with concurrent Capgras and koro we all pray will turn up!


ANDREW SMITH, West London Healthcare NHS Trust, Uxbridge Road, Southall, Middlesex UB1 3EU

Criteria for compulsory hospital admission

Sir: I am puzzled by J. H. M. Crichton’s article on the revised Code of Practice for the Mental Health Act, 1983 (Psychiatric Bulletin, January 1994, 18, 45–46). He says that Chapter 2 about assessment and admission specifies “that a patient may be admitted because of danger to others even without danger to the patient’s own health and safety”.

This is nothing new. What is new is the point underlined by Ministers in the Foreword to the Code, that risks to their own or other people’s safety are not the only criteria for patients’ admission, and that they may be detained in the interests of their own health, OR safety, OR for the protection of others. Only one of these grounds needs to be satisfied.

Members of the National Schizophrenia Fellowship have been concerned for a long time that some psychiatrists do not appear to know what the criteria for compulsory admission are. It is very disappointing that an article devoted to the revised Code does not pick up the change of wording specially introduced to clarify this point.

DOROTHY SILBERSTON, Vice-Chairman, National Schizophrenia Fellowship, 28 Castle Street, Kingston-upon-Thames, Surrey KT1 1SS

Sir: I am grateful to Dorothy Silberston for raising an important point about the Department of Health’s new guidance on the use of the criteria for compulsory hospital admissions.

It was not implied, however, in the paper on the revised Code of Practice that there was any change in the criteria for compulsory admission, which would of course require change in statute law. It is clear from the references in the paper that it was based on the Code of Practice laid before Parliament on the 19 March 1993; it was written and submitted before the Code was published. There was no opportunity to comment on the Secretary of State’s foreword which was not included in the Parliamentary copy.

I think Dorothy Silberston is mistaken in her view that psychiatrists do not know the criteria for compulsory admission. The conclusion of the paper comments on this point. It is clear that the criteria for admission have been more clearly ‘spelt out’ not only in the revised code but in its foreword and in press releases from the Department of Health. The purpose of this new emphasis I think is less about informing psychiatrists about admission criteria and more about persuading psychiatrists to lower their threshold when considering if a patient fulfils compulsory admission criteria. This point is further elaborated in a paper soon to be published (Crichton, 1994).

Crichton, J.H.M. (1994) Supervised discharge. Accepted Medicine Science and the Law. John H. M. Crichton, University of Cambridge, Institute of Criminology, 7 West Road, Cambridge CB5 9DT

Continuing medical education


Continuing medical education for consultants and non-trainee psychiatrists should include regular reviews of developments in the other branches of medicine and surgery. Could the College consider commissioning general review lectures of recent developments in various medical disciplines for the Annual Meeting?

D. M. HAMBIDGE, Royal Air Force Outpatients Department, Nocton Hall, Nocton, Lincoln LN4 2AA

Sir: I agree with the thrust of Dr Hambidge’s letter although I would need some convincing about the relevance of surgery. I think a better format for this than large review lectures during College meetings would be:

(a) update one day courses for a maximum of 30 consultants on the topic, endocrinology and psychiatry
(b) articles on the same type of topics in the new College Journal for ‘continuing professional development of consultants, Advances in Psychiatric Treatment’. We will plan to act on this.

A. C. P. SIMS, Chairman, Committee on Continuing Medical Education, Royal College of Psychiatrists

Label of personality disorder

Sir: I was disappointed with the letters in response to Dr Steadman’s article (Psychiatric