medicine, has existed for 40 years, the same length of time as the RCGP. But the political and commercial influences referred to in the editorial have resulted in only a small minority of medical practitioners in the UK becoming members of a Balint group. Yet in the rest of Europe, and in other continents, there has been great use and further development of the Balint techniques.[4]

The editorial refers to the important principle of the doctor–patient relationship. This is not merely a matter of how the doctor deals with each patient, but also how patients respond to their doctor. Balint frequently reminded doctors that the word doctor originated from the word teacher. However, before teaching patients, we should try to learn from them, not just about them.

We were educated in a tradition of curative medicine; but, as Balint stated, we should aim to 'cure sometimes, relieve often, comfort always.' 'There is nothing wrong in prescribing a tonic; what is wrong is giving a tonic and nothing else.' We were trained to regard all patients as bearers of disease, and to decide if they are genuinely ill; but there is more to medicine than medicines, and more to patients than their signs and symptoms. We have all been taught: 'Don't just sit there, do something'; but what can often be as helpful is: 'Don't just do something, sit there'. Finally, Balint reminded us to 'regard your patients as human beings; while never forgetting they are still your patients.'

JACK NORELL

50 Nottingham Terrace
York Gate
Regent's Park
London NW1 4QD

References

1. Balint M. *The doctor, his patient and the illness.* Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone, 1964.
2. Hopkins P (ed). *Patient-centred medicine: proceedings of the first international Balint conference.* London: Haverstock Publications, 1972.
3. Balint E, Norell J (eds). *Six minutes for the patient: interactions in general practice.* London: Tavistock Publications, 1973.
4. Norell J. The International Balint Federation, past, present and future. *Fam Pract* 1991; **8:** 4.

Health promotion: time for a new philosophy?

Sir,
There are philosophical differences between public health and personal care. While the editorial by Kelly and Charlton (June *Journal,* p.223) may be a valid criticism of public health policy it lacks understanding of the important issues of family medicine. As general practitioners we do not see health promotion as an alternative to management of illness, but integrated into medical care.

Health promotion, from the perspective of the general practitioner, is a valuable resource for individual health. The 1981 report of the Royal College of General Practitioners[1] discussed areas of importance in preventive medicine, and promotion of health was seen as an integral part of the consultation.[2] Even the Ottawa charter for health prevention presented at the international conference on health promotion in Ottawa, Canada in November 1986 enshrined the provision of personal skills as one of the key areas in health promotion.

Health promotion should be subjected to scrutiny but it is incorrect to say that this has not occurred. Many interventions have been validated in primary care and some have been proven to be ineffective.[3] Even if, as suggested by Kelly and Charlton, health promotion were limited to helping our patients to stop smoking, to reduce drinking and to increase physical activity, it should remain an important component of the consultation. The editorial also suggests that we consider a healthy human being to be 'a rare and delicate organism'. Surely this concept has always been the cornerstone of personal doctoring?

There are limitations to mass intervention and it is questionable whether lifestyle intervention and social engineering are either appropriate or wanted, but while general practitioners relate to patients as individuals, there should be no problem tailoring health promotion to individual need and priority. The problem is not in the philosophy of health promotion but the imposition of public health doctrine on personal care.

DOMHNALL MACAULEY

Department of Epidemiology and Public Health
The Queen's University of Belfast
Mulhouse Building
Grosvenor Road
Belfast BT12 6BJ

References

1. Royal College of General Practitioners. *Health and prevention in primary care. Report from general practice no. 18.* London: RCGP, 1981.
2. Stott NC, Davis RH. The exceptional potential in each primary care consultation. *J R Coll Gen Pract* 1979; **29:** 201-203.
3. United States Preventive Services Task Force. *Guide to clinical preventive services.* Baltimore, MD: Williams and Wilkins, 1989.

Continuing medical education

Sir,
We read with interest the two articles on continuing medical education by Dr Murray and colleagues (April *Journal,* p.157, May *Journal,* p.194). Our colleagues from the west of Scotland should be congratulated on their ability to attract general practitioners to courses that they organize but we fear that their success has not been experienced in other parts of the country.

We have shown previously the difference in behaviour between trainers and non-trainers in general practice[1] and the preference of many general practitioners for the courses provided by drug companies.[2] Our concern is that, under the current arrangements for the postgraduate education allowance, obtaining continuing medical education of the right quality is becoming a lower priority for many general practitioners than the desire to collect their complement of postgraduate education allowance sessions at the lowest possible cost. If this situation continues then we fear for the long term future of postgraduate education.

K G HARDING
P OWEN
L ALLERY

Cardiff Postgraduate Medical Centre
University Hospital of Wales
Heath Park
Cardiff CF4 4XW

References

1. Allery L, Owen P, Harding KG. Differences in continuing medical education activities and attitudes between trainers and non-trainers in general practice. *Postgrad Educ Gen Pract* 1991; **2:** 176-182.
2. Hayes TM, Allery LA, Harding KG, Owen PA. Continuing education for general practice and the role of the pharmaceutical industry. *Br J Gen Pract* 1990; **40:** 510-512.

Membership of the RCGP by assessment

Sir,
I qualified in 1950 and I passed the membership examination of the Royal College of General Practitioners in 1976. I found it rather difficult to start studying again, after some 25 years or so. But I did and I felt a great deal of pride and satisfaction when I was successful. During the necessary revision I realized how much I had forgotten over the years.

The advantage of the examination is the revision that is necessary. I feel this advantage would be lost if membership were awarded 'by assessment', and the value of