even begin to frame hypotheses regarding explanatory models of distress. Thus, the insights of a sociologically and anthropologically informed psychopathology may have been with us sooner, rather than we constantly having to be on guard against seduction by the ideal forms of psychopathology handed down to us by Jaspers. After all, the psychotic disorders and their symptoms are unlikely to be wholly discrete entities and, similarly, psychosis lies along a continuum with normal reasoning and experiences.


---

M. Broome Section of Neuroimaging, Division of Psychological Medicine, Institute of Psychiatry, De Crespigny Park, Denmark Hill, London SE5 8AF, UK

**Sexual dysfunction and antipsychotics**

The adverse side-effects of antipsychotic medication, including sexual dysfunction, are believed to be one of the main reasons for non-compliance (Smith *et al.*, 2002). However, it is the broader issue of sexual behaviour in psychiatry that we need to focus on. Sexuality is important to most patients, as the drive to procreate is strong. Psychiatric professionals tend not to be interested in discussing sexual behaviour, for reasons such as that they feel it is not important enough, or that it is something private. Apart from embarrassment, worries also arise because of the sensitivity of this issue in the litigation-ridden atmosphere of current practice. Patients’ sexual behaviour is usually considered when it is perceived as deviant or when others are felt to be at risk (e.g. in the context of sexual abuse or harassment).

Buckley and colleagues, having emphasised the importance of sexuality to in-patients, have conducted surveys on psychiatric in-patient units. These have shown a ‘wide variety of differing management approaches’ (Buckley & Robben, 2000) to in-patient sexual behaviour. Also, most mental health facilities perceive sexual behaviour as an ‘infrequent problem’ (Buckley & Weichers, 1999).

Healthy expression of sexuality is frowned upon and pornographic material is discouraged on most general adult psychiatric wards. This is justified, as it would not be appropriate. Little consideration is given to the idea that freer expression of sexuality may be therapeutic.

Psychiatric in-patients are vulnerable, yet inhibition of sexual behaviour may increase distress, which can be detrimental to mental health. In the era of holistic medicine such an important facet of patient care has to be catered for. We should offer patients ways by which they can express themselves sexually in a safe and private environment. The way forward is to design in-patient wards, and write management policies, that are more ‘person-friendly’.
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**One hundred years ago**

**The Edinburgh scheme for a psychiatric clinic**

*To the Editors of The Lancet*

SIRS,—In your leading article on “The Edinburgh Scheme for a Psychiatric Clinic” in THE LANCET of Feb 1st, p. 318, you appear to bestow your unqualified blessing upon the London County Council scheme for the establishment of reception houses for the preliminary treatment of the insane. You apparently are unaware that each Poor-law district in London possesses one or more such reception houses in the shape of fully-equipped and up-to-date mental wards attached to the various infirmaries. The buildings belonging to the Lewisham Infirmary consist of a handsome separate block, accommodating 11 male and 11 female patients, and fitted with all modern appliances. The system which upon my recommendation has been carried out by the local magistrates and guardians of the poor is to detain all cases of alleged lunacy in the mental block for a variable period before deciding upon their transfer to an asylum. The most gratifying results have attended our treatment. Out of 1382 cases treated during the past seven years 742 have been discharged cured, 144 have died, 20 have been sent to imbecile establishments, and only 476 have been sent to asylums. The majority of the deaths were cases of senile dementia.

The objections to the London County Council scheme are many. The change will simply be from one authority to another, but it will involve the enormous expenditure associated with the building and staffing of at least four large institutions. I anticipate that the buildings alone would cost over £300 000. The expense of collecting the patients from the wide area feeding each reception house must be considered. There is also the hardship inflicted upon the relatives and friends of the patients by making them travel long distances for the purposes of visiting, &c.; but the strongest argument against the proposed change is the stigma of “lunacy” which will rest upon the reputation of every patient who enters a reception house. Under existing
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