



Results of elections in 2003 – Dean, Editor, Council, and the Court of Electors

Dean

The results of the ballot for the office of Dean were as follows:

Number of ballot papers despatched	9374
Number of ballot papers returned	2738
Number of invalid ballot papers	2
Number of valid ballot papers counted	2736

First stage

Dinesh Bhugra	1296
Hubert Lacey	884
Ilana Crome	556

Second stage

Dinesh Bhugra	1566
Ilana Crome	–
Hubert Lacey (non-transferable)	1079 91

Professor Dinesh Bhugra was therefore elected Dean to take office from 2 July 2003.

Editor

No ballot was necessary.

Professor Peter Tyrer was elected Editor to take office from 2 July 2003.

Council – Elected Fellows and Elected Members

The results of the ballot for Elected Fellows on Council were as follows:

Number of ballot papers despatched	9402
Number of ballot papers returned	1758
Number of invalid ballot papers	5
Number of valid ballot papers counted	1753

First stage

Professor Pamela Jane Taylor	838
Professor Ilana Belle Crome	539
Dr Saroj Chhabra	376

Second stage

Professor Pamela Jane Taylor	584.34
Professor Ilana Belle Crome	734.20
Dr Saroj Chhabra	433.60

Professor Ilana Belle Crome and Professor Pamela Jane Taylor were therefore elected as Fellows on Council.

The results of the ballot for Elected Members on Council were as follows:

Number of ballot papers despatched	9402
Number of ballot papers returned	1769
Number of invalid ballot papers	9
Number of valid ballot papers counted	1760

First stage

Dr Philip Sugarman	603
Dr Kwame Julius McKenzie	549
Dr Geetha Oommen	236
Dr Balakrishnan Somasunderam	197
Dr Waquas Waheed	175

Second stage

Dr Kwame Julius McKenzie	606.00
Dr Philip Sugarman	603.00
Dr Geetha Oommen	252.00
Dr Balakrishnan Somasunderam	233.00
Dr Waquas Waheed (Non transferable)	– 66.00

Dr Kwame Julius McKenzie and Dr Philip Sugarman were therefore elected as Members on Council.

Court of Electors

Number of ballot papers despatched	9402
Number of ballot papers returned	1942
Number of invalid ballot papers	4
Number of valid ballot papers counted	1938

First stage

Dr Jeremy Bolton	452
Professor John Charles Gunn	414
Professor Ramalingam Chithiramohan (Mohan)	284
Professor Ilana Belle Crome	254
Dr Kedar Nath Dwivedi	172
Dr Annie Y. H. Lau	120
Dr Morad El-Shazly	101
Dr Harish Gadhvi	74
Dr Ashokkumar G. Patel	67

Final stage

(quota for election=276.86)

Dr Jeremy Bolton	276.86
Professor Ramalingam Chithiramohan (Mohan)	276.86
Professor Ilana Belle Crome	276.86
Professor John Charles Gunn	276.86
Dr Annie Y. H. Lau	275.94
Dr Kedar Nath Dwivedi	261.18
Dr Morad El-Shazly	173.26
Dr Harish Gadhvi	42.17
Dr Ashokkumar G. Patel (Non-transferable)	– 78.01

Dr Jeremy Bolton, Professor Ramalingam Chithiramohan (Mohan), Professor Ilana Belle Crome, Dr Kedar Nath Dwivedi,

Professor John Charles Gunn and Dr Annie Y. H. Lau were therefore elected to fill the six vacancies on the Court of Electors.

Psychiatry and the death penalty

Revised statement from the Ethics Sub-Committee

This statement by the Royal College of Psychiatrists follows a review of previous statements published in the *Bulletin* in 1992 (re-confirmed in 1997) and in 1994.

Although there is no death penalty in the UK, there are members in countries that still retain the death penalty and there are UK members, primarily from the Forensic Faculty, who may be asked overseas for professional opinions where the death penalty is a legal option. The purpose of this statement is twofold; first, to help members and other psychiatrists who may be faced with ethical dilemmas if their work is related to capital cases; and second, to contribute to the debate on the use of the death penalty. This statement is intended to apply to psychiatrists involved in the capital process as both clinicians and experts.

The College considers that the death penalty is not compatible with the ethic upon which medicine is based; to act in the best interests of the patient. It recognises the complexity of lawmaking, and the range of public and professional opinion. It also recognises that the state or other legal bodies might wish to have a professional opinion on a person where the death penalty may be an option. The issues raised are similar in kind to those faced by psychiatry when the duties to the patient and to society may be in conflict and when opinion is asked for by a court rather than by a patient. However, there are specific ethical issues when professional judgement relates to a person's death.

There are two general ethical principles when working as a doctor with social systems that might cause death or undue suffering. The first is to maximise patient welfare over the concerns of the social systems, which may have quite different goals. The second is that when involvement with the organisational process is inevitable, there is then a judgement as to how closely to participate in the decisions and actions that may lead to death. Both these principles are in play at different points in the process of medical involvement in the death penalty.

The College supports individual psychiatrists who do not wish to take any part in a process that might end in a person's death. It also believes that the