were criticized by conservatives for doing so.

What is wrong with taking away the veil of affirmative ideology (i.e., the belief that everything is good about something) and calling facts and actions by their true name? Why shouldn't American citizens be allowed to criticize politics in their country and point out the actual reasons that motivate political activities? After all, one of the most important advantages of a functioning democracy is that people have the opportunity and the right to criticize the system, even in its ideological outcomes.

Everyone who wants to know realizes that, at least since the 1970s, political activity has been

mainly determined by economic interests. That Afghanistan after 1989 was of interest at all only depended on its strategic location for oil companies. And as the hope faded that the Taliban would guarantee stabilization there, the world just forgot the country, as it does with so many other regions without relevant meaning to economic interests.

I was all the more dismayed because I didn't read Karpman's letter in a provincial newspaper but in *The Script*, the international transactional analysts' professional organizational newsletter. As far as I remember, we transactional analysts are not only committed to our Ethics Code—which I understand as being committed to truth instead of ideology—but we also adopted Eric Berne's "Menschenbild" or worldview. In reading Berne accurately, we cannot help but find him an upright defender of autonomy. Berne was a well-educated man, so we may assume that he knew the roots of the term "autonomy" in the philosophy of the Enlightenment, especially Kant. Kant wrote two core sentences concerning the Enlightenment and autonomy:

"Sapere aude!"—to dare to think for yourself.

"Aufklärung ist der Ausgang aus der selbstverschuldeten Unmündigkeit"—enlightenment that means giving up one's dependence, which one has accepted without being forced to.

What do those sentences mean? They mean just what Frances Bonds-White and Bill Cornell did: Both of them used their own capacity to think and reason and then wrote down what they found out from doing so.

Can we as transactional analysts really confine our autonomous thinking and acting to our psychotherapeutic practice? As if our work took place and we and our clients lived in an apolitical space? How can we support autonomy in our therapeutic work if we aren't allowed to live autonomously as critical and responsible citizens? Don't we teach our clients that harmony can be more harmful than necessary conflicts? Thus, can an American citizen who criticizes the American government and a German citizen who criticizes the German government not be loyal in a more upright way than someone who merely affirms the status quo because of indifference? In contrast to those who are indifferent, those who are critical of their government acknowledge the suffering they and others experience as a result of deplorable conditions and want to see such conditions changed.

Let me conclude with my utmost conviction: Good therapeutic as well as good educational work can only be done by responsible adults who are also critical and politically informed citizens living the ethical postulates they are committed to beyond their therapeutic practices.

Ulrike Müller, Freiburg, Germany

Dear Ulrike:

Let's see if I got this straight. It's OK if you express your political opinion but it is not OK if I express mine? And it's OK in America to criticize the Right but not OK to criticize the Left? This is just what I warned everybody about. If the editor opens the door to political warfare, people will rush in with their many one-sided "I'm OK, You're Not OK" political agendas. Me and Nazi Germany? Where is the transactional analysis?

Stephen B. Karpman, San Francisco, California, United States

POLITICAL HATE MAIL

Dear Editor:

I wrote a letter in the June 2002 *Script* challenging a maverick editorial policy of publishing hot political issues by the editor, and as a result I am buried in hate mail from both the June and August 2002 issues. The problem is that in neither issue was I offered the courtesy of a chance to rebut. In my defense I will respond with four editorial recommendations and include the three disallowed rebuttals.

Recommendations:

1. The editor should not introduce hot, divisive, and inciting political issues as if there were no opposite sides to the issue. In the June 2002 issue I urgently responded to what I considered to be three potential third-degree problems in the *Script* Members' Forum. These problems, with my rebuttals included, are as follows:

a) War is third-degree and therefore anti-war rhetoric is third-degree. There is the widespread fear of flying airplanes and loss of millions of lives, yet at least two separate third-degree, anti-war, anti-American entries were published unopposed. I confronted this new policy with several dozen well-reasoned arguments in the June 2002 *Script*. I am nonpolitical, I don't want to see *The Script* opened up to the same heated I+U- political prejudices that we see in daily newspapers and TV. We've heard it all before. Who's going to say something new? The Left? The Right? Is an invitation to competing anger rackets an appropriate use of valuable *Script* space? Have we considered the risk/reward ratio?

b) Membership dropout and damage to ITAA finances can be third-degree financial suicide. In other scientific organizations in which there has been a left-wing coup of the media, significant losses in membership have followed. We in the ITAA experienced a massive drop in membership in the 1970s Schiff debacle after it was polarized into a dirty political war between two rival TA schools. The ITAA isn't so financially stable that we can risk that again. I assume that most of us want this to stay an Adult scientific organization.

c) Ethics charges in a professional organization are third-degree, particularly when circulated worldwide, as is *The Script*. Angry letters to the editor commonly occur all the time in real life, but *The Script* editor, referring to my letter in his rebuttal, made the suggestion of a possible ethics violation by me. There was no ethics violation. In fact, in the ITAA it is more of a violation to publicly suggest that there is an ethics violation. I presume the ITAA isn't against the expression of anger. By linking "ethics guidelines" and "personal attacks" in that same opening sentence, permission and validation were given for these Rescue counterattack letters to be sent out at me. I was not given a chance to avoid this or rebut this. In his note, the editor admitted that I attacked policy, not him.

2. The editor should be sensitive to the power of the press and not "run up the score" against any one member. In my June 2002 letter to the editor, I challenged the two "Let's You and Him Fight" political games that were published previously. The editor rebutted my letter after a promise in an April email not to do so (I had emailed him about the concept of "outnumbering" someone). So now we have a "score" of three to one against me, and counting. I was not given a chance to rebut the apparent ethics wording that he included or get him to withdraw it.

continued on page 6

Members' Forum

continued from page 5

Two months later, in the August 2002 issue, I find two published attack letters putting me down while ignoring my points. That made the odds five to one against me, now forcing me to respond. What's wrong is that I was given no chance to rebut any of these in the same published issue. A timely, same-page rebuttal is absolutely necessary to eliminate the months-long growing hurt, anger, and misinformation between publications.

3. If time permits, angry letters should be preceded by a three-way discussion with the editor. In the first letter in the August 2002 issue, O'Reilly-Knapp harshly criticized me personally when she wrote this about my criticism of the editor: "an attack on the integrity of an individual is appalling and the lowest form of human encounter." But that is exactly what she is doing to me: attacking my integrity, attacking me personally, making me subhuman. I call that *Script* hate mail: mailed anger that only attacks the person, not the issue. Anger begets anger in the cycle of violence. Closure is needed. Can we ask of the editor, should her letter have been: a) published, b) censored, c) unilaterally edited, or 4) mediated? Is there a policy? Perhaps if we could have discussed the letter with the editor, O'Reilly-Knapp may have rewritten it in such a way that I could have just let the whole thing go.

Additionally, in the other August 2002 attack letter, Woods criticizes me for the very thing he praises: "having the temerity to question the ethics and the morality of..." However, that's exactly what I did, question the editorial policy, and like Woods, speaking out for what I believe. We do the same thing, but it looks like Woods is criticizing me. A three-way discussion may have straightened out that, too. These things can go on and on if the editor doesn't mediate for closure. Publishing deadlines must be secondary. Now, with these rebuttals I've made, the "score" seems even to me, five to five? What happens next? A new flood of anti-war, anti-American letters looking for a new straw man (me)?

4. As a general rule, the editor must be careful not to allow any "appearances" of retaliation, favoritism, double standards, abuse of power, or censorship and, instead, should promote a clear stance of openness, honesty, and impartiality.

The power differential must be acknowledged and monitored. Power controls the flow of information. Power controls the rewards and punishments. The editor has the power to create beauty, as he did with the wonderful June 2002 five touching biographies and "Moving Beyond Tragedy," or the power to allow a "shoot the messenger" scenario to one who criticizes his editorial policies.

In the June 2002 *Script* rebuttal to my letter, the editor stated his policy: "*The Script* does not publish letters containing personal or ad hominem attacks. We make every effort to work with authors, when necessary, to help them shape their letters in keeping with these guidelines while still expressing their views." As I have illustrated above, unfortunately, none of this protection was given me in the recent attacks, nor was his stated policy granted me of working with the authors. Double standards? More consistent policies, including these recommendations, are needed to get closure so we can go beyond petty games and focus our creative energies meaningfully once more on building the theory, practice, and more importantly, the acceptance of transactional analysis.

Steve Karpman, San Francisco, California, United States

QUESTIONS ABOUT SCRIPT EDITORIAL POLICY

Dear Editor,

Being the editor of *The Script* carries a great responsibility. I admire a person who will assume such a position of leadership, especially when in our profession we hold so dearly to such principles as win-win interactions, OK-OK transactions, and integrity. The editor must select without bias, edit without censorship, protect without rescuing, allow confrontation without persecution, permit criticism without attack, and encourage opinions, thoughts, and feelings without contaminations. He or she must make decisions, moderate, mediate, clarify, and perhaps even arbitrate, all from a position of neutrality.

But, perhaps I am assuming too much and projecting my own editorial value system. My personal and professional mission, like so many of us TAer's around the world, is predicated on a philosophy of OKness. This commitment to an equality among us carries over, for me, to the written word as well. Although we all have a choice as to whether to read *The Script*, including these letters to the editor, my preference is simple: keep the exchanges OK-OK and still disagree, confront, or debate.

Perhaps what would be valuable for some of us would be to have a regularly updated, published code that would include comprehensive guidelines and examples from the editor for what will and will not be acceptable for a letter to be published, as well as options and alternatives. This could include content issues, and if we accept the premise of OK-OK exchanges, would include process assessment criteria. Naturally, as the editor would be the gatekeeper and final decision maker, it would be even more important for all to know the guidelines with examples of what the editor can and cannot do. (Were I the editor, that would greatly simplify my life.)

On the other hand, this very letter may not represent how most feel, think, or believe about *The Script* and in particular the Letters to the Editor. To evolve professionally, we must progress and exist as a democratic organization. I do my best to take personal responsibility for how I choose to feel, good or bad, OK or not OK, when spoken to or written about. Yet professionally some might declare "freedom of speech [and of letters]"—desiring little or no such editorial guidelines, arguing from my very same premise for a different conclusion: that authors should be able to choose how they say what they say in Letters to the Editor and that readers need to choose how they feel about it. If that is the decision of the majority, or powers that be, and incorporated into guideline policies, so be it. To that end, I would be sad, continue in the ITAA and transactional analysis, and simply not read the letters. Relevant for me is that distress invites distress. OKness liberates OKness, encourages cohesion, embodies friendship, and allows healthy disagreements.

I am in the ITAA because of the hope and expectation that we will live and model the principles of transactional analysis among ourselves and to the world. Is your mission, my mission significantly to enhance the quality of lives for generations? The Letters to the Editor is a forum in which we may practice and reinforce the stated missions of the ITAA. Without further clarifications and agreed upon guidelines, these best laid plans of mice and men, editors and writers, and readers as well, may sorely go astray. *Petitio principii*: an argument cannot be based on contradictory premises. Shall we all "compromise"? [Free Child Elvis trivia humor: "Don't be Krell"]

Taibi Kahler, Little Rock, Arkansas, United States

Dear Bill,

I have read with interest in recent issues (*The Script*, June 2002 and August 2002) the dia-

logue between Steve Karpman, yourself, Marye O'Reilly-Knapp, and Ken Woods. In my view, Steve Karpman has not been dealt with in a fair manner.

At this time it seems that *The Script* has no policy or statement on the discussion of politics within its pages. In June 2002, Steve Karpman states that he thinks *The Script* is becoming a left-wing, anti-American rag under your editorship.

He is allowed his views and you gave him that right by publishing it. Then, as you would be aware, you made an editorial note at the end. You accused him of personal attacks but there is no statement as to what constitutes an attack and what does not. I do not see it as an attack but as him being passionate about his views. This is a concern: if an editor accuses a reader of something but then makes no statement as to validate that accusation. I think it is fairly safe to say that the average reader would tend just to accept the editorial comment. If they do, then Karpman is automatically defined as an "attacker." I am not sure if you offered him the right of reply to that accusation, but I hope you did.

Then in the August 2002 edition I see Marye O'Reilly-Knapp assume that it was an attack also, and how this is the "lowest form of human encounter." It seems to me that her comment is just as "attacking" as anything Steve Karpman wrote. In the same edition we have Ken Woods also assuming Karpman was attacking, as you suggested. Then he states that he does not take sides regarding your editorship. To publically agree with your comment that a reader is attacking seems to me to be fairly clear about which side of the fence he is on.

It seems to me that there is a definite need for editorial clarity here. Is politics in or out of *The Script*? What is an attack and what is not? Has Steve Karpman been given the right of reply to these three "attacks" in the same edition as they are printed? That is, if someone attacks me in a future edition of *The Script*, I would like to know that I will be given the right (and enough time) to respond in that same edition.

Tony White, Leederville, North Perth, Western Australia

ANOTHER RESPONSE TO KARPMAN'S LETTER

Dear Steve Karpman:

I read your letter in the May-June 2002 *Script* some time ago and don't have a copy, so please let me know if I misconstrued anything.

1. You seem to equate "right wing" with conservative, patriotic, and pro-violence and war. If so, you are doing conservatives a serious disservice. Remember Margaret Chase Smith, Republican and ardent conservative, who stood alone in the US Senate as she voted against war. Remember one of the finest Republican patriots, Robert Taft, who spoke and voted against wars of aggression. And remember that every president in the twentieth century, except possibly Jimmy Carter, ordered acts that other countries would consider terrorism—in Central and South America, Africa, Asia. Remember that Bill Clinton, Democrat, ordered the destruction by bombing of the only pharmaceutical manufacturing plant in Somalia (and afterward admitted the plant had NOT made anything illegal or dangerous). That terrorism caused the deaths of thousands because they had no antibiotics, no medicines against TB, and so on. Clinton apologized but did not rebuild their plant.

2. ITAA members should not engage in political discussions of such matters. What should we care about? How to diagram violence? I think it is our duty to do anything we can to keep politics in front of everyone.

A European paper printed, "International law

no longer exists. It is taken for granted that the United States can do whatever it chooses." Steve, is that the politics we shouldn't talk about?

You brought up Eric Berne. I think you attended at least a few of his big Carmel parties in his home. Invariably, he would dim the lights, then announce, "Everyone lie down on the floor and put your arms around each other. And think about war and how we can stop it." Then the lights would come on and we'd talk about how to get the United States out of Vietnam. He hated violence, Steve, and he seemed very depressed about Vietnam.

None of us know what he would have said today, so we all guess. I guess he would be proud of our ITAA members who are working to comfort the sufferers here and abroad and would be especially proud of those in ITAA who are pursuing mediation and arbitration in an attempt to prevent terrorism nationally and internationally. This means being proud of being political.

Mary Goulding

Dear Mary Goulding:

Sorry Mary, but every political stereotype you have of me is wrong, as it has always been. But now I'm not amused, because you've taken it beyond our emails. Clarification: I don't "equate 'right wing' with conservative, patriotic, and pro-violence and war." You guys do. I equate Right wing with Left wing, as I've explained before. Brothers under the skin. Equally closed minded. Clubs playing "Me Too." As I've told you, I see these extremes as Time Structuring hobbies for the deeply opinionated Critical Parent, deceptively couching their anger rackets and Angry Righteous scripts in Nurturing Parent clothes, as Rescuing know-it-alls, making the "other" not OK. Diagram that. I think the need to force their opinions on others is scripted too, Left or Right. The game is "Trading Prejudices," where intimidating opinions are used to scare away ALL dialogue so there can be NO solution, and the Payoff for that is that the special Club fellowship is maintained.

I hate politics. I don't take sides. I believe in understanding and respecting BOTH sides for starters, and knowing the games. It's not that hard. Basic TA. But I don't see this in *The Script* political letters, so I fight against prejudice. I want to see truth here, not bias. But I have been noting with interest the amount of hate mail that the Left delivers to me, this convenient straw man (see above letters). The anti-violence sharks have smelled the blood. How many more attack letters to come?

Also, Mary, it seems that your opinions are based on the *only* valid Adult facts and the *only* valid Parent morality, but you have a right to believe that they are. Anti-war? What if the Eiffel Tower were hit? Would our European anti-war activists agree with you then? Of course I'm anti-violence and you're anti-violence. But isn't this preaching to the choir? But, otherwise, I love you as always, but please don't single me out again. This is getting old.

Steve Karpman

ADVANCED TRANSACTIONAL ANALYSIS TRAINING

Transactional analysis training is now available internationally via correspondence from the Gregory Institute for Transactional Analysis with Linda Gregory, TSTA, in Australia. This training is provided via videos (in English) or training lectures, with contact and supervision via email, phone/fax, and audiotapes. For a brochure and costs, contact Linda at lgregory@central.murdoch.edu.au or 3 Trafford St., Beaconsfield, WA, Australia, 6162; phone/fax: 61 8 9335 6950.

Let's Talk Violence

continued from page 1

violence. Violence became a normally acceptable way of solving problems. Within the impoverished communities, the competition over access to scarce resources triggered and sustained the violence.

Much of the criminal violence was caused by political factors, including poverty, unemployment, influx control, inferior education, and dangerous living conditions. This provides the context to understand the high levels of criminal violence in South Africa. The legacy of apartheid's violence continues to haunt our society with a heavy toll on the psychological, social, political, and economic lives of victims. And every black South African is a victim.

Allow me to relate a personal experience to illustrate the effect of such violence. Just a few weeks ago I was awakened by the shrill ringing of the doorbell and loud shouts of "Police, police!" I ran to the window and saw a convoy of police vehicles with lights flashing and a number of policemen standing at the gate. I was totally gripped with fear and for that moment forgot where I was. All my memories of police harassment, intimidation, and violations of human rights crowded my memory, and I began reliving the terrors of police brutality on myself, especially during the time of my banning and house arrest. I started to scream hysterically. My daughter came running to me and then saw the police at the gate and communicated with them. She tried to calm me down and explain to me why they were there. Although I came to my senses, with the full realization of where I was, it took me hours to really calm down. To my horror, I realized that these experiences will continue to haunt me for who knows how long.

The greatest challenge for the new South African society undergoing transformation was how to deal with perpetrators of human rights violations and, at the same time, to bring about healing to a divided and traumatized nation. What were the choices? Blanket amnesty to perpetrators and not holding accountable those responsible for violations? Purges? Prosecutions? Or truth commissions? To draw a veil over the horrors of apartheid was unacceptable to reconciliation and justice. Nuremberg-type trials were impossible. Prosecutions under the ordinary process of criminal law would have been utterly untenable. Therefore, South Africa, recognizing the need to address our past and initiate a process of reconciliation, unity, and peace committed itself to a truth commission.

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) was part of the negotiated settlement for freedom. The broad aim was to promote national unity and reconciliation in a spirit of understanding that would transcend the conflicts and divisions of the past.

The late Chief Justice Ismail Mohamed said in a leading judgment that the TRC was but one initiative in a bridge-building exercise. He said that the TRC was designed to take the country from a deeply divided past characterized by suffering and injustice to a future founded on the recognition of human rights, democracy, and peaceful coexistence. He said that the process would involve an agonizing balancing act between the need to provide justice for victims and the need for national reconciliation.

The TRC was intended to make recommendations for the reform of the police and legal system, for reparation and reconciliation, and to prevent future violations of human rights and political violence. It was based on the belief that it is psychologically healthy to uncover the past, that revealing the truth would contribute meaningfully to reconciling enemies and facilitating transformation, and that it would provide for official and public acknowledgment of human rights violations, which in

some cases may have been known but not officially recognized. That is, the TRC would break the culture of deafening silence that had developed in South Africa during the apartheid era.

Overarching all this was the provision for granting amnesty to perpetrators of gross violations of human rights. Amnesty from civil and criminal liability was granted to applicants who made full disclosure of all relevant facts for acts that were associated with a political objective and where applicants had not acted on their own for private gain or through personal malice, ill will, or spite. The TRC Act defined a political objective by examining the motive, context, gravity, and whether the target was public or private, whether the applicant acted on orders, and, very importantly, whether the act was proportionate to the political goal. Perpetrators were not required to apologize for their actions or show remorse in any way.

The success of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission has been assessed by academics, political commentators, politicians, the media,

"Restorative justice goes beyond a functioning criminal justice system and requires for its effectiveness a nation committed to a moral set of values."

and South Africans generally, often with divergent outcomes. For all its shortcomings, it played an important role in giving victims of political violence an opportunity to tell their stories to the world and to receive recognition for the losses and abuses they had suffered. Whether it exposed all of the truth is highly doubtful, because many perpetrators, often high profile ones, chose not to apply for amnesty. "Where are the security police who did not apply for amnesty? Where are the generals who gave the orders to shoot on 16 June 1976 in Soweto? Who ordered the Sharpeville killings? Who bombed Thozamile Gqweta's house and burned to death his mother, wife, and children?" These are not only questions; they are open wounds.

South Africa now has a more complete record of what happened during the apartheid regime. The commission's final report reveals a wealth of information about the workings of the apartheid state as a system. No South African can claim, "I did not know."

Criticisms leveled against the TRC include: (1) that human rights violations were defined as gross physical violations such as killing, kidnapping, severe ill treatment, and torture but excluded many human rights violations like banning, banishment, house arrest, detention without trial, forced removal, influx control, and group areas; (2) that there was no legal provision for those applying for amnesty to ask for forgiveness or show remorse; they merely had to tell the truth; (3) that in the quest for national reconciliation, survivors and families of the victims sacrificed their rights to justice and their claim to damages; and (4) that no distinction was made for human rights violations committed in pursuit of apartheid, a crime against humanity, or in the defense of freedom, democracy, justice, and peace.

Clearly the commission had foregone a process of retributive justice, justice in its narrowest sense, justice that demands punishment and trial. Rather, it looked at restorative justice in its widest sense: a collective or social justice that promotes national reconciliation; a justice that focuses on the future rather than the past, on understanding rather than vengeance, on reparation rather than retaliation, on "ubuntu" or humanity rather than victimization.

Restorative justice requires compromise—a compromise of the individual's need for conventional justice with that of the greater collective interest where restoration is aimed at the victims and communities undergoing

transformation. It aims to restore relationships between perpetrators and victims collectively rather than individually. This "restoration" would provide a basis on which a culture of human rights, respect, understanding, and lasting peace is built.

Restorative justice goes beyond a functioning criminal justice system and requires for its effectiveness a nation committed to a moral set of values. It requires fundamental attitude and value shifts, an indelible commitment to transformation that constitutes a set of optimal ideals in the pursuit of peace. South Africans acknowledged and accepted that peace necessitated forgiveness and reconciliation. However, forgiveness and reconciliation are deeply personal experiences, and for many people such forgiveness is not morally justifiable. How do I forgive the man who maimed, tortured, and murdered my innocent child? Yet through the TRC processes, many victims expressed genuine and unconditional forgiveness.

I wish I had the time to relate some of the stories that I personally know, but perhaps I can share one with you that is closest to my heart. This is the true story of Mrs. Elizabeth Hashe, but it is also the story of not just tens or thousands but millions of South Africans.

Mrs. Hashe's husband, Siphon Hashe, was one of South Africa's greatest freedom fighters, a man who served 14 years on Robben Island with Nelson Mandela. On his release, he immediately engaged in the struggle for freedom in an organization called Port Elizabeth Civic Organization (PEBCO). One day he was lured to the airport by a telephone call by someone who purported to be the British Ambassador requesting a meeting. Mr. Hashe, together with two comrades, Godolozzi and Galela, went to the airport to meet the British Ambassador, or so they thought. They never returned. Mrs. Hashe contacted lawyers and started to make her own search from police station to police station, from prison to prison, from mortuary to mortuary. The police denied that they had arrested Mr. Hashe and his comrades, although we had eye-witness evidence that the police were seen taking the three away from the airport on that day. I represented Mrs.

Little & Big Violence

continued from page 1

discounting, judging, or ignoring can and will in the end add up to big violence in thinking and doing. I kept this awareness with me and learned a great deal, especially since as the conference drew near and we became more stressed and tired, it became increasingly difficult to be aware on that level. It is so easy to become violent when one is exhausted!

I did not attend many workshops during the conference because there were always so many little things to be done, so many little and big problems to be solved, but I did chair the special program for the educational field so I was present at some workshops. I was impressed by the way Caleb Cornell explained his inner process around the teasing and pestering he experienced in school. To me his story made clear again how small incidents, small aggressions, small discounting will inevitably grow and in the end lead to bigger violence.

I enjoyed helping to create this conference and I think we did a good job. It was great to be in Utrecht with so many people speaking in our common transactional analysis language and at the same time in about 30 other languages. I was touched by the opening ceremony in which each language group/person repeated

Hashe and the families of the other two and brought three habeas corpus applications in the Supreme Court in South Africa, all of which failed. The then minister of law and order, Mr. Adrian Vlok, went on affidavit and denied that the police had anything to do with their arrests.

Then in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission it was revealed that the police did, in fact, arrest, detain, and brutally kill them by crushing their skulls with their boots. One of

"Structural violence is often expressed as economic power, which kills more slowly as it corrodes the bases for self-reliance and aggravates vulnerability."

the policemen, Ninabar, asked for forgiveness during his testimony at the TRC. Mrs. Hashe embraced this man in an act of forgiveness toward unity, reconciliation, and national building. This may be difficult for you and I to digest, to comprehend, and to accept, but this is the true South African generosity and magnanimity toward reconciliation and forgiveness.

To determine whether restorative justice has succeeded, the psyche of the nation needs to be examined. Has human dignity been restored? Is there a respect for human rights? Have perpetrators reintegrated into society? A truth commission, with a limited life span, is hardly able to be the arbiter of this. It is but one of the instruments to facilitate the process. The jury is still out on whether the TRC was a success or a failure. Just as the world now looks back at the Nuremberg Trials and makes judgments about their success or failure, it will be future generations who will either criticize and condemn or affirm and appraise the process of restorative justice undertaken in South Africa.

However, any judgment should be sensitive to the many, many people who forewent their own need for retributive justice and the sacrifices they made in supporting a greater collective healing toward peace, unity, and reconciliation. It is to them that future South Africans owe the greatest debt.

the sentence "Violence ends where bonding starts by Talking" in their own language while others listened and applauded. So much recognition for all of us! Isn't that the best antidote for violence—recognition of self and others, speaking to each other and listening? Maybe next time we will change that sentence into "Violence ends where bonding starts by Talking and listening."

So what do I tell you about this "conference child?" That the ambiance was warm and friendly, that the workshops were of high quality and interesting, that the lunches were great, that we made some mistakes here and there? As I said, I think that we did a good job, and by "we" I mean all of us—the organizers, the presenters, and all of the other participants. You and we created this, so *congratulations!* I hope we meet at the next conference.

PS—I am happy to let everyone know that all the hard work and enthusiasm for this conference brought more than 400 people from 34 countries to Utrecht and resulted (in combination with an excellent treasurer) in a nice profit of about 8000 Euro for each of the three sponsoring organizations. Isn't that great?

Marijke Wusten,
Retired Conference Coordinator,
can be reached at Nieuwe Kerkweg 3,
4322 TH Looperskapelle, Netherlands,
or at mwusten@hetnet.nl

THEME:
"Giving and Receiving"

TEMA:
"Dando y Recibiendo"

6-10 August 2003

Hotel Victoria
Ciudad de Oaxaca
México



International Transactional Analysis Conference
Congreso Internacional de Análisis Transaccional

ORGANIZED BY/ORGANIZADO POR
International Transactional
Analysis Association (ITAA)
United States Transactional
Analysis Association (USATAA)
Instituto Mexicano de Análisis
Transaccional (IMAT)

ALSO SPONSORED BY
Asociación Latinoamericana
de Análisis Transaccional

The **conference theme**, "Giving and Receiving," celebrates the "Guelaguetza" party in Oaxaca, during which native peoples of the area regale one another with dance, song, and products from each region. This spirit of sharing mirrors the giving and receiving of experience, knowledge, and friendship that occurs at transactional analysis conferences. We also plan a mini-Guelaguetza during the Saturday evening party.

All conference events will take place at the **Hotel Victoria in Oaxaca, México**. **Reduced room rates:** US \$130/double or single occupancy (tax, gratuities, & buffet breakfast included). Reserve with the hotel before 1 July 2003 and mention you are part of "TA Conference." Email: reservaciones@hotelvictoriaoax.com.mx; website: www.hotelvictoriaoax.com.mx. For information on less expensive accommodations as well as **preconference tours** to local archeological sites and **postconference tours** to nearby beaches, see www.taconference.com

CONFERENCE REGISTRATION (Includes coffee/tea breaks and opening Mexican party)			
	Early Before 15 Dec. 2002	Late After 15 Dec. 2002	Onsite
Regular	US\$230	US\$265	US\$300
Student	US\$135	US\$150	US\$175

Closing parade with Guelaguetza Party and Dinner: US\$30 additional. There will be a minimal charge for the children's program.

Payment in US dollars: If you pay by check, make payable to "New Beginnings-Mexico 2003 Conference" in US dollars through a US bank. You may also charge to VISA or MasterCard (not American Express); indicate total amount charged, including a \$10 fee for each credit card transaction. To register, send your check or credit card information (name on card/card number/expiration date) plus your name, postal address, and phone/fax/email addresses to Gaylon Palmer, 11140 Fair Oaks Blvd, Suite 10, Fair Oaks, CA 95628, USA; phone #1-916-863-7096; fax #1-916-863-7098; email: gaylonlcsw@aol.com

Payment in pesos (use exchange currency of the day): (1) Make a money transfer to this account: BBVA Bancomer, Account No. 0135605334, Instituto Mexicano de Análisis Transaccional (IMAT), México City. Make sure the total amount due is transferred to IMAT. Bank charges abroad are paid by the ordering customer. Send an email to registration@taconference.com for confirmation after making your transference; OR (2) In the Mexican Republic make a deposit to this account: BBVA Bancomer, Account No. 0135605334, Instituto Mexicano de Análisis Transaccional (IMAT). After making the deposit, send your bank receipt by fax to: (5255) 52-71-52-04.

Cancellations received by 1 May 2003 will be refunded in the total amount minus \$300 pesos administrative fee; after 1 May until 1 July refunds will be given in the amount of 30% paid.

Conference Office: Instituto Mexicano de Análisis Transaccional (IMAT), A.C., Agrarismo 21, Col. Escandón, México, D.F. C.P. 11800; tel: (5255) 55-15-06-28; fax: (5255) 52-71-52-04; email: registration@taconference.com.

REDECISION THERAPY ANNUAL CONFERENCE
3-5 August 2003 ■ Hotel Victoria, Oaxaca, México

The Redecision Therapy Annual Conference will take place in Oaxaca just before the International Transactional Analysis Conference. Register for both conferences and take advantage of the opportunity to expand your knowledge in both areas while enjoying a lovely week of vacation! For more information or to submit a program proposal (deadline 15 November 2003), contact Janet Lee O'Connor, 2012 South Augusta Place, Tucson, AZ, 85710, USA; (520) 360-0007 or (520) 886-0176; southwesttraining@yahoo.com; email: jasmindarvish@yahoo.com.

CALL FOR PROPOSALS

International Transactional Analysis Conference
Congreso Internacional de Análisis Transaccional
6-10 August 2003 ■ Hotel Victoria, Ciudad de Oaxaca, México

You are invited to submit your program ideas for consideration. Please provide all information requested below using this form or a copy as your information cover sheet. Also include a computer disk (preferably PC format in Word) with a brief (3 pages maximum) summary of your presentation for the Conference Memorial Book. This will be a bilingual conference with equal representation of Spanish and English presentations. Priority will be given to new ideas. **Deadline: 1 December 2002.**

Title of presentation

Name/Academic Credentials/TA certification (if not certified, please include the written endorsement of a certified transactional analyst)

Postal Address

State/Country/Postal Code

Telephone (home & work)

Fax

Email

Copresenter(s) (include name, credentials)

Objectives (what I hope to accomplish during my presentation)

Format: lecture discussion panel workshop
 other _____

Duration: 2 hours 1.5 hours 30 minutes

Field: clinical educational organizational counseling
 beyond TA fields

Support Groups: I am willing to facilitate 3 morning groups (50 mins./ea)

Send proposals in English to: Gaylon Palmer, 11140 Fair Oaks Blvd., Suite 10, Fair Oaks, CA 95628; fax: 916-863-7098; email: gaylonlcsw@aol.com

Send proposals in Spanish to: Gloria Noriega, Instituto Mexicano de Análisis Transaccional, Agrarismo 21, Col. Escandón, México, D.F. C.P. 11800; fax: (5255) 52-71-52-04; email: program@taconference.com