It is a cop-out to say "I'm not a replacement for a real therapist" while treating it seriously.

The real answer is - it's impossible to do this responsibly. In terms of controlling all the variables and errors. His answer is likely that he's doing it responsibly-enough and traditional therapy is too conservative / there's too much utility and 'good' to be gained from doing public therapy.

In psychology it is clear that people do not understand themselves and often are unaware of their own feelings/boundaries until transgression. Knowing this, therapy is intentionally private to err on the conservative/safe side.

Many of the streamers would not have agreed to discuss what they opened up about publicly. All of them are likely happy with the results but this does not make it ethical.

Conservative barriers mitigate risk but retard progress, that's simply nature of how organic systems grow and levels of abstraction. Who is responsible when it goes wrong and the results are undesirable? Who is responsible when the enforcer of that rule isn't sufficient? And so on…

I'll give Dr. K the benefit of the doubt but truly the onus should be on him to have a mature understanding of consent and how prior verbal consent can still be insufficient for therapy. That's difficult to admit, but anyone in good faith who understands psychology and power dynamics would concede.

That said, I do believe he's had a positive impact and there is much utility to be gained from public therapy however in terms of responsibility and accountability I share the concerns as there is zero and it's actually an impossible problem to solve. **Responsible therapy necessitates privacy.**

I think he's good to continue if it's legal, however I am hyper-aware that it's really a matter of time before someone has real, legitimate regrets or is impacted negatively.

Consent is impossible and I do not envy policy makers. It's much simpler to determine whether something is helpful or harmful. We know gambling is a losing sport yet it is legal with certain restrictions – the same for smoking and other destructive (net-negative) behaviors. The line between autonomy and consent is difficult. The quick examples that come to mind are euthenasia, alternative medical treatments, etc. Protecting people from themselves is the same tough decision for informed consent with therapy here and it's the same for suicidal intervention. Defer to the policy makers and professionals, but notably with all abstracts comes overhead and drag.

Here is a more formal legal argument where I first commented and spawned me to write this article that I have been thinking on for some time

https://www.reddit.com/r/Healthygamergg/comments/hlejy0/conversations\_that\_need\_to\_be\_had\_what\_is\_the/

The purpose of me bringing these topics up is not to attack or "cancel" Dr. K. I think he is the greatest weapon I have ever experienced in fighting against the stigma of mental illness. This is a topic that is very personal to me and I actively advocate for in my life. I believe that the nature of his work in his current form is, or even if it isn't, could be perceived by others to be inappropriate and jeopardize the longevity of this mission.

Dr. K contends he is [not providing therapy](https://www.reddit.com/r/Healthygamergg/comments/hk47so/is_it_ethical_to_livestream_deeply_personal/fwrqsmh/)

Question 1: Is Dr. K engaged in psychotherapy?

Psychotherapy comprises communication between a client and a provider that is intended to help the client find relief from mental health concerns, work toward finding solutions to problems in their life, and change ways of thinking and acting that are preventing them from working productively, functioning in daily living, and enjoying personal relationships.

[Source](https://www.hprac.org/en/reports/resources/Final-HPRAC-Psychotherapy-Report-Oct312017_AODA.pdf)

This describes what Dr. K does to a T. We could go into much much greater detail of the specifics but that is an exact description of the majority of the work he does on stream. Mind you, he is a trained psychotherapist, [who practices psychotherapy in private practice.](https://kanojiapsychiatry.com/approach/)

Individuals usually seek psychotherapy when they have thoughts, feelings, moods, and behaviors that are adversely affecting their day-to-day lives and/or negatively affecting their work or school performance, relationships, and the ability to enjoy life. Psychotherapy can be complemented by other therapies (e.g., medication and counseling) to assist the client in treatment or the process of change.

[Source](https://www.hprac.org/en/reports/resources/Final-HPRAC-Psychotherapy-Report-Oct312017_AODA.pdf)

Many of the people who seek out Dr. K's help are doing exactly this.

This brings us to the next question: What is the nature of the relationship between Dr. K and The patient individual coming on his stream.

We know Dr. K's position and how he views it. But his perspective is only one half of the equation. How the guest on the stream views it is the other half. To varying degrees, they come on with a specific topic to go over and are seeking help and guidance on. They are coming to talk about the streaming 'Psychiatrist'

It is undeniable there is a disconnect between the guest and how they view Dr. K and what he does for them and how Dr. K perceives his work. He is engaged in textbook psychodynamic talk therapy:

Psychodynamic therapy is based on the idea that behavior and mental well-being are influenced by childhood experiences and inappropriate repetitive thoughts or feelings that are unconscious (outside of the person’s awareness). A person works with the therapist to improve self-awareness and to change old patterns so he/she can more fully take charge of his/her life.

[Source: American Psychiatric Association](https://www.psychiatry.org/patients-families/psychotherapy#:%7E:text=Psychodynamic%20therapy%20is%20based%20on,outside%20of%20the%20person's%20awareness)

This concept of treatment and therapy is very, very important because of the concept of informed consent. Dr. K mentions he doesn't diagnose or prescribe so it does not count as treatment. He is clearly providing psychotherapy though and the biggest governing body for Psychiatry, the American Psychiatrist association addressed the ethical issues of informed consent when practicing psychotherapy in contrast to more invasive treatments or medication:

Psychotherapy: Informed consent developed in the context of invasive procedures and has since been extended to treatment with medication. There has always been uncertainty as to the extent to which the doctrine of informed consent is applicable to psychotherapy. Although discussions about treatment may fit poorly into some psychotherapeutic approaches, recent changes in practice that emphasize short-term, problem-focused therapies are more accommodating (or even encouraging) of such interactions. Whether or not required by the law, it seems reasonable to encourage psychiatrists to discuss with their patients the nature of psychotherapy, likely benefits and risks (where applicable) and alternative approaches (both psychotherapeutic and non-psychotherapeutic) to their problems.

[Source](http://jaapl.org/content/jaapl/25/1/121.full.pdf)

With Dr. K denying there is the treatment, there can not be informed consent.

He does acknowledge a form of consent takes place though

If people understand that they are coming on stream to discuss personal issues with someone who has medical training, should they be allowed to?

-Dr. K [Source](https://www.reddit.com/r/Healthygamergg/comments/hk47so/is_it_ethical_to_livestream_deeply_personal/fwrqsmh/)

Is this "freely" given consent? Many of these people have agreed to come on and discuss deeply personal issues and trauma in font of 10,000s of people. Is a good thing? It absolutely can be both for the person and the audience. Conversations like this are vital to addressing the stigma of mental illness that is behind the crises we currently are experiencing. But dealing with trauma is a very serious matter and must be handled with the utmost care, by someone trained in how to do it. Dr. K is obviously very well equipped to handle the subject. And so you know in doing so he can't not be providing a form of care as a trauma-focused approach is a form of care. You never seek trauma; it comes up when the person is ready to discuss it.

Does Dr. K actively seek trauma? No. Are the people discussing it making a decision "Freely" without other influences? No.

When someone decides to come on many other factors are at play. They get 15 mins of fame, they might raise their viewer count, that might equate to more revenue. These aspects muddy the water and poison the well when it comes to making the serious decision to open up about trauma on a stage as big as Dr. Ks. It is not actively seeking trauma but it is accepting the discussion of it under unethical conditions.

When I say continuing as he is currently puts his entire mission at risk it is not hyperbole. There is a reason no one else is doing what he is the same way he is. This isn't a novel idea, it's one people know you can not do.

Not all of his streams fall under what I have discussed. He can continue to do what he is doing being as, if not more effective in accomplishing his goals. I implore him to take the steps necessary to protect the great thing he has created.
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In summary I believe there is complete utility and positive benefits for Dr. K and public therapy. That said it is absurd to believe there are no repercussions – there is a non-zero negative impact – and it would not surprise me if this is complete malpractice and illegal.

That said, I don't believe that because something is illegal that it shouldn't be done or is intrinsically harmful – it just isn't conservative and always in the patient's best interest. And I think if anyone is in good faith it is obvious that Dr. K is not invested in the patient's outcome or their best interest. The tricky part is the patient, not the audience, understanding that.

I believe Dr. K is completely negligent AND it's a necessary service that is worth it. Worth it for the people, average viewers like myself, and it's negligent in terms of practicing medicine and responsibility in developing dependency and relationships with other streamers. He's having both and it's rightfully confusing.