College in March (Bulletin, May 1980, p 70). But since then the arrest of Vyacheslav Bakhmin has been followed by that of two more Commission members, Leonard Ternovsky (a Moscow doctor, in April) and, again, Alexander Podrabinek (in June). The two remaining members, Felix Serebrov and Irina Grinina, have been threatened with serious consequences if they continue to issue the Commission’s invaluable Information Bulletin.

In the face of these grave developments the College has not yet issued any public statement. Bearing in mind Dr Voloshanovich’s statement that the Commission 'is deeply appreciative of all the support it has received from abroad over the last three years: this has had an important effect', could I now call on the College to speak up strongly in the Commission’s hour of need? I hope that our officers will take speedy action, and that individual members will write letters of support for the Commission (to Felix Serebrov, Ozernaya ul. 27, kv. 109, Moscow, 119361 USSR), and of protest to H. E. the Soviet Ambassador, 18 Kensington Palace Gardens, London W8, with copies to President Brezhnev, The Kremlin, Moscow. Such letters can if numerous, mitigate the sentences to be handed out soon to Bakhmin, Ternovsky and Podrabinek, and reduce the chances of further arrests. They will also, indirectly, help to prevent an increase in the continuing Soviet practice of interning dissenters in mental hospitals on non-medical grounds.

The whole matter is urgent.  

HAROLD BOURNE  
(on behalf of the Working Group on the Internment of Dissenters in Mental Hospitals)  
21 Golders Green Crescent  
London NW11 8LA

Reviews


This pamphlet would appear to indicate that 'Therapeutic Community' as a treatment concept is now entered upon the third phase in the life of an idea; after revolution and recantation, rehabilitation. At one level the paper is about the social and psychological rehabilitation of people with mental disorder who display diminished social competence. At another level it is rehabilitative of the concept of Therapeutic Communities in the sense that its expressed purpose is to convince planners and administrators in local authority social service departments and voluntary groups of the value, economies, style and rationale of Therapeutic Communities.

The paper was written by members of a working party of the Association of Therapeutic Communities as a summary of the themes of a Day Conference held at the King’s Fund Centre in 1978. It begins by briefly reviewing national policy in relation to the mentally ill, drawing attention to the statements in recent Government publications regarding their emphasis on the need for the provision of low-cost day and residential accommodation. After indicating the scale of the problem with reference to the numbers of patients being discharged from mental hospitals, it suggests the need for a complementary scheme to reinforce a network of care for people being referred to Social Service Departments by psychiatrists, general practitioners and social workers.

Arguing for recognition of the necessity to differentiate needs and services, three models of psychiatric day-care are discussed: a supportive or resocializing model for apathetic psychotics, a re-educative model for unsophisticated personality disorders and a reconstructive model for articulate sufferers of moderate to severe neurosis, personality disorder or psychosis in remission. Conceding that the first two models approximate in style more to 'therapeutic community approach' and only the last to 'therapeutic community proper', the authors stress that the aim of all three models is to enable the individual to achieve a sense of personal responsibility, a conscious verbal recognition of gains made during the process of interactions in the community and a translation of those gains into action outside of the community.

Having earlier lamented the tendency to rate some professional skills above others, the authors proceed to devote the rest of the paper, that is half of it, to the work of a 'reconstructive' St Luke's Centre in Chelsea, leaving the reader to exercise his imagination as to the activities of the resocializing and re-educative centres in the same borough. The account of the experience of the St Luke’s Centre, if not amounting to a do-it-yourself guide, nonetheless in eight pages takes the reader through a well organized informed discussion of the issues involved in setting up and running a day care centre in rented shared premises. It covers planning and economic considerations, an outline of the developed programme, selection and continuing mutual assessment of clients, involvement of families and a section on the selection and training of staff. It ends by indicating where and from whom further information may be obtained.

While in these financially straitened times initiatives are difficult to contemplate, if one accepts the economies presented by this paper then, as the situation facing psychiatrists and their patients worsens, the package solution offered by the authors may go some way towards relieving an embattled service.

CHARLES LUND  
Consultant Psychotherapist  
Newcastle General Hospital  
Newcastle upon Tyne, NE4 6BE