

useful. That one feels that this is a real shortcoming of the book reflects the rapid pace of progress in this field and the consequent urgent need for up-to-date discussion of the ethical issues involved.

ART CONNOLLY
*Medical Student,
 Oxford Medical School,
 John Radcliffe Hospital, Oxford*

Law on Poisons, Medicines and Related Substances

P F C Bayliss, 104 pages, London, Studies in Law and Health Service Management, Ravenswood Publications, 2nd ed, 1986

In 1851, the legislature took its first small step in the control of dangerous substances, many of which were then freely available to the public either as constituents in commercially-sold cleansing agents or for pest control, or in themselves as tonics sold for human consumption. The Arsenic Act restricted the use of poison for criminal purposes, an abuse which in the light of recent developments in the illegal use of drugs and medicines generally, has now fallen into insignificance.

The present law on the subject distinguishes between drugs, poisons and medicines, the lines between the different categories being drawn by statutory definition, and not by causal distinctions reached by a layman's common-sense approach. The result has been, for example, that some substances formerly known as poisons have now been absorbed into one or another of the other two categories, with particular regulations applying to the statutory definitions.

The modern law is to be found basically in three statutes passed between the years 1968 and 1972 – the Medicines Act 1968, the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971 and the Poisons Act 1972. As in most enabling legislation, the detailed control of the matters affected lies in the hands of the minister concerned, who issues his directives in the form of statutory instruments which have the force of law, and are subject to the ultimate veto of parliament should they overstep the mark. Finally, the reports of important decisions reached in the High Court provide the precedent on matters not fully defined in the statutes, these decisions being binding (for example, the case of *R V Watts* 1984, which is referred to in Dr Bayliss's book).

One of the most valuable features of the book is the lists of statutes, statutory

instruments and cases provided for those who wish to refer to original sources, although adequate summaries may be found in the text. Since the legislation contains the inevitably prosaic minutiae of the administration of dangerous substances, these summaries make hard reading, but this is a book primarily for reference and, as such, is comprehensively done. The people for whom the book is written, namely, anyone working in the health service as a doctor, dentist, pharmacist, midwife or administrator (not forgetting students) cannot be reasonably expected to absorb it all, although it is unfortunately true that a false step taken along the line between factory and patient may incur a penal sanction. It is for those responsible for the administration involving the final destination of a potentially dangerous substance to provide the proper guidance.

For those whom it may concern, then, Dr Bayliss's study explains the nature and purpose of the legislation and summarises the gist of its content. Although much of this is of a pedestrian nature, the writer does not fail to give a degree of prominence to what he considers (rightly) to be the ultimate purpose of the legislation, and he is particularly concerned with the way in which it aims to protect innocent people suffering, or likely to suffer, from the results of any perverted use of the substance in question, for example from the illegal administration of an insufficiently tested drug, or from the illegal use of a drug in order to assist a criminal act such as a rape or an unauthorised abortion.

A proper place is given in the book to the problem of drug addiction, and it appears to the reviewer slightly odd that the word 'drug' does not appear in the title.

The book contains little of direct interest to the ethicist since this was not its purpose, rather it is a clear statement of the law as it stood in 1986.

MRS SHELAGH J GASKILL
*Solicitor,
 Dibb Lupton,
 6 Butts Court,
 Leeds LS1 5JX*

Cross-currents: Interactions between Science and Faith

Colin A Russell, 272 pages, Leicester, £9.95, Inter-Varsity Press, 1985

The author is Professor of the History of

Science and Technology at the Open University, where he has been involved in the production of three courses related to the theme of this book, which have been taken by several thousand students. So it is not surprising that it is strong on history. Anyone not well acquainted with the theme will profit both from the text and the interesting bibliography. In particular one will learn a good deal of the relation of the scientific achievements to the religious beliefs of great figures of the past from Boyle and Newton to Einstein and Rutherford. Most attention is given to physics. Russell is well aware of the problems of compression, but even so the chapters covering the twentieth century are highly concentrated. After a brief look at Lorenz, Desmond Morris, E O Wilson and Lynn White (the historian) the book rather peters out with a chapter on Faraday.

A mythology has developed on the historical relations between natural science and Christian theology to the effect that it has been a tale of continual warfare between the two, resulting in a series of unsuccessful rearguard actions by theology. Russell has no difficulty in showing that in fact there were varying reactions from both sides. He makes the interesting suggestion that much of the opposition to Darwinism from both scientists and Christian leaders was because it was perceived to be subversive of the social order, a sociological insight which there is no space to document or follow up.

Russell writes eirenicly, but he writes from a type of evangelical theological point of view which requires comment. He wants to vindicate the importance of 'Biblical principles' for the prosecution of natural science, and thus to stress the importance of the Reformation, and to destroy the negative image often attached to Puritanism. (In my view this is because it is treated as too monolithic a phenomenon.) Russell is not a Fundamentalist, as that term is usually understood, the chapter on geology and the Flood makes that clear but, unless one accepts a conservative evangelical theological position, the philosophy and theology underlying the book is not satisfactory. It takes no account of the factors of cultural relativity in human thought as a fundamental issue with which modern theology has had to reckon. The Bible is treated as if it speaks in a uniform way. No account is taken of different theologies which have been held at different times related to the same Biblical data. It is not realised that repeating the same Biblical and