

An Atlas of Clinical Neurology. By JOHN D. SPILLANE. London: Oxford University Press. Second edition. 1975. Pp viii+432. Index 6 pp. Price £9.00.

This is the second edition of Dr Spillane's highly successful Atlas, first published in 1968. Its fourteen sections are profusely illustrated with the author's unique series of clinical photographs. This new edition has been revised and modestly expanded to bring it up to date and make it even more comprehensive and clinically instructive than the first. Valuable additions include a new section on abnormalities of stature and an expansion of the section on iatrogenic neurological disorders. Although the book is intended to be an illustrated companion to a textbook of neurology, it presents a wide range of clinical neurology in a most attractive and easily assimilable form. A great deal can be learnt from simply looking at the pictures and reading the captions, which often contain condensed case histories, but this would be to miss real value in the authoritative but engagingly written text. Altogether the Atlas is highly desirable as a personal possession.

GREGORY STORES

DELINQUENCY

Residential Treatment and its Effects on Delinquency. By D. B. CORNISH and R. V. G. CLARKE. Home Office Research Studies No. 32. London: H.M.S.O. 1975. Pp 73. Price £1.

As with true love, the course of good research rarely runs smooth, and furthermore, in both instances, the results when they arrive some months later are sometimes embarrassing. So it was with this excellent study by workers whom all of us in this field have come greatly to respect.

For over a hundred years well-meaning people have had good ideas about what to do with juvenile delinquents (or with adult criminals, come to that) and have often translated these ideas into residential institutions of one sort or another. It was not until the 1950s that Ashley Weeks carried out the first ever controlled evaluation of the effects of such institutional treatment. There were great difficulties in persuading the courts to direct the delinquents alternately to one of two very different schools, one rich in staff and modern treatment and one a traditional benign autocracy; and when the final assessment was made there was an embarrassing lack of

significant difference in the reconviction rates. As further results rolled in there was a similar lack of difference in reconvictions between Borstal and Youth Prison (Benson), between an Approved School run as a therapeutic community and other Approved Schools (McMichael), between authoritarian and permissive regimes for young psychopaths (Craft), between an adolescent ward and Approved School (Warren), and between Borstals directed towards individual attention and traditionally (Bottoms and McClintock). Not that only residential establishments fail in this way. Individual counselling and befriending (the Cambridge Somerville study), psychoanalytically orientated social casework (Hodges and Tait), at least 30 months of child-guidance treatment (Craig and Furst), group discussions and treatment by a youth counselling service (Meyer, Bargatta and Jones), all fail in the prevention or treatment of delinquency as assessed by controlled experiment. Then came the apparent answer. Adams, working with young naval offenders at Camp Elliot and in the Deuel Vocational Institution, California established that all evaluations of treatment are likely to produce the same grey figure unless each study takes account not only of the sort of subject being 'processed' and the sort of treatment provided, but also the sort of agent who is carrying out the treatment.

The present authors, working in a Bristol Approved School, valiantly try to assess each of these three variables in a carefully controlled experiment. Their publication sets out in highly readable form how incredibly difficult it is to do this and how many pitfalls await the unwary. However, they battle through to a conclusion which unhappily takes us back to the same old 'no significant difference' between the experimental and control groups.

As a result of their experience they have some very pertinent things to say, not only about research methodology but about the aims and expectations that we might reasonably have for the residential treatment of delinquents. They are not very hopeful, but warn against dismantling the system before something better is prepared to replace it. They suggest that the delinquents' immediate environment, and the learning processes responsible for habitual reactions to particular situations, are likely to be most rewarding for further study. Reading between their elegant lines the reader may begin to appreciate that Approved Schools (as well as many closed or penal establishments) are primarily to quell the anxieties of society rather than to eradicate delinquent behaviour. Who, we might ask, really needs the treatment most!

P. D. SCOTT