

wishes to support me? Are there no trainees who feel that a lot of their time as clinical students was ineffectively and inappropriately spent? Apparently not. And yet I am convinced that the contribution of general practitioners to education at pre-qualification level is now by far the largest challenge facing us.

If it were not for the fact that Sir George Godber rang me to say that he thought the article made a lot of sense I should fear that no one opened the *Journal* to read what I had written.

NIGEL OSWALD

University of Cambridge School of
Clinical Medicine
Addenbrook's Hospital
Hills Road
Cambridge CB2 2QQ

Trainee representation

Sir,

As participants in the College's second annual trainee conference (News, December *Journal*, p.573) we support the College's view that two way communication between trainees and the College is vital. However, we wonder whether the conference achieves this aim? While the meeting gave the College an opportunity to inform those trainees present of some of its major preoccupations, communication in the other direction was poor. Since many of the trainee faculty representatives were meeting for the first time, the group lacked the necessary cohesion and sense of purpose to identify and represent national trainee issues to the College. We feel this is symptomatic of the poor representation of trainee's views at all levels of the College.

At the last national general practitioner trainee conference (Durham, 1987) trainees expressed their dissatisfaction with their representation through the College and the General Medical Services Committee. As a result, the GMSC has undertaken an internal review of trainee representation. We wonder whether the College should undertake a similar review so that trainees will be able to make their full contribution to the College?

MALCOLM THOMAS
JEREMY GRIMSHAW

40d Leazes Terrace
Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 4LZ

The College: academic or political?

Sir,

Professor McCormick and colleagues. (January *Journal*, p.30) deserve praise for

their article discussing the College's objectives. In effect, they call for debate on the question of whether the stated objectives of academic excellence and educational achievement are compatible with the College as a political and representative organization, and if so, where the balance should lie.

The College's founding fathers had no doubt. The *British Medical Journal* supplement of 27 October 1951, in its report of a meeting of the British Medical Association's General Medical Services Committee, states: 'Dr G.F. Abercrombie [Chairman of College Council] said he could speak for the whole of his Council when he stated that they were not interested as a Council in medical politics. Their sole object was the education of the general practitioner and the improvement of general practice.' Also: 'Dr J.H. Hunt [Honorary Secretary of the College] repeated that they were interested only in the academic side of general practice.' And later: 'It would be their aim to refer all matters to do with medical politics to the BMA.'

A few months later the College suited the action to the word when it submitted evidence to the Cranbrook committee and sedulously refrained from giving advice on administrative topics.

Times change, but as far as I can recall, the College has never formally altered its policy, nor sought the membership's consent to extend its activities to the political field. There has, however, been a sea change and I believe that the effects have been detrimental to patients and profession alike. The only beneficiary has been the Department of Health and Social Security: ministers and civil servants have repeatedly been able to divide the profession and defeat its officially elected representatives.

Such political activity has begged the question of whether the College can act as a representative organization. If, in pursuit of high standards it seeks to exclude from membership those with lower ones, how can it claim to represent those it excludes? There are also some people who, rejecting a seemingly patrician approach to the politics of practice, refuse to join, even when cajoled with the offer of honorary membership.

Some members I have met would be glad to see the College expand its political activities. I am not sure if they are consciously seeking a means to impose their own views on their non-member colleagues, and it is a cause for concern that they might use their right to comment on standards as a cover story for political activity. As a democrat I would be happier if they took part in the local medical

committee/GMSC system which represents every general practitioner in the National Health Service.

Besides, is there not something in a royal charter which forbids political activity?

B.D. MORGAN WILLIAMS

White Lea
Beech Close
Stratford-on-Avon CV37 7EB

Fellowship by assessment

Sir,

I am becoming increasingly concerned at what appears to be a concerted campaign by some, mainly younger, members of the College to abolish the present method of fellowship by election.

Fellowship never has been some sort of 'long service and good conduct medal'. I was a member of the fellowship committee for five years and any experienced member could spot an 'old boy' nomination, and it was usually rejected if that was its only merit.

The task of the nominator is onerous and time consuming and no one would go to the trouble unless he felt strongly that his candidate had outstanding qualities. The nominator also has to find two sponsors. The nomination is then sent to the provost for his support and he consults two fellows not associated in any way with the nomination. Finally, copies of all the papers are sent to each member of the fellowship committee before it meets to consider its recommendations to Council. The fellowship committee may make its own enquiries. All this is done in complete confidence and any candidate attempting to canvass his own nomination is not considered.

I have no objection to a parallel route to fellowship when a member feels he has been overlooked and wishes to be assessed. The only difference from the existing method would be that the candidate would nominate himself.

I have been involved with the nomination of several members over the years both directly and as a provost and I feel the process is a thorough assessment by at least four people — the nominator, two sponsors and the provost. Fellowship is an honour that the College should be able to confer as at present, an honour that depends entirely on the candidate's standing among his peers. I am proud to have been elected under this system.

JOHN KELLY

Laurel Garth
4 Wong Lane
Tickhill
Doncaster DN11 9NH