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of couple therapy, whether analytically or behaviourally based, focused on the couple's interaction and mutual projections are totally different from the psychodynamics of one to one examination of an individual's personal anxieties.

Yet another paper attempted only to assess how far achievement of this brief technique is possible by seminar training with leaders who are not psychoanalysts.1 It is good to know that the multidisciplinary British Association of Sexual and Marital Therapists has now begun to offer training and is using the seminar method. I look forward to its assessment of results.

PRUDENCE TUNNADINE
Scientific director
Institute of Psychosexual Medicine
London W1M 9DE


Should relatives watch resuscitation?

A haunting experience in Nepal

EDITOR—I wish to contribute my experience to the debate concerning whether relatives should be allowed to witness resuscitation.1 While I was a medical student doing my elective in Nepal a large earthquake occurred there. In the first 24 hours afterwards the hospital, staffed by three doctors and ten medical students, was overwhelmed by 500 casualties. On the same day a 35 year old woman attempted suicide by ingesting organophosphorus weedkiller. Her husband had left her for her younger sister, and she was thus homeless without money. Debate ensued in view of the hospital being overrun by earthquake victims should she be treated? The potential consequences of her death to her children, however, led to her being admitted to a make-shift intensive care unit. Her children slept on a bench on the veranda outside.

In the absence of a bleep system a cardiac arrest occurring in the unit was signalled by the wall of an old masonry siren. The women arrested and was resuscitated several times before dying. Unfortunately, the siren also acted as a signal to the children. Each time we performed cardiac massage and defibrillation on the woman we were aware of four forlorn faces pressed up against the window. What did they think we were doing to their mother? How could we stop attempts at resuscitation when to admit defeat would bring such miserable consequences to our audience? I am still haunted by the experience. I suspect the children are too.

SIMON BRITTN
Surgical senior house officer
Royal United Hospital, Bath BA1 3NG

Opportunity is appreciated

EDITOR—I am surprised that the article and subsequent correspondence discussing whether relatives should watch resuscitation have paid such little attention to the feelings of the resuscitation team.1 Most doctors would admit that resuscitation is stressful. People cope with anxiety in several ways, but most medical staff seem to try to do this by using a mixture of humour and detachment from the patient. Both of these are difficult to use in the presence of a relative. Doctors and nurses often feel less confident, guilty, and sad after a failed attempt at resuscitation. The presence of a relative, who is usually emotionally distraught, puts the patient into context as someone's father, husband, or child and negates this coping strategy.

I have worked in an accident and emergency department where relatives were invited to watch resuscitation while accompanied by a senior member of the nursing staff. I and other team members found it harder to cope when relatives were present at resuscitations. This was recognised in the department, and measures were taken for staff to recharge their emotional batteries and have time to offer support to each other. Relatives often expressed how much they had appreciated the opportunity to witness the resuscitation. I believe that allowing relatives to witness resuscitation is beneficial and should become more widespread, as should recognition of the staff's need for coping strategies in this stressful situation.

JANET DAY
Trainee general practitioner
Citherne Health Centre,
Citherne

We have no regrets

EDITOR—R J Schilling's letter suggesting that relatives should be prevented from watching resuscitations seems to us to represent two of the worst foundations for medical practice: arrogance and anecdote.1 Beliefs that patients and relatives should be present only at the convenience of the doctors and that the doctor knows best are sadly outdated. The use of one anecdotal experience to guide clinical practice is also unacceptable.

We were both present at the unsuccessful resuscitation of our 7 month old son last year. It was a traumatic experience that will haunt our memories for a long time, but we have no regrets about having been there. Attempts to usher us away while our child was dying seem incomprehensible, and we can understand the favourable response of parents who are allowed to watch resuscitations. We could not have surrendered or abandoned our child at such a critical time to a group of anonymous doctors. We believe that few parents would, or should be forced, to do so.

New ideas will always take some adjusting to, but there is little excuse for denying relatives the choice of being present at resuscitations. Doctors may have to control their attempts at black humour, but our own professional experiences during resuscitations suggest that this would be no bad thing.

JOHN WRIGHT
Registrar in public health medicine
North Yorkshire Health Authority,
York Y03 4KF

HELEN FORD
Senior registrar in neonatology
St James's University Hospital,
Leeds LS9 7TF


Hearing voices

EDITOR—As the editors of Accepting Voices, the book reviewed by Raymond Cochran,1 we believe that the sentences that he quotes are so taken out of context as to be misleading. For example, he quotes, "It is unfortunate that hearing voices is designated as auditory hallucinations because that presumes the existence of pathology." This might sound strange, since half of the patients diagnosed as having schizophrenia suffer from auditory hallucinations, until one realises that only a third of people who hear voices have a mental illness. Tien and Eaton et al have shown that 2% to 4% of the population have these experiences.2 In separate epidemiological studies they have shown that the phenomenon is related to a psychiatric illness in only a third of people who experience it. Hearing voices is too often taken to indicate schizophrenia.3

Cochran quotes another sentence out of context: "[Romme] advises voices hovers to cope with their voices by accepting the presence of an influence lying outside [themselves], but grasp fully that it is not more powerful than [themselves]." This also sounds strange in isolation. Cochran himself refers to the fact that "the most widely used method is to treat the patient with neuroleptics, but some patients have drug resistant hallucinations which require other treatments."2 It is in patients requiring alternative treatment that we have explored the efficacy of other methods. We have found that advising some of these people that the voice is outside themselves is helpful. Many people tend to believe that what the voices say is the truth, but they can be helped to have a dialogue in which that is not thought to be so. This often reduces anxiety, allows them to realise that the content may be nonsense, and helps them to gain control.

When a medical approach fails, as it does in 60% of cases of auditory hallucinations, we feel that learning to cope with the hallucinations remain, and these are central to the ideas we were presenting. English academic research workers—for example, Bentall et al—are also exploring alternative treatments.

M ROMME
Professor of social psychiatry
ESCHER
Science journalist
Medical School,
University of Limburg,
PO Box 616,
2600 MD Maastricht,
The Netherlands


Child resistant containers

EDITOR—In her letter about accidental ingestion of methadone by children Michelle Jacobs raised the question of the use of child resistant containers for liquid medicines.1 Child resistant containers have been used for solid dose medicines for several years, and the Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain has been trying for some time to extend the use of such containers to liquid medicines.2 There has been considerable difficulty in producing a child resistant container—that is, bottle and cap—that can be used for liquid medicines without the cap sticking as a result of the sugar in many of the medicines. Despite the potential difficulties, in 1991 the society advised its members to dispense methadone, as a special case, in child resistant containers.3 A new shape for the neck of standard medicine bottles has now been approved by the British Standards Institution, and bottles and caps are being produced to meet these new requirements.
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