

the fact that it is simply a reprinting of papers written to be presented orally. Some of the papers seem to be too brief to cover their subjects adequately while others are far too lengthy and detailed with respect to matters of only remote relevance to the law. In this respect the volume invites comparison with the publication of the American Bar Association entitled "Computers and the Law", the 2nd edition of which was published in 1969. This covers much the same area but is composed of papers written specifically for publication and carefully edited. With respect to some areas it is not as detailed as the University of Sydney seminar but it does cover the entire field somewhat more systematically and completely.

The present volume would have been improved if it had been subjected to rigorous editing which required some of the discussions to be expanded and others to be abbreviated. The average lawyer will probably find the volume somewhat hard going if he sits down to read through all of the papers presented here. However, if he will skim those that are pedestrian and take the trouble to study those that explain the arcane aspects of scientific and statistical methodology he will be the wiser for his efforts. The volume is certainly worth inclusion in a lawyer's library, both as an introduction to the subject and as a reference work for the topics that it does cover. However, in view of the nature of the subject matter, this is a work that should be repeated in five years, and periodically thereafter. The principal suggestion that can be made for the next seminar on this subject is that there be more strict editorial direction so that less time and space are spent on the practical details of peripherally relevant topics and more time and space are given to discussions such as the excellent discussions of evidentiary and jurimetric problems in the present volume.

LEE LOEVINGER*

Proceedings of the Institute of Criminology, University of Sydney, No. 3, 1968: Drug Abuse Seminar. University of Sydney, Faculty of Law, 1969, pp. 117. (\$4.00).

The 1968 Seminar on Drug Abuse is one of a series of seminars that have been held at the University of Sydney sponsored by the Institute of Criminology. The papers presented at the Drug Abuse Seminar of 1968 have been reproduced in pamphlet form and provide an informative glance at some professional attitudes toward drug abuse as well as some indication of the direction Australia is taking to eliminate drug abuse. The authors represent the disciplines of medicine; law (including law enforcement, advocacy and decision making); and sociology. The different concerns and thought processes evident in the several papers, if brought together, could be useful in any effort to evaluate the overall problem of drug abuse and to direct available resources in the most productive ways. In fact, there remains a critical need to tie the information and ideas into a single rational whole. Someone with the training and intellect to understand the pharmacology, the physical and psychiatric effects, the social stresses and the legal format is sorely needed to clearly define the problem, develop a scheme of priorities and suggest solutions. Until a unified approach to the entire problem of drug abuse is prepared I fear that unrelated bits of information and ideas will not serve well, if at all. [See Joel Forte, "The Pleasure Seekers" (1969)—The

* Attorney, Washington, D.C.; member of the Standing Committee on Law and Technology of the American Bar Association.

best attempt yet to deal knowledgeably with all aspects of society's drug problems.]

A brief summary of the collected papers, prepared by Professor K. O. Shatwell, carefully reviews the seminar and its several predecessors held in 1966. Professor Shatwell outlines the areas of discussion including education, legal controls and treatment. He particularly notes the general tendency to encourage drug use for many minor medical problems, leading to a "drug-oriented" society and the suggested remedy—education. Professor Shatwell's summary is an excellent review of the seminar. Further direct review is redundant. However, a brief critique of the seminar, the attitudes portrayed and the information and ideas promulgated might be useful.

First, drug abuse terminology is a "turned-on", "turned-out" bag of psychedelic distortion. Linguistic confusion and contradiction is a principal culprit in many educational programs as well as some new drug legislation.

Drug terminology and drug classification is undoubtedly difficult. Nonetheless, careless use of terms causes endless confusion and needless disagreement. For example, "drug use" may denote undesirable personal social activity but without further description the dimensions are unknown. The badness remains subjective and speculative. "Dangerous drugs", may mean anything but is technically meaningless since all drugs are potentially dangerous; "drug abuse" is used to cover a multitude of concepts but should properly be limited to excessive use of a drug resulting in damage to health and social adjustment; "addiction" is variously used to include any or all of the concepts of psychological dependence, physical dependence, tolerance and withdrawal symptoms. Finally, the most pernicious of all classifications is the legal classification which places drugs within or beyond the ambit of criminal control without scientific or logical basis.

In the drug abuse seminar pamphlet A. A. Bartholomew specifically decries the difficulty posed by legal definitions while Judge M. F. Farquhar states:

Our problems in sentencing are bedevilled, too, by the grouping of most drugs the use of which creates an offense and of most restricted prescribed substances into statutory sections invoking like penalties. The enactments seem not to attempt in any real way to distinguish, say, the narcotics with their joint physical and psychic dependence coupled with a marked tolerance characteristic from, say, the Cannabis-type drug with moderate to strong psychic dependence but with an absence of physical dependence resulting in characteristic abstinence syndromes when the drug is discontinued and with no evidence of tolerance [p. 95].

Second, statistics and evaluations based on statistics are uncertain. The preface to the papers notes that valid statistical information was lacking in 1966. The same uncertainty existed in 1968 and probably still in 1972. Detective Sergeant C. R. Abbott states, "It is difficult to appraise the drug situation in New South Wales on the meagre fragmented information available." [p. 90]. Further, the reports from treatment centres such as Wistaria House and the Drug Referral Centre, while extremely interesting, are not particularly useful in gauging the scope of the drug problem nor in accurate evaluation of the specific programs. The statistics have a substantial subjective basis and, as noted, the setting up of a control group is almost impossible [p. 50]. The drug problem is described by broad estimation on the basis of related (not necessarily relevant) statistics and individual suspicions.

Third, there is failure to re-evaluate first principles about drug abuse. The fundamental logic of existing approaches is not challenged. Perhaps the basic premises are sound. But professionals that exchange expertise within the protective structure of an academic seminar should at least question those

premises. What drugs are addictive? And addictive in what sense? What drugs have what effect upon the physical and psychological health of people? And most critical and germane of all in proceedings of the Institute of Crimology: should the criminal law be used as an instrument to control drug abuse? Professors Morris and Hawkins in "The Honest Politician's Guide to Crime Control" (1970) [p. 8] maintain that as to the use of drugs "... the invocation of the criminal process is wholly inappropriate".

The general spirit of drug seminars is to superficially describe drug abuse problems and existing programs of rehabilitation followed by a statistical evaluation of success; to describe legal actions, followed by more statistics, and finally to consider legal problems, e.g. search and seizure and sentencing, but without re-evaluation of the total process. Can criminal law ever meet the problem of drug abuse? Is there actually a problem of drug abuse or is excessive drug taking only symptomatic of underlying social and personal maladjustment? Can society afford to support some drug abuse rather than forcing potentially less desirable alternatives? Are there potentially less desirable alternatives? Can society justify and tolerate a happy self-destructing drug abuser or must all people be socially productive and conformable to make us comfortable?

Failure to re-evaluate basic premises or to question conventional actions assures responses by well-meaning front-line drug foes that must eventually take a high position on lists of the ludicrous. Only recently a new phrase was popularized in Northwestern United States—"Wyoming Green". A mountain of grass in Wyoming was reputed to have marijuana-like qualities. The hippies were wonderstruck and the police were panicked. The most recent public announcement is that "Wyoming Green" is not botanically or chemically the same as marijuana and therefore not illegal. Further it was noted that "Wyoming Green" is neither depressant nor hallucinogenic although the particular hill is reputedly being patrolled by the local police. The pot users' traditional mistrust of official pronouncements assures a continuous flow of visitors to the notorious mountain for personal on-site tests. A most bizarre and ludicrous play continues. And to what end?

If medical and pharmacological clarity is not obtained, if relevant scientific evidence is obscured by irrelevant statistics, and if criminal law persists as the principal actor in drug abuse control, the composite total of official action should create a sufficient negative impact to assure a steady growth in drug abuse for many years to come.

LARRY M. ELISON*

Principles of Australian Administrative Law (4 ed.), by D. G. Benjafield and H. Whitmore, Australia, Law Book Co. Ltd., 1971, xxxviii + 367 + (index) 9 pp. (Cloth bound, \$10.75; limp cover, \$8.75).

It is a pleasure to welcome the fourth edition of this leading textbook, which started life as a pioneering work by Professor W. Friedmann, and is now produced by the distinguished team of Professors Benjafield¹ and Whitmore.² In common law countries administrative law is a very rapidly developing subject, and it is a mark of the success of this edition that the authors have managed to bestride the relevant laws, not just of Australia, but of

* Professor of Law, University of Montana.

¹ LL.B. (Syd.), D. Phil. (Oxon), Professor of Law, University of Sydney.

² LL.B. (Syd.), LL.M. (Yale), Professor of Law, School of General Studies, Australian National University.