Correspondence

EDITED BY KIRIAKOS XENITIDIS and COLIN CAMPBELL

Contents ■ A role for psychedelics in psychiatry? ■ Kraepelinian dichotomy ■ CBT for refractory symptoms in schizophrenia ■ Olanzapine co-therapy in bipolar disorder ■ ECT in depression ■ Hospital admission rates and diagnosis ■ Obesity and schizophrenia ■ Zero tolerance of violence

A role for psychedelics in psychiatry?

I read with interest the editorial ‘Can psychedelics have a role in psychiatry once again?’ (Sessa, 2005). Aside from overcoming current legislative barriers, attention needs to be given to education about known research into this field, a function which this editorial usefully starts to fulfil.

The concern remains that the image of psychedelics was not shaped by the already existing extensive professional literature, but by the mass media sensationalising the accidents of unsupervised self-experimentation (Grof, 2001). It could therefore be surmised that decisive influences will be a variety of political, legal, economic and mass-psychological factors, rather than the results of current and ongoing scientific research. Interest from the psychiatric community will be paramount if this research information is to be critically reviewed with a view to clinical application.

The difference between psychedelics (entheogens) and other psychotropic drugs is that entheogens work as ‘non-specific amplifiers of the psyche’, inducing an altered or non-ordinary state of consciousness (Grof, 2000). The content and nature of the experiences are not thought to be artificial products of their pharmacological interaction with the brain (‘toxic psychoses’) but authentic expressions of the psyche revealing its functioning on levels not ordinarily available for observation and study. In order to conceptualise this, a vastly extended cartography of the psyche (Grof, 2000), one which challenges our biomedical psychiatric model, is required.

Within psychiatry, entheogenic substances (one of several methods of inducing a non-ordinary state of consciousness) could contribute to a powerful form of experiential psychotherapy; an important addition to a psychiatric armamentarium, working with domains of the psyche traditionally ignored in our ethnocentric Western model (Schlitz et al, 2005).

Potential credence for this field depends upon whether we view all non-ordinary states of consciousness as pathological or whether in some cases, some ‘psychotic’ experiences can be seen to have potential value as well as being potentially damaging. There is ongoing interest among mental health professionals in the concept of spiritual emergence as well as the therapeutic power of altered states of consciousness, the subject of a recent 1 day meeting held jointly with the Royal College of Psychiatrists and the Royal Society of Medicine (http://www.rcpsych.ac.uk/college/sig/spirit/index.asp). I would certainly value a continuing debate exploring this area.


N. Crowley Amersham General Hospital, Buckinghamshire Mental Health NHS Trust, UK. E-mail: nicola.crowley@bmil.nhs.uk

The editorial by Dr Sessa is both timely and encouraging. The almost complete denial, not only by the media but also by the psychiatric establishment, that lysergic acid diethylamide (LSD) and related psychedelics had an important place in the therapy of a wide range of psychoneurotic disorders is astonishing. This clearly has a psychodynamic explanation.

The interest shown during the 1950s and 1960s by the psychiatric establishment in the use of the psycholytic agents is even greater than Dr Sessa indicates. The meeting of the ‘American Psychological Association’ at which the therapeutic use of LSD was discussed was actually held at the Annual Meeting of the prestigious American Psychiatric Association, in 1955, rather than 1951 (Cholden, 1956). Subsequently, the role of psychedelics in therapy was the subject of a number of national and international conferences. Perhaps the most significant of these was held in London in February 1961, when the Royal Medico-Psychological Association, the forerunner of the Royal College of Psychiatrists, devoted the whole of its 3 day quarterly meeting to the subject (Crocket et al, 1963).

Dr Sessa touches briefly on the question of the possible resumption of psycholytic therapy. There have been a number of recent suggestions that this could once more become a possibility. Psychiatrists tempted to enter this field (assuming that the appropriate drugs – LSD, 3,4-methylenedioxymethamphetamine (MDMA), psilocybin – are made legally available to doctors) should bear in mind that the success of psycholytic therapy depended on careful training, not only of the therapist, but also of the nurses and others who formed the therapeutic team. That expertise at one time reached a high level, and all that has been lost. My hope is that research and practice will continue, and that it will be supported by the College.


R. Sandison 28 The Southend, Ledbury, Herefordshire HR8 2EY, UK

Dr Sessa is to be congratulated on his welcome review of research into psychedelic drugs. We are reminded of the hope that these drugs ‘could be for psychiatry what the microscope is for biology or the telescope is to astronomy: an essential tool to explore the parts of the internal world that are usually inaccessible’.
Grot (1975, 1990) has been the most prominent explorer of these inaccessible regions for over 40 years and once research into lysergic acid diethylamide (LSD) became impossible, developed a technique for inducing non-ordinary states of consciousness called ‘holotropic breathwork’. This offers many of the features of the psychedelic state without the need to take a drug. Using insights from the use of LSD and holotropic breathwork in thousands of people, Grof (1975) proposed an extended model of the psyche with psychodynamic, perinatal and transpersonal layers. These are provocative models of mind which challenge existing Western paradigms of consciousness and which probably reinforce mainstream suspicion of any insights purporting to arise from the psychedelic experience. However, they do represent a serious attempt to explore, describe and understand the complex features of the non-ordinary state of consciousness and its theoretical implications.

Holotropic breathwork is marketed more as a means of personal exploration than psychotherapy, but careful preparation, the context, a highly supportive setting and integration after the non-ordinary state of consciousness are deemed crucial if the experience is to have value (Grof, 1990). This approach is in contrast to the views of Strassman (http://www.tripzine.com/interviews.asp?id=1-strassman) who researched the use of N,N-dimethyltryptamine (DMT) in 65 volunteers between 1990 and 1995 in a hospital setting with little attention to the surroundings. Strassman (2000) concluded that DMT probably did not have a beneficial effect in itself, that its use was high risk and that psychiatrists generally did not have the experience, sensitivity or training to support, contain, direct or interpret the more unusual experiences that arise. Thus, although the drug is easily taken, the context and setting is a little more complicated and is at least as important.

My point is that psychedelic drugs are just one of a number of methods for the induction of a non-ordinary state of consciousness. Non-drug methods for the induction, exploration of and therapeutic uses for non-ordinary states of consciousness may prove to be more productive for psychiatrists interested in this area, given the controversy that the use of psychedelic drugs will always arouse.

In his stimulating editorial, Dr Sessa gives a history of the enthusiasm for psychedelic psychotherapy that enjoyed a brief flowering following Hoffman’s discovery of lysergic acid diethylamide (LSD) in 1943. Dr Sessa argues that the time may now have come for a reappraisal of the role of such substances in psychiatry. Having myself recently had cause to look at this literature (Edwards, 2005), I find myself somewhat less keen on a reinstatement of this practice.

Within the historical frame one could argue that the proper subject for the case study is the conduct and attitude of the professionals who were the enthusiasts of that time. The tone of the contemporary publications was in general remarkable for a willingness to get ahead of the research evidence, and rush to positive and at times even messianic conclusions. Here are some examples of writings within that genre: ‘These agents have a part to play in our survival as a species...’ (Osmond, 1957); ‘The wonder of LSD is that it can bring within the capabilities of ordinary people the experience of universal love’ (Davidson, 1961); ‘I feel that those on the moving edge of new culture will eventually use these tools in a way that will utterly transform the nature of human consciousness’ (Einhorn, 1971).

What one sees in those kinds of statements is the dubious ambition of therapists to gain possession of chemical magic and exert power over their drugged patients – the therapist as shaman rather than as evidence-based practitioner. But that I’m sure is not Dr Sessa’s intention.


T. Read Department of Psychiatry, Royal London Hospital, Whitechapel, London E1 1BB, UK. E-mail: Tim.Read@ekmht.nhs.uk


Author’s reply: I am most grateful for the correspondence regarding my article on psychedelics. Dr Read is right to point out the various techniques for inducing a non-ordinary state of consciousness. As well as the breathwork developed by Grof (1990), humankind has historically used meditation, exercise, fasting, chanting, dancing and even sex to induce transforming internal changes. What all these states have in common is the final goal of increased awareness and a loosening of the ego – facilitating personal exploration and being useful therapeutically to aid psychotherapy. As well as non-drug-induced non-ordinary states of consciousness, psychedelics may have an important role to play – both in psychotherapy and in the scientific study of consciousness.

I agree with Dr Edward’s comments about statements made by some overenthusiastic individuals of the psychedelic movement. Many clinicians of the 1960s (not to mention writers, artists and pop stars) saw LSD as a magic wand, a common panacea to assure ‘better living through chemistry’. It was this attitude that killed genuine scientific study and kept the therapeutic potential of psychedelics shelved for so long.

Psychedelics cannot save the world, but they may have a role to play as adjuncts to the psychotherapeutic treatment of neuroses. We must at least study and research their potential with modern randomised controlled trials. For the hundreds of clinicians and thousands of patients of the 1950s and 1960s that witnessed the safe and effective usage of psychedelics, these substances did appear to be useful (Masters & Houston, 1973). But as a profession we need to distance ourselves from the Timothy Leary-esque, messianic approach to psychedelics, if we are to allow a dispassionate and scientific study of their potential.

I was pleased to read Dr Crowley’s in-depth understanding of the complexity and value of the altered state of consciousness. Thankfully, there are clinicians such as Dr Crowley with the confidence not to dismiss the non-ordinary state of consciousness as mere ‘acute confusion’, but to believe that psychedelics, and non-drug non-ordinary states of consciousness, can inform and enlighten us with new approaches to understanding the mechanisms (and associated pathologies) of the brain. Since the earliest human societies we have sought knowledge and healing from these states — perhaps now this technique can be utilised in a scientific and evidence-based approach to relieve the burden of anxiety disorders for today’s patients.

I am most grateful to Dr Sandison for his kind and supportive words — and thank him for the correction regarding the date of the American Psychiatric Association conference in 1955. I share his astonishment at the medical profession’s inability or unwillingness to embrace the therapeutic potential of psychedelic substances. This shortcoming is augmented by the fact that the hiatus in research over the past 40 years appears to have been for socio-political rather than scientific reasons — and it is those pioneering psychiatrists like Dr Sandison who are right to feel disheartened.

I am enthusiastic, however, at the current re-emergence of interest in this field. There are increasing numbers of randomised controlled trials of psychedelics (largely from the USA) and these may yield new approaches to understanding the mechanisms (and associated pathologies) of the brain. Since the earliest human societies we have sought knowledge and healing from these states — perhaps now this technique can be utilised in a scientific and evidence-based approach to relieve the burden of anxiety disorders for today’s patients.

I do hope that my article, and a forthcoming meeting to be held at the College (contact me at drbensessa@hotmail.com for further details), can help raise awareness of this subject. I also agree with Dr Sandison in his plea for continued support from the College to bring this subject to the attention of doctors in the UK.

**Kræpelinan dichotomy**

Craddock & Owen (2005) attribute the proposed demise of the Kræpelinan dichotomy to advances in genetic epidemiology, and rightly emphasise the need to integrate data across multiple domains in large numbers of people. However, it may also be important to use a population-based approach. This involves extra effort but avoids being misled by convenience samples which may not be representative of the population. This is illustrated by Fig. 1 in the editorial of Craddock & Owen which suggests that prototypical schizophrenia and prototypical bipolar disorder are relatively rare in clinical populations. Work in population-based samples suggests that there is an early, insidious-onset psychosis with a poor outcome affecting predominantly men — a ‘neurodevelopmental’ form of schizophrenia which is very close to dementia praecox (Castle et al., 1998). This prototypical form of schizophrenia together with prototypical bipolar disorder accounts for 50% of people with psychosis in a treated prevalence sample, demonstrating the utility of Kraepelin’s division. In our experience affective and non-affective psychoses can be accounted for by these prototypical forms and a further two latent classes which appear to be valid (Murray et al., 2005). Whether such empirically-derived classes might provide better phenotypes for genetic studies is as yet undetermined.

Until biological markers are identified there is perhaps only one way to improve our classification. Large-scale, empirical, population-based studies of psychiatric symptoms, demography, course, treatment response and outcomes are suggested to reclassify these disorders from first principles and provide an atheoretical framework which may capture underlying pathophysiological substrates. Such studies should, as described by Craddock & Owen, integrate both dimensional and categorical approaches but also require a developmental perspective across the life span. The debate about the Kræpelinan dichotomy illustrates the lack of evidence-based diagnostic classification in psychiatry as a discipline. It would be fitting if psychiatric genetics, which has been severely impeded by the lack of a robust nosology, focused the collective will of practitioners to establish the evidence base required for a psychiatric classification which at last reflects nature.

**Authors’ reply:** We are in full agreement with Dr Murray regarding the utility of large-scale, population-based studies. These are highly desirable and will, we hope, be facilitated by the recent establishment of the Mental Health Research Network (http://www.mhmr.info) under the auspices of the UK Clinical Research Collaboration (http://www.ukcrc.org). We also agree that longitudinal variables such as course, outcome and treatment response might be key to classification, as Kræpelin supposed. However, although we have not undertaken relevant population studies ourselves, we are not convinced that Kræpelinan dichotomous categories are any more useful in population-based samples than in clinical samples. We find the studies of Van Os and colleagues (e.g. Krabbendam et al., 2004) persuasive that dimensional measures are useful in describing psychosis-related morbidity in the general population and, contrary to the proposition of Dr Murray, we would expect dimensions to be more useful than categories in populations unselected for severe illness.

Finally, we would like to restate and further emphasise our optimism about the likely rate of progress in identifying biological markers that can validate psychiatric diagnoses. Markers (in the form of genetic polymorphisms) have already been identified that challenge current nosology. For example, using the Bipolar Affective Disorder Dimension Scale (which rates affective and psychotic dimensions; Craddock et al., 2004) in a study of over 600 cases each of schizophrenia and bipolar disorder, we have demonstrated that a risk variant within the *Neuregulin 1* gene, which has been associated with risk of schizophrenia in several samples (reviewed in Craddock et al., 2005), may confer...