

COMMENTARY

Picturing Phototherapy and Therapeutic Photography: commentary on articles arising from the 2008 international conference in Finland



Introduction

We (Judy Weiser and David Krauss) are two of the earliest pioneers of Phototherapy internationally – and as clinical psychologists with many academic publications on this topic since the mid 1970s¹ – we are pleased and honoured to be invited to provide commentary on the finished post-review versions of these articles deriving from presentations² at the recent ‘International Conference on PhotoTherapy and Therapeutic Photography’³.

Also presenters at all four of the previous international conferences on these subjects (beginning in 1979), we have each been providing education, publications, and training about these techniques for over thirty years. While Krauss (American) has focused on educating and training people in the United States, Weiser (Canadian) has lectured and provided intensive training events internationally (including Europe, Scandinavia, and the UK⁴) for over twenty years. Therefore she is uniquely able to provide comparisons between European and North American models of both Phototherapy practice and the closely-related techniques of Therapeutic Photography (whose differences and similarities are summarized below), and confirm that these overlap a great deal more outside North America than they do within the US and Canada.

Therefore we hope that our Commentary⁵ gives readers a comprehensive theoretical framework within which the practitioners whose articles follow can be located, thus permitting deeper comparison and contrast. However, while aware of the historical development of the field across many countries⁶ – and having authored a lot of its early theoretical framework⁷ ourselves – and while attempting to keep abreast of new developments and practitioners/authors – we are nevertheless aware that this field is expanding exponentially (especially in digital directions). We therefore welcomed the opportunity to attend the latest international conference where the ‘second generation’ (and perhaps third) could be interacted with, as well as learned from. This Special Issue reflects some of what we found there.

We feel like the two grandmothers of a large extended family, who have become the repository of all the family photographs, and are thus often asked to identify the people in the pictures and tell the stories that accompany these. A ‘truth’ in phototherapy is that those who create a family’s album, actually *define* its history, because the narrative of ‘who we are and how this family came to be’ is created *only* through the filters of the album’s story-teller (maker). So we must declare, from the beginning of this Commentary, that not only are we creating the very filters we ask you to look through when reading, but that we also realise we might never achieve the full story – even though we know all the authors and are familiar with their work, so it was not possible to review these articles ‘anonymously’. We therefore ask readers to be aware of these filters we are writing through and possible biases these might produce. We also ask to be informed of any additions or needed changes to the Phototherapy ‘database’ (our email addresses appear at the end of our biographies below).

Theoretical considerations for this commentary

This section provides a number of ‘lenses’ to help readers focus and clarify their comparison of the articles that follow, and point out how these inexorably affect the terminology that each author uses to describe their practices (and themselves) – thus sometimes making ‘parallel’ comparisons difficult.

1. The terms ‘Phototherapy’ and ‘Therapeutic Photography’

Just as multiple photographers will always each take a different photograph of exactly the same moment, each practitioner who works using photographs as aids to emotional healing – whether for themselves, their therapy clients, or both – will practice these slightly differently⁸. Each will also define and write about their own practice differently (often spelling phototherapy or therapeutic photography in idiosyncratic ways).

For the purposes of this Commentary, we use the same definitions for these that were used by the conveners of the Finland Conference, both in their formal ‘call for proposals’ and on their conference website⁹ (condensed with permission, from the original longer ones found on the entry page to the website ‘PhotoTherapy Techniques in Counseling and Therapy’¹⁰). These are also the operational definitions of phototherapy and therapeutic photography that have long been in existence throughout most of the world, for several decades:

Phototherapy: Using photos and photography as a component of psychotherapy or therapy practice with clients. (Note: *Photo Art Therapy*¹¹, used in some presentations¹², is a distinct subfield of Phototherapy, but was not separately delineated as such at this conference.)

Therapeutic Photography: Using photos and photography as therapeutic activity for one’s own personal insight and self-expression (and a number of

related activities for groups or communities), in situations where the skills of a trained therapist, psychotherapist, or counsellor are not needed.

2. The terms ‘therapy’ and ‘therapist’

The meanings of the words ‘therapy’ and ‘therapist’ vary widely between and among European models and those of North America (where most of the decades-old ‘theoretical foundations of Phototherapy’ literature was created). However, it is possible that authors of the articles that follow might not be aware of the varying usage of these terms (and the implications for therapy practice this difference produces).

There are also important differences (and thus possible misunderstandings based on not recognizing these) regarding the word ‘therapist’ itself, because it connotes significantly different meanings across various European countries in terms of amount of actual preparatory education (and to us, more importantly, supervised experiential training) and/or formal registration or licensing required (or not) before being permitted to practice¹³.

3. The terms ‘healing’ and ‘therapy’

There is similar vagueness in how the words ‘healing’ and ‘therapy’ are used in each country (sometimes interchangeably in one, while presumed to be very different in another) – often based on underlying cultural values and expectations regarding health, rather than any standard ‘professional’ meaning.

4. The terms ‘therapy practice using photographs as adjunctive tools’ and ‘photographic practices which might themselves be experienced as being therapeutic (“healing”)

In some countries, there is a presumption that these two practices are the same (therefore interchangeable in meaning and thus also in actual application) – while in other countries these are clearly separated in both meaning and background qualifications required of the practitioner.

5. The terms ‘model’ and ‘technique’

The overarching (yet usually unconscious) confusion between ‘model’ (modality/concept) and ‘technique’ (activity/doing), seems to exist throughout the training of therapists and counsellors worldwide, with consequences that often confound the study and practice of both fields addressed in the articles that follow – and with the result that these words are too often used interchangeably when, in fact, they are not the same.

For our purposes ‘*model*’ (modality) means conceptual theory about reasons and causes for problems, while ‘*technique*’ (activity) is what is then actually done when fixing the problem. We believe this distinction is very important to mention, because it explains our position (and that of most all the

other authors of the foundation base for these fields), that phototherapy (and therapeutic photography) are simply *techniques* and are *not* ‘modalities unto themselves’ (although we ourselves even sometimes speak of them both as ‘fields’, for the sake of brevity).

For Phototherapy, no training in the art of photography is needed, because these techniques have nothing to do with the ‘art part’ of photography. For therapeutic photography it is much the same, because having prior knowledge or experience with the craft or art of photography itself is not a pre-requisite for informal photographic encounters.

This now leads us to our final set of comparisons:

6. ‘Similarities’ and ‘differences’ – and their consequences

The differences between Phototherapy and Therapeutic Photography are probably not as important as their similarities – and therefore the presentation of them as ‘two ends of one long continuum of photo-based healing practices’¹⁴ along which all articles in this issue can be situated – can assist the reader in comparing and contrasting them. This continuum has been described in more detail by Weiser:

...*PhotoTherapy* is at one end (‘photography-during-therapy’, i.e. therapist-directed process where photos and interactions with them, are used during the therapy process to help others) and *Therapeutic Photography* at the other end (‘photography-as-therapy’; i.e. self-directed activities where photos are used for personal insight oneself, even if part of a larger project for some additional reason). (Weiser, 2001, 2005b, 2007)

However, the two practices are *not* opposites, either – and in fact overlap where they intersect – PhotoTherapy naturally including many aspects of Therapeutic Photography, though taking it several steps deeper into guided unconscious process work. They are simply contrasting ways of using emotional information that has been unconsciously embedded in people’s personal snapshots’. (Weiser, 2001, 2005b, 2007)

There *are* significant differences between Phototherapy and Therapeutic Photography. However, much like relationships in any healthy family system, such differences do not necessarily signal any serious problems or threat to either the homeostasis or dynamic qualities of the field in general, *as long as* there is clarity provided regarding both what each component is, and more importantly, what each is not.

Having such diversity and variety amongst the members of the Phototherapy and Therapeutic Photography ‘family’ can actually be very enriching and valuable to the continued health of the field by providing contrasting perspectives and practices that permit the field to evolve in a natural manner over time. This, in turn, allows therapists and photographic practitioners to find approaches that resonate within themselves and their preferred way of working with people.

All of these prefacing considerations impact the structuring and contents of the articles contained this Special Issue and produce the particular point of view from which we have written this Commentary. As Weiser has often explained¹⁵, Phototherapy techniques should be viewed as an interrelated

system of techniques used to *activate* ‘process’ during therapy – and used by already-trained therapists¹⁶ who have then added *these particular techniques*¹⁷ to their helping repertoire of formal therapy skills. Therapy happens; photographs assist this process.

In contrast, therapeutic photography involves techniques of photographic activities (and discussions arising from these) that help people gain personal insight, improve their lives, encourage social activism, build community, and so forth – all of which in situations where the skills of a formally-trained therapist are not necessary.

This distinction is one reason why we do not ever use the term ‘*phototherapist*’ to describe ourselves. It is our opinion that doing this would not reflect the full range of what is actually *done* by practitioners (who were originally trained to use many different helping techniques to assist their clients’ healing process, many of which do not even involve photographs; for example, hypnosis, dream work, and so forth). Our philosophical stance is that therapy happens, whether or not photographs are being used – but those who have been trained (to know when and why to select which Phototherapy technique for best purpose) will have very potent and effective additional tools that can be used, when appropriate, to improve that process.

Therapists who have been trained in the comprehensive system of all five Phototherapy techniques do not use all of these with *every* client, and in fact we ourselves have both had clients where Phototherapy techniques were actually never used at all, as we realized some other technique would be more appropriate. For us, Phototherapy has nothing to do with the art or craft of photography itself; however we also feel that ‘doing therapy well, *is* an art’ (Weiser, 1993/1999, p. xvi).

In other words, it is our position that Phototherapy (as done by fully-trained therapists) encompasses far more than only those activities involved in making and discussing photographs themselves – which, of course, anyone can do. Experienced therapists, by virtue of their training, supervision, and experience, use their clinical judgment in creating interventions for the benefit and well-being of their clients. There are numerous extra layers that experienced therapists have received supervised training to know to explore, which an untrained person would likely not know about, nor have sufficient experience to safely contain or follow through to healthy completion for the person sitting in front of them.

All this theoretical cogitation about definitions is also useful in raising additional issues beyond the scope of this Commentary to address. For example, whether activities that are themselves ‘therapeutic’ (healing) in nature, are therefore *by definition*, also the same as ‘therapy’ itself – and the answer to this will always depend not only on the nature of the practitioner’s formal training (or lack thereof) but also, and perhaps less obviously, on the country where the practitioner works (along with any personal and cultural ‘lenses’ through which this entire process is unconsciously filtered).

Other questions arise also, such as: When people use photographs as part of their *own* personal healing process, is this ‘therapy’? Is it *Phototherapy* if there is no formally trained therapist guiding the process? What, for these

purposes, *is* a ‘therapist’? Is a photographer with special ‘sensitivity’ and empathy able to competently do the same deep emotional work helping others that a therapist fully trained in Phototherapy techniques can do? And so forth. The answers to these kinds of questions will, of course, vary from country to country. However, we feel the questions nevertheless need to be asked.

As the differences (and similarities) between Phototherapy and Therapeutic Photography are explained in more depth in other publications¹⁸, we will not belabor these points any further, other than to explain that *not understanding the consequences arising from differential understandings and usages of such terms* can greatly complicate the comparison of practices amongst various people who write about such things.

All the above remind us of the basic existential question ‘who am I?’ which therapists trained in Phototherapy techniques often address by asking the client to compare Photographs of themselves taken by other people in their life, whether posed for, or taken unaware (for example, ‘who am I as part of this family, culture, group?’), with ‘self-portrait’ photos that they themselves have created of themselves without any ‘outside input’ from other people (for example, ‘who am I when I am alone?’).

This is what we feel, in many ways, also describes how we approached the articles in this issue: attempting to not only compare our own ‘snapshots’ of each article, but also trying to then match each of our ‘outsider’ images with the ‘self-portrait’ that each author has provided themselves, when writing about their own work.

And so it is now, from the above multiple ‘possible maps’ of the territory of Phototherapy and Therapeutic Photography – and the theoretical considerations demanded by the ‘differences’ that each of these produce – that we now provide our Commentary in more detail, comparing our ‘pictures’ of these articles with those ‘taken’ by the authors themselves. We hope we have now provided the reader with a variety of different lenses and filters (and historical perspectives which frame them) through which to examine the individual articles contained in this Special Issue.

Of the five authors, three have education in therapy fields (Halkola, Martin, and Wheeler). Their articles give attention to theoretical considerations and rationale for the use of the photographic image itself during the therapeutic encounter, although only Martin actually writes at any length about comprehensive applications of what actually *happens* during photo--based sessions¹⁹. Wheeler writes about the psychological aesthetics of photographs and elements that are essential to the understanding of how these are perceived and reacted to, while Halkola discusses elements that provide context for using photographs in the therapy experience, focusing more on rationale than practical application during therapy process itself.

From our perspective, the remaining two articles are best considered through the ‘lens’ of therapeutic photography, due not only to the backgrounds and practices of their respective authors (Dennett and Nuñez), but also to the fact that both clearly state that they are not trained therapists.

We found the articles by both British contributors (Dennett and Martin) to be very high-quality academic submissions. Dennett, the well-informed

archivist for the early British pioneer of Therapeutic Photography, Jo Spence (and once her co-collaborator), is himself a photographer and anthropologist. He provides a superb summary of the breadth, depth, and scope of Spence's practice (and life) and makes a great contribution not only to the historical record but also indirectly pointing out the need for heritage protection for the archives of such pioneers. Martin similarly provides a full picture of her practice, its origins, and its current directions. Soundly based in clearly-explained theoretical considerations, she also assists the reader by providing case examples that help demonstrate 'live' application of theory to practice, which we would like to have seen Halkola also include. Proceeding from a more personal experience base, Italy-based professional photographer and self-portraitist Nuñez's article gives the reader her 'first-person' perspective on therapeutic photography.

We now consider these more individually

Wheeler

Wheeler's Photo-Psycho-Praxis, like the title implies, is a multi-faceted and inter-related discussion: well conceived, well researched and well presented (though a bit densely-packed and thus slightly more difficult to read than some of the other articles – but well worth the reader's effort). It is an intellectually rigorous overview related to the practice of making, viewing and thinking about photos and the psycho-social-aesthetic-biological components that allow images to have such power. His article successfully unravels the discreet interconnected qualities of those components and is a 'must read' for photographers, as well as for any mental health professional who works with photo-based material – because, as he writes, 'it is the simultaneous action of these various strands, acting in the therapy room as soon as photographs are made present, that enables photographs to act as such powerful catalysts and containers'. Given our limited space as commentators we can only highlight a few of Wheeler's numerous and vibrantly cogent points.

Like a number of professionals trained in complementary disciplines who utilize Phototherapy techniques, the author is a photographer, trained art psychotherapist, and systemic mental health practitioner who has deep and comprehensive knowledge of both the history of photography and the lengthy 'artistic' tradition of photographs, allowing him to reference a number of photographers who have historically understood the complex dynamics involved in experiencing an image.

Long before the emergence of Phototherapy, there were photographers who had a strong sense of the emotional potential of images. For example, Ansel Adams (also a trained concert pianist) was long known for considering his negatives his scores and his prints his performance (and therefore explicitly linking viewing a photo with the complex experience one has when listening to meaningful music – and adding an additional layer to the 'spectator/performer' dynamic that some authors of articles in this issue have commented upon). Alfred Steiglitz claimed that his 'Equivalent' metaphoric abstract series of

photos of clouds from the 1920s not only represented but also elicited deep feelings in him. Numerous other influential photographers²⁰ have expressed similar orientations; for example the valuable statement by Minor White (1908–1976) that he was interested not only in what a photograph is of, but also what *else* it is of.

Wheeler notes that the image is not reality (the ‘reality trap’), and he attempts to help us momentarily look away from the images and toward our physiological wiring, our enculturation, and personal phenomenology to help explain the potential power of images to convince our limbic systems that something real is happening in the ‘here and now’, when activated by viewing a two dimensional representation of a three dimensional reality presented in pixel, halide or color dye.

Krauss (1983a, p. 44) has written about the power of the image as being born from that evolutionary necessity of needing to get visual information about one’s environment immediately and unfiltered. Photographic representations trigger a kind of vestigial blind spot, tricking our brains in a way that has utility in phototherapy practice.

Wheeler notes that, based on people’s experience of photographs made in their lifetimes and their viewing of historical photographs, they can fall prey to this ‘reality trap,’ a belief that photographs accurately represent some aspect of physical reality that at some point in time could be viewed. This in turn leads to a ‘reality gap,’ the belief that images, mediated through the photographer’s rendition are true representations of that which could have been viewed. He suggests that ‘individual knowledge of the world has for over 150 years been mediated more photographically than experienced directly’. And he also points out the fallacy created when

neuroscientists seem happy to use photographs unquestioningly... as though they’re unmediated [primary] connections with the content depicted on their surface, such as the use of photographs of mothers or infants and then interpreting the results as though those mothers or infants themselves had been present with the experimental subject as they passed through the big donut of the fMRI scanner.

Krauss also suggests another possible ‘reality gap:’ the synaptic cleft (gap), the part of the nerve chain where the electro-chemical transmitters convey information from the eye, and the optic nerve’s paths into the limbic system, the short trip that can facilitate vision, and the afore-mentioned ‘blind spot’ can all potentiate a similar visceral response to both three-dimensional and two-dimensional representations of ‘reality’ (which is one explanation of why brain researchers can use these artifacts in lieu of real persons.)

There are many other areas of Wheeler’s article we wish we had time and space to comment on, for example: discussing how early photos of people used to be formal, iconic imitations of traditional painting, and now as he notes, the majority of images that he encounters in therapy sessions are informally created with easily-deleted pixels on cell phones.

Wheeler also notes how the size of the image, and side-by-side viewing of such images, changes the aspects of the therapeutic relationship. And finally we would have liked to further discuss his comment that, ‘to view a photograph

is to invite a phenomenology unique to that encounter additional to that investment in form and content' – because for us, this is where phototherapy begins.

Wheeler at one point refers to 'the practice of psychotherapists who conduct conversations with clients, prompted by photographs, whether present or not', and we thought it worth mentioning that this seems to be both an elegantly simple way of defining Phototherapy practice and also clearly demonstrative of our position that there is more to this than only 'actively making photos with clients'.

We are pleased to see Wheeler's well-grounded and significant contribution to the ongoing theoretical evolution of this field and his consideration of the aspects of Phototherapy theory, which have not otherwise yet been fully explored.

Halkola

Finnish Psychotherapist Halkola's article demonstrates her enthusiastic sense that the emerging body of brain research of the last 15 or so years (pointing to neural markers of evolutionary utility, the biological necessity of individual attachment and relationship) is not only validating the fundamental principles of psychoanalytic and post psychoanalytic theory but also can also be useful in informing therapy (and the involvement of photographs within it). She also references research on facial expressions and maternal bonding, along with some of the more personal qualities of Barthes' writings on photography (and his attachment to his own mother), as she attempts to provide a more focused comment on 'therapeutic experience' in general. We were pleased that she did this, as it contributes important thinking to the use of her particular selection of techniques.

Although the article is titled 'A Photograph as a Therapeutic Experience,' and its Abstract promises 'an observation for the theoretical basis of Phototherapy', it is only toward the very end of the article that we find the photograph itself being brought 'into the picture' as entity, engine, and medicine.

While a good beginning to understanding how Halkola's own adaptation of phototherapy techniques can be used, we believe the article suffers somewhat from not providing any operational definition of 'phototherapy' or her 'Phototherapy methods' to set the tone for the reader, although she does mention that it means client selection of certain photographs of interest for discussion.

Halkola is well known as one of the leading Finnish figures in Phototherapy and Therapeutic Photography. She has long trained others in various techniques involved and so we are certain that she knows that Phototherapy practice encompasses far more than the few examples given in this paper. As a well-respected trauma therapist whose Dissertation was about using photographs in crisis therapy, we are certain that she has valuable skills and insights – we just would have liked to see these more fully illustrated here, as this article seems to us to be only a little bit about 'photo' or about her active

'therapy' process itself (which the inclusion of a few case examples could have so easily explained).

We also noticed many assumptions regarding Phototherapy practice that we view as different from our own experience (and our awareness of others practices with these techniques); for example, we ourselves have almost never photographed clients during their therapy sessions.

We feel that it might have improved her article to have include a more cohesive integration explaining what she actually then *does* with such photographs, as part of her larger therapy process itself, in order to highlight that relevance.

Although the article maintains that photos are therapeutic (and we agree), we also feel that the argument she uses to justify this – and the connection with the research cited – might have been able to be more fully realized. We feel that by not synthesizing her myriad points of reference into a 'whole' that presents their connections, the power of her argument seems to be slightly diminished.

As the vast majority of the article is about underlying perceptual and brain theory, readers are left to project their own meanings and questions regarding why she decides to involve photographs in the process (for example: is looking at a photograph a form of self-soothing? Can a photograph function as a 'good enough mother'? Is the act of sharing a photograph with another person a kind of social sharing? Are there times when looking at a photograph could create or re-stimulate trauma?). Questions such as these arose in our own minds, and it would have been helpful if these kinds of questions could have been more fully answered by the research cited.

The article proceeds from what appears to be a bio-psycho-social model in which she correlates brain imaging and the so called 'mirror neuron' system as it relates to what we know regarding the importance of attachment between infant and mother; especially the early basis for attachment, the mother infant eye contact 'gaze'. This is indeed worthy of consideration. Halkola cites other authors who view relationship based on this schema and how this newer data scientifically validates of some of Freud's original notions of the unconscious: how mother-child relationship styles may have positive or negative influence on developmental tasks.

It would have perhaps also been helpful for readers to have been shown some references to earlier brain research findings as related to this subject, such as Goleman's 1995 book 'Emotional Intelligence', for example – and the importance of such implications when working with visual images.

As Halkola has specialized training in 'trauma therapy' we were also surprised that, although she briefly mentions 'trauma researcher' van der Kolk, she does not include any of his pioneering publications in her reference list. We recommend therefore, that readers also spend time absorbing the neuroscience discussion in the 'Photographs and Mind-Brain' Section of Wheeler's article, as it might help provide a broader picture.

We were puzzled to see that Halkola seems not to allow for the consideration of alternative possibilities (especially from a multicultural perspective), and we wish that she had also included more about the

psychological dimensions of making and viewing photographs, and how these impact on therapy when photographs enter the process. Evolutionists might add the overlay of a larger social utility to the mirror neuron system concept, by noting the larger cultural benefits of being able to almost instantly get and share information about danger, or positive or negative emotional climate change – and to make it easier for human beings to understand social roles and their place in larger systems (or to simply signal ‘us and them’). She may well have considered all these things and simply chose not to include them due to space limitations, and so we hope that if she enlarges upon this article in the future, she might consider addressing these additional possible influences.

In highlighting the primacy of ‘biological’ photos, the domestic images of family albums and snapshots as ‘important material in understanding a person’s life and the emotional climate of his/her family life’, she seems not to include the possibility that it might simply be the viewer’s emotional connection with the photograph that gives Phototherapy its power to bypass intellectual understandings to go directly to personal truths (Krauss, 1983). And in the safe holding space of the professional therapist’s setting, the healing and positive change and enhanced psychological well being can emerge from such interactions, on their own.

As the author is a trained psychotherapist, one would wish that her final section, ‘Photograph as a tool in psychotherapy’ were more sharply-focused in discussing the rationale for photos and more about how they are actually used when activated to assist the therapy process. The paucity of her description of how photos are selected, their qualities, and how they function, may frustrate the reader, as the very reason for using photographs in therapy is not as fully articulated as might have been desired.

We would also have been more comfortable had she explained her apparent stance that photographers’ intentions can somehow be universally read in the photographs they produce, especially regarding the implications of this assumption for any outside-observer’s objective interpretation of the meaning of client-produced photographs.

We believe the reader would have benefited from Halkola having referenced the larger body of very early phototherapy publications about techniques involving the immediate active viewing of photos during sessions (using instant-feedback techniques) described in, for example, Hunsberger (1984), Nelson-Gee (1975), or Woychik & Brickell (1983). For example, the reader is left to imagine what the author means by the words such as ‘looking therapy.’ This is disappointing, as Halkola obviously went to great lengths to present the preceding research.

We commend the work that Halkola has long been doing and would also like to hear more of her thinking as she answers important questions such as, ‘therefore, how and in what ways can photos be used for psychotherapeutic treatment-related aims? How and in what ways can photos give clients the new tools to understand their lives in more useful ways? How and in what ways do ‘photographs and taking photographs help people to perceive events and to realise their importance at a non-verbal level,’ or why ‘it is of great importance

that the majority of photographs used in therapy are biographically meaningful pictures?’

There is much potential here for a fuller and more nuanced²¹ discussion of how biological science informs her thinking in the areas of trauma, somatic and mental illness, and her rationale for its remediation through working with photographs. There is a great opportunity here for the author to create a major position paper as she further develops the integration of these two areas – and we look forward to reading it.

Dennett

Dennett’s article is comprehensive, thorough, and all its parts fit together into a flowing treatise that traces Spence’s history from its beginning photo-encounters up to the time of her death – and her continued and ongoing influences. Spence began her work in the 1970s (via Keith Kennedy’s ‘Group Camera’ process), coincidentally approximately the same years we (Weiser and Krauss) were independently formulating our own photograph-based therapy approaches – and, also coincidentally the same time period of Krauss’s own participation in ‘Re-evaluation Co-counseling’ and his academic training in Moreno-based psychodrama.

The first decade or so of her work, Spence (and occasional collaborators, including Dennett) had no idea that anyone else was doing such things – and surely no idea that people elsewhere had named practices the same ‘Phototherapy’ word that she was using (having originally used ‘camera therapy’) to describe what she did. While Spence and Weiser eventually met²⁷ (and became close friends), Krauss never had the chance to meet her – and both of us feel she would have really enjoyed being part of the Finland Conference. But from our mutual ‘insider perspective’ we can certainly affirm that Dennett’s is a seminal historical article of great importance on many levels.

Dennett’s article brings to the reader a vast survey of influences informing Spence’s practice – many of which readers might not have been aware of before (for example, her work for the British Film Institute and the opportunities this afforded her to think about underlying theory for photography). Dennett’s inclusion of Spence’s notes about how ‘Mirror Practice Self-Portraiture Therapy’ is actually done, provides an invaluable example of the precision with which Spence monitored and documented her practice. He makes it clear that Spence was extremely prolific at publishing for not only readers to use for themselves, but also to record these processes for the historical record.

While Martin also discusses the later ‘Collaborative Photo Therapy’ component of Spence’s practice, Dennett’s article provides the first cohesive overview to her three earlier methods (‘Therapeutic Staging’, ‘Mirror Therapy’, and ‘Scripting’) that either of us has ever seen. For this we are grateful, as this was greatly needed by those who know various parts of her work, but have not had the chance to read a concise comprehensive overview like the one presented here. Dennett also explains the evolution of Spence’s various titles for her work, and confirms that toward her latter years she was, in fact, moving

away from using the term 'photo therapy' and into using 'camera therapy' to describe her practice (and even at times also considering the term 'autobiographical photography' [Hagiwara, 2005]).

He also provides insight from his own perspective of 'being there' in those years, of the important meeting of Spence and Martin and how this led to combining some of Spence's earlier Nottingham cancer camerawork with the co-counselling system (also known as 'relational counselling' (RC) process). He explains that unlike more traditional counselling conducted by a trained mental health professional, co-counselling is not a formal therapy field and instead uses reciprocal peer-to-peer counselling where each participant takes turns being counsellor and client (which Krauss, having been involved in RC himself, confirms). And more importantly, Dennett provides description (which Martin's article also mentions) of how Spence and Martin then reworked the co-counselling system to introduce an important change regarding the usual photographer-sitter/client relationship.

Dennett's article narrates how Spence's artist's passion, forged through camera work, allowed her to access the inherent therapeutic power of 'art as healing' process: a fearless self-affirmation as she confronted the ebb and flow of her life circumstances, from her 1982 cancer diagnosis, until her untimely death a decade later.

We feel that the international field of therapeutic photography owes Terry Dennett a large acknowledgement of appreciation for the gift he has given it, in providing the important history of Spence's early role in the field's evolution in the UK – a history that he alone could provide.

Martin

Similar praise can also be offered to Martin, who completes this picture by contributing her own portion of this history as it continued to evolve. We found the article by Martin (who prefers to call her work 'Phototherapy'), to also be an excellent and extremely well written, valuable document – another 'must read' in any serious study of both fields (as her work seems to us, to overlap these, as a previously explained).

Martin describes herself as a therapist, while positioning her work as being a 'photographic collaborative practice of...image-making' (Martin, 2008). Much more than simply carrying Spence's work forward, Martin also (and more significantly) brings both her own longstanding innovative and well-regarded practices, and her postgraduate education in counselling, into the picture.

In reading Martin's article, the reader gets a very good picture of not only the 'what and how' of 'Re-enactment Phototherapy' – but more importantly also the 'why', for which Martin is to be commended for including. Martin presents a well nuanced article with an understanding of various overarching visually-based therapeutic techniques and processes that can be useful to clients – which, when combined with her two case examples and her discussion of her own adaptations of such techniques (along with the rationale for

working the way she does), gives the reader a well-composed portrait of her work as it continues to emerge.

Martin's article charts the course of her own development from the beginnings of her collaboration with Spence in 1983, and their shift from exchanging co-counselling roles to the use of more theatrical dramatic and personal tableaux, as each woman used the setting and camera work to deal with her own significant issues.

In this well-focused portrait of 'Re-enactment Phototherapy', Martin shows how Spence and she worked by reconstructing photographic images into new narratives and actively interacting with them via peer-to-peer sequential role exchanges (between photographer and subject), based on their adaptation of the 're-evaluation co-counselling' ('RC') model (mentioned earlier), created by United States labor organizer Harvey Jackins, an intentionally and strongly a non-hierarchical peer-to-peer system.

We find it reassuring that both Spence and Martin have also made use of various techniques derived from both psychotherapy and counselling (for example their role-dyads being very similar to gestalt 'empty-chair' techniques) and also documented in early Phototherapy literature. For example, Martin's 'found photo' work seems to us to be very similar to the early photo-projective work with 'found photographs' mentioned by Comfort (1985), Walker (1982, 1983, 1986), Weiser (1975, 1983, 1988a, 1988b, 1990) – as well as also similar to one of Halkola's primary techniques (which for some reason, Halkola's own article does not mention): the use of pre-existing photographs as focus for clients' projections²³. Spence and Martin's intense interest in working with old family photographs and restructuring those images and dynamics (within and between the images), also brings to mind the early family photo-album work of Bowenian family therapists Entin (1980, 1981, 1983), and Kaslow and Friedman (1977) – as well as our own several publications in this regard.

As neither Martin nor Spence seem to reference such 'ancestors' in their publications, it is entirely likely that their own work emerged independently (from inside their own creativity) during the same pre-internet years where they might simply have had no way to know about the existence of any of these others – which is clear illustration of the concept that when it is time for an idea to emerge, it will.

We also really liked Martin's point that, 'the photographs provide a mapping of the session, and the possibility to reconstruct and recall it. This is useful since aspects of what happened within the session can so easily slip back into the unconscious and be repressed again'. We also thought her comments about the potential pitfalls of using digital technology are worth calling attention to:

'One of my concerns is that this editing, followed by tidying up using image manipulation will erase some of the mistakes, aberrations and quirkiness, as if repressing the unconscious of the photograph that can be found in old albums.

We both (Weiser/Krauss) share and commend Martin's concern about the expected and unexpected consequences of consciously editing digital or traditional images or family albums. Destroying the original artifact steals

the opportunity for anyone else to have their own unique experience and any possible new understandings regarding that image. We agree that this is an area that deserves much more attention and discussion.

Martin elaborates that at the end of her sessions, her clients have actual images to validate the experience – and makes the important point that the photographic mapping of the session creates opportunity for recall and reconstruction, which might otherwise not be remembered. We appreciate the careful structuring of these explanations.

Taken together, the Martin and Dennett articles provide a well-rendered portrait of photographic practices based on using photos of oneself to assist one with self-insight and personal healing.

It is very fortunate and highly instructive to have these two articles appear in the same issue, providing two ‘side-by-side’ perspectives of work that has evolved forward, while still maintaining its ancestral roots.

All photographs of people have an inherent magical quality created by our learned projections of our three dimensional reality projected on the two dimensional piece of paper. Martin sums this up nicely on the first page of her article when she states that ‘photographs offer up a slippery surface of meanings to reflect and project upon and contain a myriad of latent narratives.’ It is this understanding that we think allows any and all photographs to be potentially useful, to be both window and door, both reflection and portal to our own self awareness and personal responses to life.

And after reading Dennett’s and Martin’s articles, we are left with a sense of sadness at not having had more time to get to know Spence better, gratitude for Dennett’s ongoing work with her Memorial Archives, and an appreciation for Martin’s ongoing evolution of this work.

Nuñez

Nuñez, the Italian-based author of the third article in this Therapeutic Photography ‘trilogy’ writes from the perspective of the professional photographer-artist’s use of the medium of self-portraiture. This article demonstrates her clear passion for self-portraiture and describes how she has used it for many years for personal, social, and spiritual ends (to help herself and other people). She describes a rationale for her own practice of using self-portrait photographs in a country where the fields of ‘therapy’ and ‘therapeutic activity’ greatly overlap. Its conversational style seems to us to limit its ability to be viewed as a formal academic document, although perhaps at the same time making it more easily readable in its non-academic informality. Regardless, it nevertheless illustrates how this ‘next generation’ of practitioners are taking this field into many new directions.

Nuñez is a ‘self-portraitist’ teaching ‘therapeutical self-portrait photography’ methods to youth and adults, as a way to improve creativity and self-knowledge. She also clarifies that as a non-therapist, she occasionally partners with a psychologist in work settings to use similar self-portrait methods to enhance empowerment, self-assessment and team building²⁴.

This provides clarification to the context for understanding her article's personal perspective on the transformative power of art to inform and empower us, to help us understand ourselves, to change mindsets, and even to heal trauma. She sees self-portraiture with an artist's eye, as a method of both self-examination and confrontation, and as a vehicle which can lead us to experience inner peace – or, conversely, as an impetus which encourages us to pursue something yet unknown or unresolved.

Nuñez's delineation of various attributes or qualities inherent in the process of self-portraiture itself helps to fill out this picture. However, unlike the more formal third-person 'voice' found in the other articles, hers is first-person throughout, so that her writing becomes her verbal equivalent to the visual work she alludes to, much like a personal 'position paper'. And while she does reference the important visual art-education work of Italian Stefano Ferrari (1996), we are surprised that two other key Italian figures in the self-portrait therapy field are not mentioned anywhere in her article: psychologist Carmine Parrella (who works also with video self-portraiture) and medical psychoanalyst Fabio Piccini (2008).

She also uses the word 'therapy' a bit more informally than we are used to. As we explained earlier, having all authors begin by providing their own operational definitions for these key terms, would probably have helped the reader better compare the variety of their meanings of that word. For example, when she states, 'The self portrait experience is even more closely connected to therapy' – but then uses these descriptors to describe it: 'self-perception, self-questioning, judgement, thought and acceptance' – it is obvious to us that she is using terminology more consistent with usage in Italy where 'therapy' and 'therapeutic activity' are often interchangeable terms and frequently blended by practitioners.

As an artist who has spent much of her professional career dealing with the power of photography to confront social issues, she has long used her camera for purposes of enhanced awareness, healing and transformation, and this focus permeates her writing. The article discusses the techniques of self-portraiture as a catalyst to affirm existence, for meditation, and for making the world and those of us in it, healthier. This is a wonderfully optimistic, sincere, humanistic and spiritually oriented verbal self-portrait, presenting the author's own personal thoughts on the therapeutic use of self-portraiture. The author moves from her own statements to reference other writers who have considered the meanings of art, life and purposes of self-portraiture. This provides readers with much to think about.

While the author never explains the reasons why she believes that people now feel a stronger urge to represent themselves through a photographic medium than they used to a few decades ago, her contention that the pervasiveness of digital imaging devices making production of such images almost effortless, cannot be argued.

Additionally she makes several generalized assumptions about attending to, and understanding, our personal emotional experience and how self-portraiture impacts, mediates and transforms us. We believe that terms such as 'our higher self' could benefit from further definition and referenced inquiry

in this article. Although that term appears to be consistent with the author's purpose and goals in her personal self-portrait work, there is much more here for her to explore in words, if she chooses.

One is struck by the author's openness and artist's courage in the self-portrait process and her faith that self-examination will lead to some new understanding, even if she does not know what it may be – or that such new understanding of herself may cause disruption and force her to see herself in a different light. Nuñez writes that in creating the self-portrait she produces some undiscovered aspect of herself, and in doing so finds both a sense of personal power and the connection of shared humanity with the viewer, even if these images are produced with others, as collaborative self-portraits.

It seems to us that collaborative photography produces an image that, much like a child, has its own way of becoming in the world – and this is rarely the same as how parents had imagined or thought that child would become. It is our opinion that the job of photographer-artists, much like parents, is to encourage that process and to love, understand, and accept the result for what it *is*, rather than projecting onto it any preconceptions.

The author's discussion of adolescent images speaks to some of the developmental tasks of that period: moving through intense self-involvement, trying on different roles in the service of the creation of a stable identity, accepting physical qualities, differentiating themselves from their parents as they move toward adulthood, and finding the ability for emotional and behavioural self regulation, etc. Clearly self-portraiture allows adolescents to present these issues for themselves (and to others also) through this camera work.

It is often written that our first sense of ourselves comes from looking in the mirror, and as true as that may be, what we 'see' will always be the reverse of what everyone else sees when they look at us. So it may be true that 'facing the camera lens and releasing the shutter can immediately take us to that first essential process of the definition of the self' as the author asserts, but it seems to us that the (non-reversed) photographic image produced from such a process allows a 'truer' picture of how others see us.

We think it important to mention that Nuñez did not include any of the large body of literature published outside Italy during the latter part of the past century. For example, she omits not only our own early writings about uses of self-portraits during therapy, but also those by Fryrear (1982, 1983), Phillips (1986), Spire (1973), Wolf (1976, 1978, 1982, 1983), Ziller (1989, 1990) and Zwick (1978) – or even those about self-portraiture as self-education (for example, Weissman and Heimerdinger, 1979).

Finally, as commentators and clinical psychologists we also would be remiss if we did not also inject a note of caution in the use of such powerful techniques in professionally-directed therapy, in settings where all interventions for enhancing client well-being are based on the clinician's judgement of the client's ability to benefit from such work at that particular time – and that there are times when the self-awareness or self-confrontation derived from self-portraiture may be contraindicated.

However, in the larger picture, self portraiture allows us to see our image the way others see us and allows us to ask ourselves questions about what is shown, what is reflected or deflected, what draws us in or pushes us away, what is introjected or rejected, and so forth. As an artist, this author comes to her progressive understandings of herself from a position of using the touchstone self-portrait as a kind of spiritual practice, a discipline she uses in an ongoing manner for her own well-being and producing images to discover what she continues to aspire to be, allowing her higher self to emerge.

Conclusion

Viewed together, these five ‘snapshots’ create a new ‘album’ of European practices that we have aligned (through our own filters and lenses) along the historical continuum of ‘photo-based healing practices’ between ‘Phototherapy, Therapeutic Photography, and all that is in-between’²⁵. We hope readers find agreement with our comments above, but we also welcome dissent and argument – because this ‘family picture’, like all others, cannot satisfy all of the participants, all of the time.

We wish that this Special Issue could have included more articles from more practitioners/theorists in both fields who attended the conference, as well as contributions from other early key North American pioneers also. It is unfortunate that a number of presenters²⁶ (some of whom were also ‘Invited Plenary Speakers’), who have themselves long been doing valuable work, teaching, and/or supervising in these fields, also could not appear here. We believe that contributions from such people (including those who presented about research applications²⁷ or cross-disciplinary partnerships²⁸) would have greatly assisted readers’ deeper understanding of this field. At the same time, we realize the impossibility of including even a small portion of these within the space limitations of one issue of this journal.

We hope that the preceding snapshots have motivated the reader to want to learn more about Phototherapy and Therapeutic Photography, and provided the framework and information from which to begin further study.

Notes

1. See references.
2. All authors except Nuñez were ‘Invited Plenary Speakers’.
3. Turku, Finland, June 16–18, 2008.
4. Including England, Finland, Italy, Netherlands, Scotland, Spain, and Sweden.
5. While we have authored this Commentary jointly, we will occasionally make individual comments and these are clearly noted.
6. For example, not only the pioneering work and 1993 book of British psychoanalyst Linda Berman, and early Phototherapy theorist American Doug Stewart (1979a, 1979b) but also important early publications by other European practitioners/authors such as German publications about both Phototherapy (Schafiya, 1997; Schuster, 1996; Spitzing, 1985) and about Therapeutic Photography (Guenther-Thoma (who presented at one of the early international symposiums thirty years ago) and Katz, 1986.

7. See: Krauss, 1980, 1981, 1983a, 1983b, as well as his 1979 Doctoral dissertation on developing a training model on using photographs in counseling and therapy. Weiser, 1975, 1983, 1985, 1986, 1988a, 1988b, 1993.
8. An illustrative sample of the wide range of practices currently in use across this spectrum can be seen at: <http://www.phototherapy-centre.com/widww.htm>
9. <http://www.congress.utu.fi/phototherapy08/> (Although that 'Call For Abstracts' has now been removed, it is still available in archival form)
10. For more details, see: <http://www.phototherapy-centre.com>
11. The categories of 'photo art therapy' (pioneered by Corbit, Fryrear, and Landgarten in the 1990's) and 'Therapeutic Photographic art-making' are mentioned here because some authors have referenced their specific practice; for example, Wheeler's comment about how art psychotherapists in the UK are usually trained as artists before being trained as therapists – a significant difference to distinguish from the preparatory training of other therapists using Phototherapy techniques.
12. For example, the presentations by Anor, Manesse, and Cahn.
13. For example, we have been informed that being a psychotherapist in Finland means additional training *beyond* being licensed as a therapist, which is itself a license-protected term [Halkola, personal communication]. Yet we have also been told that, in England, while the term 'art psychotherapist' requires much training and certification before the license can be earned [Wheeler, personal communication], the word 'therapist' itself can be used in England by any person who wants to call themselves this, even if never having had any training or credentials whatsoever in that field [Dennett's article explains this further].
14. www.phototherapy-centre.com/comparisons.htm#Comp2
15. For example, 1993/1999, 2001, 2004a, 2004b, and elsewhere.
16. In North America, where Phototherapy as a formal practice began in the mid 1970s, it was a term specialized for use only by those with postgraduate university degrees in a mental health field, *plus* additional supervised training and then formal registration in one of those professions.
17. For more information about the five interrelated techniques forming the system of Phototherapy, see: http://www.phototherapy-centre.com/five_techniques.htm and also: www.phototherapy-centre.com/home.htm
18. Readers can find many additional clarifications of the similarities and differences between these two practices in Weiser, 2005b, 2006 (in Italian), 2007 – as well as a succinct summary on: <http://www.phototherapy-centre.com/comparisons.htm>
19. We need to acknowledge that we find it difficult to know where exactly to locate Martin's practice along the above-described continuum of Phototherapy and Therapeutic Photography, because it seems to us to belong almost on the 'cusp' between the two, as it contains elements of both. It seems to us that her sessions *are* the therapy work, due to her 'active studio' approach of creating images on-site during sessions (the definition of Therapeutic Photography), rather than being part of some larger therapy process during which photos can often be – but are not always – used during the sessions (the definition of Phototherapy). The article describes her practice as being far more than simply the kind of 'photos-as-therapy' that is done by people with no knowledge of counselling, in that she also conducts informed process and provides deep feedback based on her education – all of which a novice practitioner (of only Therapeutic Photography) likely could not do. We look forward to Martin's future writings as a possible way to more fully understand where she might herself place her own practice along this 'photos-during-therapy'/'photos-as-therapy' continuum (for example, does she also conduct counselling sessions where photo-creating or photo-reviewing do not happen?).
20. For example, Arnold Gassan (1977: *Handbook for Contemporary Photography*), Ralph Hattersley (1971: *Discover Yourself Through Photography*), Freeman Patterson (1979: *Photography and the Art of Seeing*), Minor White (1957: *What*

is Meant by 'Reading' Photographs), Richard Zakia (1975: *Perception and Photography*) and many others.

21. From our previous knowledge of Halkola's high-quality work and teaching, we realize some of the difficulties discussed above might simply be the result of translation issues.
22. These were the years before the internet, and Spence and Weiser only finally met by accident after a gallery-owner in Canada informed her about Spence's earlier exhibition there – while Spence found out about Weiser only through reading a small advertisement for Weiser's 'PhotoTherapy Training Workshop', for which Spence sent her a letter enquiring attending. In a strange stroke of fate, those two 'first-letters to each other' crossed over the Atlantic; obviously this was a fortunate meeting – and their growing professional relationship (and friendship) flourished and was further nourished by their copious deeply-philosophical correspondence that help to clarify their similarities and differences to mutual satisfaction. More about this can be read in Weiser's Chapter for Hagiwara's 2005 book '*Jo Spence Autobiographical Photography*'.
23. See: <http://www.spectrovisio.net/en/products/>
24. See: Nuñez, personal communication viewable at: www.phototherapy-centre.com/widww.htm; retrieved 27 December, 2008.
25. See: <http://www.phototherapy-centre.com/comparisons.htm#Comp2>
26. For example: Europeans such as Italian psychologist Carmine Parrella, Dutch art psychotherapists Marliese Manneke and Annette Cahn – as well as equally-important but non-Europeans such as Canadian psychiatrist Joel Walker (a key phototherapy pioneer and author), Mexican psychologist Francisco Aviles-Gutiérrez, and Israelis psychotherapist Nirit Kucik and art therapist Brigitte Anor.
27. PhotoVoice (American Edward Mamary) or PhotoLanguage (Swedish Astrid Ståhlberg).
28. Educator Mike Simmons and social worker Tracy Wilson (both British).
29. Further reading list online: http://www.phototherapy-centre.com/recommended_readings.htm

References²⁹

- Berman, L. (1993). *Beyond the smile: The therapeutic use of the photograph*. London: Routledge.
- Comfort, C.E. (1985). Published pictures as psychotherapeutic tools. *Arts in Psychotherapy*, 12(4), 245–256.
- Corbit, I.E., & Fryrear, J.L. (1992). *Photo art therapy: A Jungian perspective*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Entin, A.D. (1983). The family as icon: Family photographs in psychotherapy. In D.A. Krauss, & J.L. Fryrear (Eds.), *Phototherapy in mental health* (pp. 117–134). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Entin, A.D. (1981). The use of photographs and family albums in family therapy. In A. Gurman (Ed.), *Questions and answers in the practice of family therapy* (pp. 421–425). New York, NY: Brunner/Mazel.
- Entin, A.D. (1980). Family albums and multigenerational portraits. *Camera Lucida*, 1(2), 39–51.
- Ferrari, S. (1996). Il perturbante della fotografia: Qualche indagine sulle implicazioni psicologiche del fotografare ('Disturbing photography: Some psychological research on the implications of photography'), in: *Studi di Estetica* ('*Studies of Aesthetics*'), 14, 93–116.

- Fryrear, J.L. (1983). Photographic self-confrontation as therapy. In D.A. Krauss, & J.L. Fryrear (Eds.), *Phototherapy in mental health* (pp. 71–94). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Fryrear, J.L. (1982). Visual self-confrontation as therapy. *Phototherapy*, 3(1), 11–12.
- Güenther-Thoma, K., & Katz, H. (1986). *Fotografie hinter gittern (Photography behind bars)*. Frankfurt: Dezernat Schule und Bildung.
- Hagiwara, H. (Ed.). (2005). *Jo Spence autobiographical photography*. Osaka: Shinsuisha Press.
- Hunsberger, P. (1984). Uses of instant-print photography in psychotherapy. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 15(6), 884–890.
- Kaslow, F.W., & Friedman, J. (1977). Utilization of family photos and movies in family therapy. *Journal of Marriage and Family Counseling*, 3(1), 19–2.
- Krauss, D.A. (1983a). Reality, photography and psychotherapy. In D.A. Krauss, & J.L. Fryrear (Eds.), *Phototherapy in mental health* (pp. 40–56). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Krauss, D.A. (1983b). The visual metaphor: Some underlying assumptions of phototherapy. In D.A. Krauss, & J.L. Fryrear (Eds.), *Phototherapy in mental health* (pp. 56–70). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Krauss, D.A. (1981). Photography, imaging, and visually referent language in therapy: Illuminating the metaphor. *Phototherapy*, 1(5), 58–63.
- Krauss, D.A. (1980). A summary of characteristics of photographs which make them useful in counseling and therapy. *Camera Lucida*, 2(4), 6–7.
- Krauss, D.A. (1979). The uses of still photography in counseling and therapy: Development of a training model. *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation*. Kent State University, Kent, Ohio.
- Krauss, D.A., & Fryrear, J.L. (Eds.). (1983). *Phototherapy in mental health*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Landgarten, H. (1993). *Magazine photo collage: A multicultural assessment and treatment technique*. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Martin, R. (2008) <http://www.rosymartin.info/phototherapy%20workshops.html> retrieved 24 December, 2008.
- Nelson-Gee, E. (1975). Learning to be: A look into the use of therapy with Polaroid photography as a means of recreating the development of perception and the ego. *Art Psychotherapy*, 2, 159–164.
- Phillips, D. (1986). Photography's use as a metaphor of self with stabilized schizophrenic patients. *Arts in Psychotherapy*, 13(1), 9–16.
- Piccini, F. (2008). *Ri-Vedersi*. Milan: RED! Publishing House.
- Schafiyha, L. (1997). *Fotopädagogik und fototherapie. Theorie, methoden, praxisbeispiele* ("Photo-pedagogy and photo therapy: Theory, methods and practice"). Weinheim und Basel: Beltz Verlag.
- Schuster, M. (1996). *Fotopsychologie: Lächeln für die ewigkeit ('Photo-psychology: Smile for eternity')*. Heidelberg: Springer Verlag.
- Spire, R.H. (1973). Photographic self-image confrontation. *American Journal of Nursing*, 73(7), 1207–1210.
- Spitzing, G. (1985). *Fotopsychologie. Die subjektive seite des objektivs* ("Photo-psychology: The subjective site of the objective"). Weinheim und Basel: Beltz Verlag.
- Stewart, D. (1979a). Photo therapy comes of age. *Kansas Quarterly*, 2(4), 19–46.
- Stewart, D. (1979b). Photo therapy: Theory and practice. *Art Psychotherapy*, 6(1), 41–46.

- Walker, J. (1986). The use of ambiguous artistic images for enhancing self-awareness in psychotherapy. *Arts in Psychotherapy*, 13(3), 241–248.
- Walker, J. (1983). The photograph as a catalyst in psychotherapy. In D.A. Krauss, & J.L. Fryrear (Eds.), *Phototherapy in mental health* (pp. 135–150). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Walker, J. (1982). The photograph as a catalyst in psychotherapy. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 27, 450–454.
- Walker, J. (1980). See and tell. *Phototherapy*, 2(3), 14–15.
- Weiser, J. (2009). Pages from website 'PhotoTherapy Techniques in Counseling and Therapy' Retrieved 19 December, 2008, from, www.phototherapy-centre.com; www.phototherapy-centre.com/home.htm; www.phototherapy-centre.com/five_techniques.htm; www.phototherapy-centre.com/comparisons.htm; www.phototherapy-centre.com/widww.htm; www.photo_therapy-centre.com/recommended_readings.htm
- Weiser, J. (2007). Using PhotoTherapy techniques in art therapy and other counseling practices. *Canadian Art Therapy Association Newsletter*, 6(4), 4–7.
- Weiser, J. (2006). Tecniche di FotoTerapia nel counseling e nella terapia: Usare le foto comuni e le interazioni con le fotografie per aiutare i clienti a prendersi cura delle proprie vite ('PhotoTherapy techniques in counseling and therapy: Using photos, and interactions with them, to help clients heal their lives'), (C. Parrella & M. Paganelli, Trans.). *Informazione: Psicoterapi, Counselling e Fenomenologia*, 7(Sept–Oct), 120–147.
- Weiser, J. (2005a). Remembering Jo Spence: A brief personal and professional memoir. In H. Hagiwara (Ed.), *Jo Spence autobiographical photography* (pp. 240–248). Osaka: Shinsuisha Press.
- Weiser, J. (2005b). A picture is worth a thousand words: Using PhotoTherapy techniques in arts (and other) therapies practice. In L. Kossolapow, S. Scoble, & D. Waller (Eds.), *Arts therapies communication (vol. iii), different approaches to a unique discipline: opening regional portals* (pp. 481–486). Münster: Lit-Verlag.
- Weiser, J. (2004a). PhotoTherapy techniques in counseling and therapy: Using ordinary snapshots and photo-interactions to help clients heal their lives. *The Canadian Art Therapy Association Journal*, 17(2), 23–53.
- Weiser, J. (2004b). The continuum of arts-based healing practices: Arts-in-therapy/arts-as-therapy. *Creative Arts in Counselling Chapter Newsletter (Canadian Counselling Association)*, 1(2), 3.
- Weiser, J. (2001). PhotoTherapy techniques: Using clients' personal snapshots and family photos as counseling and therapy tools (Invited feature article in 'Special Double Issue: Media art as/in therapy'). *Afterimage: The Journal of Media Arts and Cultural Criticism*, 29(3), 10–15.
- Weiser, J. (2000). PhotoTherapy's message for art therapists in the new millennium. *Journal of the American Art Therapy Association*, 17(3), 160–162.
- Weiser, J. (1993/1999, 2nd Edition). *PhotoTherapy techniques: Exploring the secrets of personal snapshots and family albums*. Vancouver: PhotoTherapy Centre Press.
- Weiser, J. (1990). 'More than meets the eye': Using ordinary snapshots as tools for therapy. In T. Laidlaw, C. Malmo, & Associates, (Eds.), *Healing voices: Feminist approaches to therapy with women* (pp. 83–117). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Weiser, J. (1988a). 'See what I mean?' Photography as nonverbal communication in cross-cultural psychology. In F. Poyatos (Ed.), *Cross-cultural perspectives in nonverbal communication* (pp. 245–290). Toronto: Hogrefe.
- Weiser, J. (1988b). 'PhotoTherapy': Using snapshots and photo-interactions in therapy with youth. In C. Schaefer (Ed.), *Innovative interventions in child and adolescent therapy* (pp. 339–376). New York: Wiley.

- Weiser, J. (1986). Ethical considerations in PhotoTherapy training and practice. *Phototherapy Journal*, 5(1), 12–17.
- Weiser, J. (1985). Training and teaching photo and video therapy: Central themes, core knowledge, and important considerations. *Phototherapy Journal*, 4(4), 9–16.
- Weiser, J. (1983). Using photographs in therapy with people who are ‘different’. In D.A. Krauss, & J.L. Fryrear (Eds.), *Phototherapy in mental health* (pp. 174–199). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Weiser, J. (1975). PhotoTherapy: Photography as a verb. *The B.C. Photographer*, 2, 33–36.
- Weissman, N., & Heimerdinger, D. (1979). *Self-exposures: A workbook in photographic self portraiture*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Wolf, R.I. (1983). Instant Phototherapy with children and adolescents. In D.A. Krauss, & J.L. Fryrear (Eds.), *Phototherapy in mental health* (pp. 151–174). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Wolf, R.I. (1982). Instant Phototherapy: Some theoretical and clinical considerations for its use in psychotherapy and in special education. *Phototherapy*, 3(1), 3–6.
- Wolf, R.I. (1978). The use of instant photography in creative expressive therapy: An integrative case study. *Art Psychotherapy*, 5(1), 81–91.
- Wolf, R.I. (1976). The Polaroid technique: Spontaneous dialogues from the unconscious. *Art Psychotherapy*, 3(3), 197–201.
- Woychik, J.P., & Brickell, C. (1983). The instant camera as a therapy tool. *Journal of the National Association of Social Workers*, 316–317.
- Ziller, R.C. (1990). *Photographing the self: Methods for observing personal orientations*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ziller, R.C. (1989). *Auto-photography: Observation from the inside-out*. California, Newbury Park: Sage.
- Zwick, D.S. (1978). Photography as a tool toward increased awareness of the aging self. *Art Psychotherapy*, 5(3), 135–141.

Judy Weiser, R. Psych, A.T.R.
Email: jweiser@phototherapy-centre.com
David Krauss, Ph.D