CONFERENCE PAPER · 2007

No 'Relating Cure' Without Embodiment — Conference Notes

Michael Soth

Notes from a paper presented at the BACP Annual Conference 2006 (published 2007), expanding on the central argument of 'Is Relating as Such Curative?' — that the claim 'it's the relationship that matters' requires crucial qualification: there can be no relating cure without genuine embodiment. A purely verbal relationship, however warm, cannot reach the somatic substrate where the wound lives.

KEY THEMES

- The embodiment qualification to 'the relationship is the cure'
- Verbal relating vs embodied relating
- What embodiment actually means in the therapeutic relationship
- The therapist's bodymind aliveness as primary vehicle
- Clinical illustrations of disembodied vs embodied relating

The Central Qualification

The claim that 'the relationship is the cure' — or that 'it's the relationship that matters' — has become a consensus across the psychotherapy field. But it requires a crucial qualification: not any relationship is curative, and not any form of relating will do. There can be no relating cure without genuine embodiment.

What does this mean? It means that the therapeutic relationship which heals is not primarily a verbal relationship — a meeting of minds conducted through words — but an embodied one: a meeting of two bodymind processes in the relational space between them. It means that the therapist's own bodymind aliveness — their capacity to be genuinely present in their body, to be moved by the client's experience, to register in their own somatic reality what the client's unconscious is communicating — is not a background condition for the 'real' therapeutic work, but is itself the primary vehicle of healing.

This matters because it is entirely possible to have a warm, empathic, verbally rich therapeutic relationship which is, at the somatic level, profoundly disembodied. The therapist may be genuinely caring, genuinely attentive, genuinely skilled — and yet their own bodymind may be essentially absent from the encounter, conducting the relationship through a screen of professional composure which prevents genuine somatic contact.

What Embodied Relating Looks Like

Embodied relating is not the same as body-oriented technique. A therapist can use no body-oriented techniques whatsoever and still be genuinely embodied in the therapeutic relationship — genuinely present in their own somatic reality, genuinely open to being affected by the client, genuinely using their own bodymind experience as information about the relational field.

Conversely, a therapist can use every body-oriented technique in the book and still be fundamentally disembodied — managing the client's body from the outside, directing their somatic process without genuine resonance, applying technique without genuine presence.

What distinguishes embodied from disembodied relating is not technique but quality of presence: the degree to which the therapist's own bodymind is alive, responsive, and genuinely in contact with the client's bodymind. This quality of presence communicates itself non-verbally, below the threshold of conscious awareness — the client's unconscious registers it with extraordinary precision, and responds accordingly.

Clinical Illustrations

Two contrasting clinical vignettes are used to illustrate the difference. In the first, a therapist who is professionally skilled but personally defended — whose own bodymind is essentially absent from the encounter — provides warm, accurate reflection without genuine contact. The client leaves sessions feeling understood but not met. Progress is slow; the therapy has an oddly flat quality despite the therapist's competence.

In the second, a therapist who is less theoretically sophisticated but more genuinely present — whose own bodymind is alive and responsive in the encounter — provides contact rather than reflection. The client experiences something which they cannot quite name but which feels qualitatively different from previous therapy: the sense of being genuinely met rather than professionally managed. Change

happens more spontaneously, often in ways neither party anticipated.

The difference is not competence or knowledge but embodiment — the quality of the therapist's presence in their own bodymind as they sit with the client. This is what no technique can substitute for, and what training can develop but not manufacture.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

— Soth, M. (2005) Embodied countertransference. In N. Totton (ed.) New Dimensions in Body Psychotherapy. OUP

— Soth, M. (2005) Is relating as such curative? Unpublished

— Soth, M. (2006) How the wound enters the consulting room. Therapy Today

— Winnicott, D.W. (1969) The use of an object. International Journal of Psychoanalysis 50

— Clarkson, P. (1995) The Therapeutic Relationship. London: Whurr

Published at soth.co.uk · © 2007 · All rights reserved