

opened in Britain in 1972. The reader develops an appreciation for the many issues involved in establishing and maintaining shelters, including an examination of the differing philosophical and organizational approaches to the development of shelters within and between the two nations.

An analysis of the characteristics of the state as an organizational institution is followed by an examination of the dynamic relationship between the battered women's movement and the state in the arena of public policy and social change. Each nation gives different emphasis to the disease model and to the social status of women in society in public debate about battered women. They likewise differ in their legislative responses. Similarly, an examination of the justice system as a vehicle for social change, and in particular its response to women over time, including battered women, is made.

Chapter 7 addresses the impact of what might be called the disease model (the therapeutic society) to explain battered women and violent men and suggests alternative ways of looking at what is basically a problem of social order. The traditional therapeutic model is contrasted to the pro-feminist approach. The remaining two chapters examine the role of research in making social policy recommendations and summarize the challenges that emanate from the changing status of women in Britain and America.

This book is extremely comprehensive and informative. Many forensic psychiatrists might not have the interest to pursue a study of the battered women's movement to the scholarly depth of this volume. Those who do will be richly rewarded with a lesson on the political and social structure of our society and on the many issues involved in influencing social change.

#### ERRATUM

Galley proofs of the article "Treatment Boundary Violations: Clinical, Ethical, and Legal Considerations" (Bull Am Acad Psychiatry Law 20:269-88, 1992) by Robert I. Simon, M.D., were not sent to the author because of an oversight. As a consequence, typographical errors in the galley proofs remained uncorrected. In addition, the case of *Omer v. Edgren* cited in the text was misspelled. We regret these errors.