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on antibiotic dosing in pediatrics; treatment of tuberculosis; chemoprophylaxis for special situations such as surgery, travel, and contact with cases of meningitis; drugs for parasitic infection, infections transmitted by pets, and many others. There is an entire section on vaccination, including routine vaccines, special vaccines, and detailed coverage of many vaccine issues, including the Federal Vaccine Compensation Act. Infection control in day care centers is also covered.

In order to judge the quality of this book, one must keep in mind its objective. This volume is meant to be a handy bedside or office-based compendium of information for use in clinical management decisions. Thus, it is not exhaustive in its coverage of any single topic, and, most important, there is no attempt to educate a student of any particular subject in the way a textbook does. For this reason, the book probably does not belong in the hands of a student. As an instance, the section on *Hemophilus influenzae* infections is seven pages long and covers most epidemiologic and management areas, including antibiotics, vaccine, and chemoprophylaxis, very well. Nevertheless, there is no information on biologic susceptibility factors other than age; there is no information on the role of natural antibody, nor on virulence factors of the organism. These facts are easily found in a number of textbooks of infectious diseases. The section on infections due to hepatitis B virus is very comprehensive and over ten pages long, but it contains only one and one-half lines about the virus itself. While I feel the book is outstanding for its purpose, its limitations are also quite clear. Pediatricians keep this book next to their phones to answer questions concerning incubation periods, contraindications to vaccines, drug doses, and the like. They do not use it to learn about diseases.

Other criticisms? The consensus of an expert committee assures that the recommendations represent the community of experts, but the range of opinions is not evident. Since the objective of the book is to deliver clear, unambiguous recommendations, the strength of the data supporting these recommendations, and minority opinions, are not present.

This volume is not only recommended for its intended audience, it is really a necessity for them. Members of the American Academy of Pediatrics receive it free. Other pediatric practitioners should invest the modest cost ($25). In addition, it would be useful in the library of any practitioner in a primary care area, as well as specialists in clinical infectious diseases, infectious disease epidemiology, and hospital epidemiology. It is appropriate that this book be found in any pediatric library and pediatric ward nursing station. The very familiar phrase "What does the 'Red Book' say?" is a request for the most authoritative statements on children's infections.
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**Psychosomatic Medicine and Contemporary Psychoanalysis.** By Graeme J. Taylor. Madison, CT, International Universities Press, Inc., 1987. 391 pp. $37.50.

Psychoanalysis is often criticized for not keeping up with advances in modern medicine. In an attempt to expand one area for development, Graeme Taylor has shown how contemporary thought in psychoanalysis can provide a new disease model for psychosomatic illness. Taylor's review is meticulously researched and presented and provides a logical and relevant basis for further work. Most notable is his clear
presentation of a psychobiological perspective, integrating behavioral and neurobiological research with object relations theory.

Taylor begins with a historical review of psychoanalytic approaches to psychosomatic illness, suggesting that the latter grew out of the former. Early studies tried to discern a personality type which correlated with classic psychosomatic illnesses, such as asthma and hypertension. Franz Alexander regarded conflict and dependency as correlates of illness. In the 1950s and 60s, disillusionment with psychoanalytic approaches led to studies which looked at stress and bereavement in generating a susceptibility to illness. Work along the lines of Hans Seyle’s general adaptation syndrome largely replaced psychoanalytic research during this period. To counter this perception, Taylor refocuses discussion on the more recent notion of “alexithymia,” a clinically derived concept which he defines as “a specific disturbance in affective and symbolic functions which renders [the] communicative style sterile and colorless.” According to Taylor, this term has reintroduced discussion of the role of psychoanalytic therapy for psychosomatic illness. In his opening chapters, Taylor clearly presents the successes and failures of each of these developments along with numerous illuminating cases.

In Parts II and III, Taylor discusses current research in object relations theory and neurobiology, respectively. The mother-infant relationship, which he describes as a regulatory factor in the child’s homeostasis, is shown to be highly relevant for research purposes. Animal studies have linked separation from the mother to variations in heart rate, sleep, growth, and thermoregulation. Recent attempts to create bridges of thought between neurobiology and psychoanalysis are discussed with respect to dream theory, and here the author seems to stray. He provides an extensive review of neurobiological studies on sleep and dreaming and ties in early psychoanalytic theory, but he does not pursue the issues sufficiently. Little is said about how sleep research—which has become the most popular area of mind-brain discussion—can bridge enormous epistemological dilemmas between psychoanalysis and neurobiology. Moreover, how is this research relevant to psychosomatic illness? Taylor’s point here is elusive and leaves too much extrapolation to the reader.

Gathering together a rich history of research and theorizing on psychosomatic illness, Taylor approaches the last chapters stressing the potential contribution of object relations theory. As stated above, an understanding of the mother-infant bond, taken here as the most original interpersonal relationship, is crucial for studying predispositions to illness. A truly biopsychosocial approach to psychosomatic illness can only gain from such an understanding, and psychoanalysis is one logical tool of study. Although the author’s overall work is successful in defining a role here for psychoanalysis, he falls short—despite a gallant effort—in establishing a clearly “new” model for disease. He has merely pointed in one direction and provided numerous signposts.

The groundwork for any psychobiological or biopsychosocial model is difficult to construct, because there are endless considerations from each direction. Despite this fact, Taylor has done a masterful job in bringing together many diverse threads of research, thought, and theory. Consequently, he has defined a unique and viable role for psychoanalysis in the study of psychosomatic medicine.
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