severe mental illness as opposed to 'mental health problems'. The latter may not require specialist psychiatric input as medicalising problems of living is clearly undesirable.

The centrally driven 'one size fits all' approach to 'modern' service delivery has left many patients with serious psychiatric illness bereft of the clinical expertise and leadership to effectively manage their condition. Notions of complexity (undefined) and risk have superseded diagnostic context. The 'diffusion of responsibility' as conceptualised in New Ways of Working often leads to unfocused care plans and risk management assessments without the one element essential to modifying any risks – that is, effective psychiatric treatment based on a comprehensive diagnostic formulation and understanding of the nature of the illness. Accurate diagnosis not only allows appropriate treatments for individual patients but also prioritisation of resources in service delivery. Furthermore, a diagnostic threshold is an essential requirement of the Mental Capacity Act in the assessment of capacity of our most vulnerable patients.

Major changes in psychiatric management and service structure have been introduced that are mostly not evidence based and certainly not consequent upon real advances in treatment. The political dimension to this process makes constructive criticism difficult. The letter to *The Times* from Kinderman and members of the New Ways of Working Care Services Improvement Partnership and National Institute of Mental Health exemplifies this.[2] In response to the article by Craddock *et al* they refer disparagingly to the 'traditional medical model' in contrast to 'modern mental healthcare' which is a 'collaborative team effort' as if the medical model concerns itself only with medical matters in the most narrow sense. They also suggest that some psychiatrists are unable to 'cope with the loss of hegemony' and refer by implication to Craddock *et al* as demonstrating 'intellectual arrogance . . . and assumptions of superiority'. Their response to put it mildly offers little basis for constructive debate and has previously been described as 'messianic' in tone.[3]

Like many psychiatrists engaged in the treatment of serious mental illness and organic brain disease we look to our professional body the Royal College of Psychiatrists for a lead but find our views are not adequately represented.

1 Craddock N, Antebi D, Attenburrow M-J, Bailey A, Carson A, Cowen P, Craddock B, Eagles J, Ebmeier K, Farmer A, Fazel S, Ferrier N, Geddes J, Goodwin G, Harrison P, Hawton K, Hunter S, Jacoby R, Jones I, Keedwell P, Kerr M, Mackin P, McGuffin P, MacIntyre DJ, McConville P, Mountain D, O'Donovan MC, Owen MJ, Oyebode F, Phillips M, Price J, Shah P, Smith DJ, Walters J, Woodruff P, Young A, Zammit S. Wake-up call for British psychiatry. *Br J Psychiatry* 2008; **193**: 6–9.

2. Kinderman P, Vize C, Humphries S, Hope R. Modern mental healthcare is a team effort [letter]. *The Times* 2008; 3 July.

3. Lelliott P. Time for honest debate and critical friends. Commentary on . . . New Ways of Working. *Psychiatr Bull* 2008; **32**: 47–8.

Walter M. Braude, Hollins Park Hospital. London WA2 8WA, UK. Email: walter.braude@5bp.nhs.uk; **Andrew F. Blakey**, Macclesfield General Hospital, Macclesfield, UK

doi: 10.1192/bjp.193.6.514a

I would like to provide a medical student's perspective on the paper by Craddock *et al*.[1] I am about to enter my 4th year of medicine (having just completed an intercalated BSc in psychology and medicine) and will soon have my first real exposure to clinical psychiatry. Although I am keen on psychiatry, the majority of my fellow students are happy to express disdain at the thought of a psychiatric career. It is obviously difficult to say why this might be the case but something is clearly amiss in the way that psychiatry is being presented to tomorrow's doctors.

During my BSc, it was interesting to gain insight into the opinion that psychologists have of psychiatry, which unfortunately was one of 'over-medicalisation' and neglect of psychosocial factors. For me, this reiterated the importance of early positive interaction between the two professions and a need for better understanding of each others' strengths. Perhaps this interaction is best initiated during undergraduate training?

More importantly, and from the angle of a card-carrying wannabe psychiatrist, this paper has confirmed that clinical psychiatry is attractive to me not because it is excessively reductionist but because it deals with the complex interplay between psychiatric (and non-psychiatric) illness and countless important psychosocial factors. Furthermore – and this may be the blind optimism of youth talking – I hope to become an excellent physician who is trusted and respected by her patients. Because of this, I am not discouraged by those who fail to consider psychiatrists as 'proper doctors', although it is clear to me that this negative view by other doctors acts as a deterrent for some of my colleagues who might have been interested in a psychiatric career.

Finally, on a more anecdotal note, I have the perspective of someone who has lost a relative because of failure in psychiatric and non-psychiatric care and social support. Had an appropriate (and properly functioning) multidisciplinary team been in place, both in assessment and management, I believe that the outcome would have been very different. So in response to the question 'if a member of your family were a patient, is a distributed responsibility model the one for which you would opt?' my answer would be an uncertain 'ummm, I think so', so long as this included the appropriate level of assessment and involvement of a senior psychiatrist alongside other professionals.

1 Craddock N, Antebi D, Attenburrow M-J, Bailey A, Carson A, Cowen P, Craddock B, Eagles J, Ebmeier K, Farmer A, Fazel S, Ferrier N, Geddes J, Goodwin G, Harrison P, Hawton K, Hunter S, Jacoby R, Jones I, Keedwell P, Kerr M, Mackin P, McGuffin P, MacIntyre DJ, McConville P, Mountain D, O'Donovan MC, Owen MJ, Oyebode F, Phillips M, Price J, Shah P, Smith DJ, Walters J, Woodruff P, Young A, Zammit S. Wake-up call for British psychiatry. *Br J Psychiatry* 2008; **193**: 6–9.

Rhiannon Allen, Cardiff University, UK. Email: rhiannonallen321@hotmail.com

doi: 10.1192/bjp.193.6.515

Craddock *et al*[1] call for the restoration of the 'core values' of biomedicine – diagnosis, aetiology and prognosis – despite evidence that such concepts have delivered little more than stigma and helplessness.[2] A generation ago, Mosher demonstrated that contrary to received opinion, the recovery of people with schizophrenia could be enabled with no more than sophisticated psychosocial support.[3] Since then the role of personal, social and environmental factors in generating 'breakdowns' and 'fostering recovery' has become widely accepted. The 'mental well-being' train has left the station and in many places is close to its destination.

Craddock *et al* advocate a 'more positive and self-confident view of psychiatry', but complain that 'many people . . . have developed exaggerated and unrealistic expectations'. Clearly, psychiatry's reification of diagnosis, with the implication of effective treatment, fostered such expectations. The comparison of mood disorders with heart disease serves as an illustration. Much of the emergent distress within high-income nations has more to do with lifestyle, values and other psychosocial factors,

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.193.6.515a Published online by Cambridge University Press

than anything resembling biomedical pathology. If the global burden of depression is to be lifted, it will require more than specifying more 'clearly the key role of psychiatrists'.

Although Craddock *et al* were clearly offended by talk of mental health and well-being, this focus is long overdue. Talk of 'mental illness' and 'our patients' is regressive and paternalistic. On the 60th anniversary of the NHS it should be unnecessary to advocate well-being as the purpose of healthcare. Mental health advocacy joins the abolition of slavery, votes for women, feminism and gay rights as another example of emancipation within Western society. The 'service user' title may be unsatisfactory, but is another linguistic step towards acknowledging that people are the agents of their lives. They must be addressed as persons if genuine emancipatory mental healthcare is to become a reality.

The learning disabilities field provides a precedent. A generation ago, most people with significant forms of 'mental sub-normality/deficiency' lived in hospitals under the care of psychiatrists. Today, despite the influence of genetic anomalies or organic disorders such people live in natural communities, albeit with broad-based psychosocial support. Some may have occasional need to consult physicians, but their lives no longer revolve around their diagnosis. This change in philosophy did not devalue psychiatry but did acknowledge that all problems in human living affect persons. All talk of psychiatric treatment should follow suit, embracing the word's original meaning: the 'manner of behaving towards or dealing with a person'.[4]

Regrettably, Craddock *et al*'s rallying call will be offensive to many service users who have struggled to detach themselves from the more unfortunate aspects of traditional psychiatry. It will also be dispiriting to many of their colleagues. Craddock *et al* may be surprised to discover that nurses have already joined psychiatrists as statutory prescribers of medication,[5] and some clinical teams recognise the virtue of electing the professional best qualified to inspire and nurture the team.[6] Time, perhaps, to wake up and smell the coffee.

1 Craddock N, Antebi D, Attenburrow M-J, Bailey A, Carson A, Cowen P, Craddock B, Eagles J, Ebmeier K, Farmer A, Fazel S, Ferrier N, Geddes J, Goodwin G, Harrison P, Hawton K, Hunter S, Jacoby R, Jones I, Keedwell P, Kerr M, Mackin P, McGuffin P, MacIntyre DJ, McConville P, Mountain D, O'Donovan MC, Owen MJ, Oyebode F, Phillips M, Price J, Shah P, Smith DJ, Walters J, Woodruff P, Young A, Zammit S. Wake-up call for British psychiatry. *Br J Psychiatry* 2008; **193**: 6–9.

2 Kirk SA, Kutchins H. *Making Us Crazy: DSM – The Psychiatric Bible and the Creation of Mental Disorders*. Free Press, 1997.

3 Bola JR, Mosher LR Treatment of acute psychosis without neuroleptics: two-year outcomes from the Soteria project. *J Nerv Ment Dis* 2003; **191**: 219–29.

4 Oxford Dictionaries. *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* (5th edn). Oxford University Press, 2002.

5 Department of Health. *Improving Patients' Access to Medicines. A Guide to Implementing Nurse and Pharmacist Prescribing within the NHS in England*. Department of Health, 2006.

6 Rosen A, Callaly T Interdisciplinary teamwork and leadership: issues for psychiatrists. *Australas Psychiatry* 2005; **13**: 234–40.

Phil Barker, Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Nursing, University of Dundee, Scotland, UK. Email: phil.j.barker@btinternet.com; **Poppy Buchanan-Barker**, Clan Unity International, Fife; **Fran Biley**, University of Bournemouth; **Ben Davidson**, Priory House, Leatherhead; **Lawrie Elliott**, Centre for Integrated Healthcare Research and the School of Community Health, Napier University, Edinburgh; **Alec Grant**, University of Brighton; **Hugh McKenna**, Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, University of Ulster; **Shaun McNeil**, Voices of Experience, Glasgow; **Steve Onyett**, Care Services Improvement Partnership, Bridgwater; **Richard Peacocke**, Dorset Mental Health Forum, Dorchester; **Mark Radcliffe**, University of Southampton; **Angela Simpson**, Seebohm Rowntree Building, University of York, UK

doi: 10.1192/bjp.193.6.515a

I thoroughly enjoyed the Editorial by Craddock *et al*,[1] and would like to address the following points. First, the perceived 'lack of recruitment and retention in psychiatry'. Though there has been considerable mention of this, anyone involved in psychiatric training or workforce planning recently will be aware of the changes in numbers in the years since systems such as New Ways of Working[2] were conceptualised. What has not been mentioned (and what is more pertinent) is the effect of such changes on future recruitment and retention.

Second, the educational standards that we, as trainees, are expected to achieve are laudable, and (justifiably) a great deal of effort has been spent over the years by the Royal College of Psychiatrists to refine these (a recent example being the curriculum submitted by the College to the Postgraduate Medical Education Training Board). The delegation of assessment to multidisciplinary team members, without adequate, standardised assessment of competency, is worrying. Clinical experience has shown that GPs, when they refer patients, might not have conducted an exhaustive neurological examination or battery of tests to exclude organic causes, and would expect these to be picked up by secondary services. It is beyond the boundaries of reason (and team supervision) to expect multidisciplinary team members to be aware of organic presentations, neuroendocrine signs and symptoms, and subtleties on history and mental state examination that come with the experience (and training) of a psychiatrist. The equivalent would be a neurology service expecting a physiotherapist to assess patients referred with unexplained weakness and muscle atrophy; certainly the physiotherapist may have an important, specialised role in treatment, but the initial assessment should be by a physician, who will have a broad knowledge base, refined by training and experience.

Our patients present in complex ways and to reduce their assessment to rating scales, symptom checklists and risk management (as is currently the vogue) makes a mockery of the skills needed to practice psychiatry to an adequate standard. By delegating initial assessment to generic team members, the art of psychiatry appears to have been reduced to a 'paint by numbers' approach, that is anything but patient-centred. Looking at the fashion in which changes have been implemented, it is easy to make comparison with other Department of Health initiatives (such as the Medical Training Application Service/Modernising Medical Careers fiasco[3]). On this occasion, however, the College has the opportunity to effect change. The gauntlet has been thrown to the College to poll its membership on the implementation of New Ways of Working; this issue will not go away and needs to be resolved.

1 Craddock N, Antebi D, Attenburrow M-J, Bailey A, Carson A, Cowen P, Craddock B, Eagles J, Ebmeier K, Farmer A, Fazel S, Ferrier N, Geddes J, Goodwin G, Harrison P, Hawton K, Hunter S, Jacoby R, Jones I, Keedwell P, Kerr M, Mackin P, McGuffin P, MacIntyre DJ, McConville P, Mountain D, O'Donovan MC, Owen MJ, Oyebode F, Phillips M, Price J, Shah P, Smith DJ, Walters J, Woodruff P, Young A, Zammit S. Wake-up call for British psychiatry. *Br J Psychiatry* 2008; **193**: 6–9.

2 Department of Health. *New Ways of Working for Psychiatrists. Enhancing Effective, Person Centered Services Through New Ways of Working in Multi-disciplinary and Multi-agency Contexts. Executive Summary of the Final Report 'but not the end of the story'*. Department of Health, 2005.

3 Tooke J. Aspiring to Excellence. Findings and Recommendations of the Independent Inquiry into Modernising Medical Careers (http://www.mmcinquiry.org.uk/MMC_Inquiry_Launch_2.pdf). MMC Inquiry, 2007.

Sameer Jauhar, Gartnavel Royal Hospital, Great Western Road, Glasgow, UK. Email: sameerjauhar@gmail.com

doi: 10.1192/bjp.193.6.516

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.193.6.515a Published online by Cambridge University Press