EDITORIAL

With this issue, the section on Book Reviews in the Bulletin *is revived. Why should one have book reviews? Aren't these not simply biased opinions of insiders who either want to make clear that* they *would have been in a better position to write the book under review—as they obviously know more on the subject—or far too general descriptions of a highly specialised treatise the reviewer had no chance to grasp fully? Is it possible to publish a really critical review on a book at all? Or does a review necessarily have to be 'friendly' and full of praise for the efforts, and achievements, of the author(s)? Are book reviews not inevitably always too late? Should they be rather "previews"? What is the purpose of having the same book reviewed several times in different periodicals? Is one not enough? Or do different opinions contribute towards a more well-rounded picture on the book?*

After all, having read the review, if you want to judge its quality you have to read the book.

Opinions on this are, as always, very welcome.

—MM