

evolution in terms of disorder also accept the indisputable place of values in psychiatry. Psychiatry is conceptually and empirically more complex than the rest of medicine. Every now and then a claim is made for a concept that will push psychiatry to an exclusively biological future. But psychiatry must be the avant-garde of science, rather than the runner-up of medicine, for perspectives which truly add to those complexities (empirical as well as philosophical) to do justice to themselves.³

Psychiatry's interest in evolutionary theory is not new. The authors will be familiar with the views of Scadding, Kendell and Boorse, who all attempted to define disease in evolutionary terms. Accounts of disorder based on evolutionary theory allegedly offered the epistemological background for a value-free conceptualisation of disease. This is one way out of psychiatry's embarrassment when comparing itself against the scientific status of the rest of medicine and the medical model. However, this seems to be a misuse of natural selection, dressed in the colours of realism in order to enhance a 'scientific' psychiatry.

We do not argue that evolutionary theory has no role to play. Evolutionary psychology may offer new significant ways of approaching mental disease. But let us hope that this interest in Darwin will not be a pretext for blind reductionism and a return to a fact/value dichotomy. Britain is in the front line of value-based and evolution-based considerations with the work of Fulford, Thornton,⁴ Bolton⁵ and others. Great heritage, greater present.

- 1 Nesse RM. Evolution at 150: time for truly biological psychiatry. *Br J Psychiatry* 2009; **195**: 471–2.
- 2 Fulford KWM, Thornton T, Graham G. *Oxford Textbook of Philosophy and Psychiatry*. Oxford University Press, 2006.
- 3 Fulford, KWM. Teleology without tears: naturalism, neo-naturalism, and evaluationism in the analysis of function statements in biology (and a bet on the twenty-first century). *Philos, Psychiatry Psychol* 2000; **7**: 77–94.
- 4 Thornton T. *Essential Philosophy of Psychiatry*. Oxford University Press, 2007.
- 5 Bolton, D. Alternatives to disorder. *Philos Psychiatry Psychol* 2000; **7**: 141–53.

Athanassios Douzenis, Dionisios Seretis, Emmanouil Rizos, Ioannis Michopoulos, Christos Christodoulou, Leftaris Lykouras, Athens University Medical School, 2nd Psychiatry Department, Attikon University Hospital, 7 Rimini Street, Athens 12462, Greece. Email: thandouz@med.uoa.gr

doi: 10.1192/bjp.196.3.246a

Nesse¹ argues that psychiatry requires both proximate and evolutionary explanations to become a fully fledged biological science. He thinks that mental disorders such as schizophrenia and depression would benefit from posing the question of whether low mood and variable social ability were adaptive traits in times long gone and are no longer of evolutionary advantage in our current environment.

I think that Nesse's approach is as laudable as it is flawed. Evolutionary psychology proposes that most if not all human psychological traits are complex adaptations which have evolved under selective pressures. Richardson convincingly shows that the claim that all our psychological capacities have been selected for the purpose of accomplishing a particular task is too strong and that the empirical evidence required to support this claim is necessarily historical.² The problem is, however, that the required historical evidence is hard or impossible to come by – we simply do not know what psychological traits were prevalent let alone advantageous to survive in a Pleistocene environment about which we also have little information.

For evolutionary psychology to be regarded as a credible theoretical framework it will have to be examined against

standards of scientific enquiry used in other evolutionary fields such as evolutionary biology. Archaeopteryx was thought to be able to fly as it possessed feathers and claws to allow it to perch on trees.³ However, fossil records also showed that archaeopteryx lacked a sternal keel and that its awkward tail would have been likely to impede flying. Further comparative analysis showed that archaeopteryx was neither likely to perch nor be able to fly and refuted the conclusions arrived at by reverse engineering as proposed by Dennett.

Evolutionary psychology relies mainly on reverse engineering as this strategy requires comparatively few historical data but risks arriving at erroneous conclusions. Buller⁴ shows this to be the case for evolutionary explanations of the existence of cheater detection modules or gender differences in jealousy.

This is not to say that evolutionary psychology cannot offer an exciting and innovative framework for scientific inquiry into common mental disorders such as depression and schizophrenia but that we have to be aware of its current theoretical and methodological shortcomings and the need for further conceptual work. I agree with Geaney⁵ that further advances to understanding human behaviour and mental disorder would be best served by interdisciplinary cooperation whether based on evolutionary theory or not.

- 1 Nesse RM. Evolution at 150: time for truly biological psychiatry. *Br J Psychiatry* 2009; **195**: 471–2.
- 2 Richardson RC. *Evolutionary Psychology as Maladapted Psychology*. MIT Press, 2007.
- 3 Dennett DC. *Darwin's Dangerous Idea: Evolution and the Meanings of Life*. Simon & Schuster, 1995.
- 4 Buller DJ. Evolutionary psychology: the emperor's new paradigm. *Trends Cogn Sci* 2005; **9**: 277–83.
- 5 Geaney D. Evolutionary psychiatry: the way ahead (eLetter). *Br J Psychiatry* 2009; <http://bjp.rcpsych.org/cgi/eletters/195/6/471#27117>

Yvonne Treffurth, ST5 CAMHS, Forest House Adolescent Unit, Harperbury Hospital, Hertfordshire. Email: yvonne.treffurth@gmail.com

doi: 10.1192/bjp.196.3.247

Author's reply: Douzenis is concerned that adding evolution will make psychiatry narrowly biological in a way that excludes values. However, my article makes no claim that proximate and evolutionary approaches make up the whole of psychiatry, it says only that 'biological psychiatry is making full use of only one half of biology'.¹ Applying this additional biological knowledge to psychiatry should not exclude values. In fact, it offers a scientific foundation for addressing the very difficulties Douzenis mentions. It is fundamentally different from 19th-century evolutionary applications to medicine.² It is an antidote to mindless reductionism. It helps to solve the problem of defining disease,³ and to explain why psychiatric nosology is inherently problematic.⁴ Furthermore, profound advances in understanding human moral capacities, with important implications for psychiatry, are coming from evolutionary analyses of their origins and functions. I encourage those who share Douzenis' concerns to consider how evolutionary approaches can help us better understand our patients as individuals and provide personalised treatments that go far beyond analysing genes and prescribing drugs.

I am delighted that Treffurth finds my approach laudable, but dismayed that she seems to think my article is about evolutionary psychology. Evolutionary biology has vastly more to offer psychiatry than just evolutionary psychology, a field not mentioned in the article. I share Treffurth's concerns about the