Correspondence

EDITED BY MATTHEW HOTOPF

Contents

■ Concerns over confidentiality ■ Whose consent is it anyway? ■ Evolution and psychiatry ■ Psychotropic drugs and sudden death ■ Cognitive–behavioural techniques in practice ■ Assessing quality of life in schizophrenia ■ Is couple therapy better than antidepressant drugs? ■ Citalopram-induced bruxism ■ Psychological debriefing – does it never work? ■ Diazepam in the treatment of GBH dependence ■ Seasonality of suicides ■ Remember the depressed vegetarian

Concerns over confidentiality

We recently received our copy of *Good Psychiatric Practice 2000* (Royal College of Psychiatrists, 2000). On reading it there was little one could disagree with and much to commend it. However, there was one matter regarding confidentiality which raised our concern: "the psychiatrist will . . . respect the confidentiality of sensitive third-party information and only divulge such information either to the patient or others with the consent of that party" (p. 19).

At face value this sounds reasonable, but it is questionable whether this advice is always justifiable and legal. This is particularly the case when third-party information involves an accusation about the patient or his or her behaviour.

We have recently been involved in a case where sensitive third-party information was given about a patient who was detained under section 37/41 of the Mental Health Act 1983. The information was thought to be believable and related to prior actions of the patient unrelated to factors involved in their current hospitalisation. If the information were believed, then this would profoundly affect issues around risk management and thus the likely future care of the patient. The informant refused to inform the police of the allegation despite encouragement and refused to give us permission to disclose it to the patient. This placed us in a difficult position. It was unclear how we could take note of the informant's opinion if it was not fully investigated. There was also the question about the right of a patient to be aware of a factual matter which was taken into consideration when decisions were made about his/her care and discharge. In view of this we took legal advice, which would appear to contradict the advice given by the Royal College of Psychiatrists (2000).

There are three points which seem worth mentioning. First, the European Court of Human Rights (Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, article 6: http://conventions.coe.int/treaty/EN/Treaties/html/005.htm) states that any person who is charged with a criminal offence is entitled to a fair hearing by a tribunal, and has the right to be informed promptly of accusations against them. This may well have implications for detained patients who appeal for a mental health review tribunal where all allegations regarding their behaviour or mental state are 'accusations against them'. Second, doctors have a clear and overriding duty to their patients. Psychiatrists have a duty to act in good faith and in the patient's best interests. This involves informing them of any information which will affect clinical decisions and is likely to include any information discussed with the Home Office in the case of a restricted patient. In short, our duty to the patient and the public interest outweigh any duty to the informant. Third, if an allegation involves sexual abuse, it raises our responsibilities with regard to child protection legislation and the public interest. Enacting this may lead to investigation and hence to the patient being aware that information has been given and being able to identify the informant.

We would suggest that the College reviews its recommendations over third-party information, and recommend that any advice take account of the fact that, in certain circumstances, the rights of a patient may outweigh the rights of an informant to confidentiality.

Royal College of Psychiatrists (2000) *Good Psychiatric Practice 2000.* Council Report CR83. London: Royal College of Psychiatrists.

J. Sandford, A. Lee, A. James Avon and Western Wiltshire Mental Health Care NHS Trust, Blackberry Hill Hospital, Blackberry Hill, Stapleton, Bristol BS16 IED

Whose consent is it anyway?

We were interested to read the editorial by Pinner (2000). In particular, the significant advocacy role we have traditionally accepted of relatives, which may conflict with the views of elderly people in general. It has become accepted good practice in clinical situations and research to seek and be influenced by the opinion of carers and relatives acting in this role.

The issue of consent among mentally incapacitated adults is a complex problem. We have been studying the views of elderly patients with mental health problems towards cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR). The study was confined to an acute in-patient population. Part of this enquiry required us to ask patients with a dementing illness "If your heart was to stop now, would you want us to bring you back to life?" and "If you were suffering from an incurable illness, would your answer be the same?" Other than completing a severity rating scale and depression inventory nothing else was required of the patient.

Relatives were asked for permission to approach patients. Considerable effort was made to recruit support by lengthy discussions and written material but to no avail. Eleven consecutive relatives refused, saying, in all cases, that the question would upset the patient too much.

There is evidence that relatives' proxy consent does not necessarily reflect the wishes of individuals and where divulging the diagnosis of dementia is concerned relatives wish this information to be withheld from the patient when they would expect to be told if they were affected (Maguire *et al*, 1996). This double standard also seems to affect psychiatrists (*Hospital Doctor*, 16 July, 1997). Denial has been reported as a means of coping by Alzheimer's patients (Bahro *et al*, 1995); is it possible that carers' decisions are influenced more by processes of denial and emotional self-protection than the needs of the patient?

Although there have been concerns that discussions about CPR with elderly patients might be distressing, the evidence indicates that elderly people are grateful for the opportunity to discuss this subject, which they consider important and upon which they wish to make their views known (Morgan & King, 1994). It is also clear that decisions and policies about CPR are usually absent or unclear and decisions are frequently left to junior staff in an emergency. Moreover,

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.178.2.177-a Published online by Cambridge University Press

nursing and medical records are frequently contradictory and do not necessarily coincide with patients' expressed wishes (Aarons & Beeching, 1991; Morgan & King, 1994).

Unless we are to make blanket decisions of policy or rely heavily on proxy consent that may not represent patients' wishes, how are these matters to be decided? At best, the present position hinders research and at worst does patients the injustice of excluding them from important decisions about their life or death.

Aarons, E. J. & Beeching, N. J. (1991) Survey of "Do Not Resuscitate" orders in a district general hospital. *British Medical Journal*, **303**, 1504–1506.

Bahro, M., Silber, E. & Sunderland, T. (1995) How do patients with Alzheimer's disease cope with their illness? A clinical experience report. *Journal of the American Geriatric Society*, **43**, 41–46.

Maguire, C., Kirby, M., Coen, R., *et al* (1996) Family members' attitudes toward telling the patient with Alzheimer's disease their diagnosis. *British Medical Journal*, **313**, 529–530.

Morgan, R. & King, D. (1994) Views of elderly patients and their relatives on cardiopulmonary resuscitation. *British Medical Journal*, **308**, 1677–1678.

Pinner, G. (2000) Truth-telling and the diagnosis of dementia. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, **176**, 514–515.

A. Spencer Leeds Community Health Trust, Crooked Acres Lodge, 1 Spen Lane, Kirkstall, Leeds LS5 3EJ

R. Eggar Worcester Community and Mental Health Trust, St Anne's Orchard, Worcester Road, Malvern WR14 1EZ

D. Anderson North Mersey Community NHS Trust, Sir Douglas Crawford Unit, Mossley Hill Hospital, Park Avenue, Liverpool L18 8BU

Evolution and psychiatry

Dr Abed (2000) states that "ancestral females, of course, were never uncertain about the genetic relatedness of their offspring". This is a very confident statement – much more confident than most of Charles Darwin's. Could he provide the evidence that makes him so certain?

Abed, R. T. (2000) Psychiatry and Darwinism. Time to reconsider? *British Journal of Psychiatry*, **177**, 1–3.

J. L. T. Birley Upper Bryn, Longtown, Hereford HR2 0NA

The editorial by Abed (2000) demands further comment. The author writes as if unaware that 'evolutionary psychology' is only the latest in a line of contentious theories of biological determinism that includes 19th-century 'eugenics' and 20th-century 'sociobiology' (Rose & Rose, 2000). Moreover, the version of evolution put forward by the author has been rejected as grossly oversimplistic by many modern evolutionary biologists (Lewontin, 2000). The author appears to believe that natural selection is the sole mechanism of evolution, which has, over aeons, honed every detail of all life forms into states of exquisite adaptation. Our minds and brains, accordingly are viewed as perfectly adapted to the hunter–gatherer way of life prevalent on the savannah of half a million years ago.

In fact, there are many elements in the living world which have evolved through processes other than natural selection and which are neutral or even negative with respect to adaptation (Sober & Wilson, 1998). The mind and brain are therefore much more complex than is suggested by theories which reduce 'natural' human behaviour to that of a particular imagined past.

Evolutionary psychologists reveal their lack of balance and antipathy to complexity most clearly when they 'discuss' the social sciences. No references are cited by Abed (2000) when he implies, disingenuously, that all social scientists believe the mind starts as a *tabula rasa*. And his statement, "social and cultural factors cannot be considered as separate and independent causative agents acting independently on individual minds" exemplifies both the bias and the flawed logic of his position. Social, cultural, economic and historical explanations need in no sense imply the irrelevance of intrapsychic factors. They differ from psychological explanations as a biomechanical explanation of muscle contraction differs from a biochemical one. So while some, such as Abed, find conceptual pluralism unsatisfactory, it is probably the only realistic approach to a true understanding of the complexities and unpredictabilities of human behaviour.

Finally, there is no mention of the fact that, historically, 'biology-as-destiny' models have been used to legitimate a range of shameful practices, including sterilisation of people with disabilities and vicious racism. Although it is an open question whether such theories inevitably lead in that direction, evolutionary psychologists should at least acknowledge their discipline's own 'evolutionary history'.

Abed, R. T. (2000) Psychiatry and Darwinism. Time to reconsider? *British Journal of Psychiatry*, **177**, 1–3.

Lewontin, R. (2000) *It Ain't Necessarily So: The Dream of the Human Genome and Other Illusions*. London: Granta.

Rose, H. & Rose, S. (2000) *Alas, Poor Darwin: Arguments against Evolutionary Psychology*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Sober, E. & Wilson, D. S. (1998) *Unto Others: The Evolution and Psychology of Unselfish Behavior*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

P. Lucas Hadley Lodge, Chase Farm Hospital, Enfield EN2 8JL

Abed's (2000) enthusiastic advocacy of evolutionary psychology contains much that is sensible but its central hypothesis that psychiatry is weak because of its conceptual pluralism is unsatisfactory. Conceptual pluralism may be a sign of weakness but it is hardly unique to psychiatry. Abed's example of a physicist not violating the Newtonian law of gravity is particularly unfortunate. Einstein's general theory falsified the Newtonian theory of gravity nearly 100 years ago, but physicists still use the Newtonian theory when it is useful. Indeed modern physics abounds with mutually incompatible theories, and the mutually incompatible corpuscular and wave theories of light have been jostling side by side for a couple of centuries. If physics, the fundamental science, tolerates conceptual pluralism, then the other sciences, which are based on the laws of physics, cannot be criticised too severely for also being pluralistic.

This has led some philosophers of science to suggest that it is unrealistic for science to aim at the truth; rather, the purpose of scientific hypotheses is to provide a theoretical framework to help us overcome problems that we encounter in nature – the instrumentalist view (van Fraassen 1980; Churchland & Hooker, 1985). This instrumentalist view of science is less ambitious, but given the history of science seems more practical and persuasive. We should not, therefore, be too embarrassed by the conceptual pluralism of psychiatry – we are in good company.

Abed, R. T. (2000) Psychiatry and Darwinism. Time to reconsider? *British Journal of Psychiatry*, **77**, 1–3.

Churchland, P. M. & Hooker, C. A. (eds) (1985) *Images of Science*. Essays on Realism and Empiricism with a Reply. Bas C. van Fraassen. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

van Fraassen, B. (1980) *The Scientific Image*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

W. Prothero Hounslow & Spelthorne Community & Mental Health NHS Trust, Mental Health Services for Older People, Fordbridge, Holloway Unit, Ashford Hospital Site, London Road, Ashford, Middlesex TW15 3AA

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.178.2.177-a Published online by Cambridge University Press