use of the term 'mental health' rather than 'mental illness'? The government has stressed repeatedly in the National Health Service Next Stage Review that maintenance of health and well-being is its job just as much as treatment of illness. Performance management, outcome measures and payment by results drive vague 'support' out of the system, promoting more structured, evidence-based care delivery.

The Future Vision Coalition, comprising leading mental health charities, directors of social services, the Mental Health Foundation and, crucially, the network of our employer trusts, has just published *A New Vision for Mental Health*,[3] bringing health and social models together, focusing more on health promotion and on quality of life rather than illness, and redefining relationships between services and users. If the psychiatric profession endorses Craddock *et al*'s vision instead, who is likely to end up out of step and disregarded?

The current investment in improving access to psychological therapies demonstrates how those evidence-based services have not been over-provided or over-used to date, whereas 93% of patients have been prescribed medication. The National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence[4] stresses the efficacy of both psychological and psychosocial interventions. The relevant expert should lead discussions where biomedical approaches are key, but where that is not the case or the whole story, which is often, the other experts are similarly important. 'Jollying along' was seen when other professions were the handmaidens of psychiatrists, only trusted to give 'support'; now they may be prescribing as well as delivering other therapeutic interventions.

Politically correct terms like 'service user' have arisen because of stigma, which psychiatrists have played their part in perpetuating, being accused of low expectations, making assumptions about behaviour based on diagnostic labels, patronising or unhelpful letters, using patients as 'cases' for training, and promoting the 'medical' model while dismissing side-effects as 'psychological'.

Our answer to their 'thought experiment' question – would you opt for a distributed responsibility model if a member of your family was the patient – is a resounding 'yes please'. Going back to a psychiatrist with a case-load of hundreds, or awaiting the arrival of yet another locum for a decision, is neither safe nor satisfactory. Lord Darzi[5] heralds a 'new professionalism' based on teamwork; teams can only be efficient and effective if members are appropriately skilled, competent and take responsibility for what they do.

We agree with Craddock *et al* that psychiatry can have a great future, but only by embracing teamwork, abandoning hegemony and accepting the importance of social and psychological as well as biological determinants of mental ill health, rather than harking back to a past which was actually far from ideal.

1 Hawkes N. Mentally ill are 'jollied along' rather than treated by psychiatrists. *The Times* 2008; 27 June.

2 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.

3 Future Vision Coalition. *A New Vision for Mental Health*. The Future Vision Coalition, 2008.

4 National Institute for Clinical Excellence. *Depression: Management of Depression in Primary and Secondary Care*. British Psychological Society & Gaskell, 2004.

5 Department of Health. *High Quality Care for All: NHS Next Stage Review Final Report by Lord Darzi*. TSO (The Stationery Office), 2008.

Christine M. Vize, New Ways of Working, Care Services Improvement Partnership. Email: christine.vize@btinternet.com; **Peter Atkinson**, UNISON National Nursing Committee; **Neil Brimblecombe**, Nursing Research and Development South Staffordshire, and Shropshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust; **Martin Crawshaw**, British Psychological Society Professional Practice Board; **Bill Davidson**, NIMHE National Workforce Programme; **Roslyn Hope**, NIMHE National Workforce Programme; **Ian Hulatt**, Royal College of Nursing; **Jen Kilyon**, NIMHE National Workforce Programme; **Peter Kinderman**, University of Liverpool; **Wendy Osborn**, member of National Steering Group for New Ways of Working; **Sally Pidd**, Lancashire Care Foundation Trust; **Kim Shamash**, Sussex Partnership NHS Trust; **Graham Turpin**, University of Sheffield, UK.

doi: 10.1192/bjp.193.6.513a

Craddock *et al*[1] present a compelling argument for retaining the biomedical model of psychiatric illness, while acknowledging that evidence-based psychosocial interventions do have an important place in management and treatment.

It is their discussion about New Ways of Working that particularly struck a chord with me. As a third-year specialist registrar who will soon be looking for consultant jobs, I find myself in a dilemma: am I for New Ways of Working or against it?

Case-loads of 300 patients seen briefly in 15-min 'routine' out-patient clinics; one urgent appointment after another; the community team, day unit and GPs all wanting their patients to be seen only by the consultant;[2] shouldering responsibility for patients not seen or advised on by me; to me, all of this sounds like a certain recipe for early burnout. Is it any surprise that I do not want any of this?

On the other hand, my medical training has taught me to diagnose and treat appropriately and I do this well. When other members of the team ask me to see someone who they think may have depression, my training enables me to not only exclude depression but to pick up the drowsiness, slurred speech and small pupils of morphine addiction, and to then manage the patient appropriately. As Craddock *et al* point out, having a broad-based assessment by a doctor at the first point of contact is likely to ensure that the patient gets the most appropriate treatment.

Craddock *et al* think we should be arguing for better resources and increased workforce. This is very reasonable but is it realistic?

Is the choice, then, between one's personal well-being and that of one's patients? I have not found the answer to this dilemma yet. It is reassuring to see that experienced psychiatrists have strong views on both sides, illustrated by the heated debate over the past few months. Perhaps I should sit on the fence just a little while longer.[3]

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 Hampson M. It just took a blank piece of paper: changing the job plan of an adult psychiatrist. *Psychiatr Bull* 2003; **27**: 309–11.

3 Vize C, Humphries S, Brandling J, Mistral W. New Ways of Working: time to get off the fence. *Psychiatr Bull* 2008; **32**: 44–5.

Adarsh Shetty, Crisis Team, Queen's Medical Centre, Derby Road, Nottingham NG7 2UH, UK. Email: dradarshshetty@yahoo.co.in

doi: 10.1192/bjp.193.6.514

We strongly support the views expressed by Craddock *et al*.[1] In our opinion, their perspective is shared by many NHS consultant colleagues and is not limited to academic psychiatry.

At the heart of the debate is the progressive downgrading of the role of the consultant psychiatrist in diagnosing and managing