

Books Reviewed

PSYCHIATRY AND ETHICS: INSANITY, RATIONAL AUTONOMY, AND MENTAL HEALTH CARE. Edited by RB Edwards. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books, 1983. 609 pp. \$29.95

Reviewed by Walter W. Winslow, MD

Mental health professionals are repeatedly confronted with an array of ethical and legal issues ranging from the individual rights of patients to criminal responsibility. This book is a collection of recently published articles from various journals in psychiatry, psychology, law, medical ethics, and philosophy, all of which have a central focus on the fundamental ethic of rational autonomy with respect to relationships with mental patients.

Included in this collection are essays from experts who have been front-runners in this field for over a generation. Professor Edwards is to be commended for putting together such a series of essays which are so timely and relevant to the activities of many mental health care professionals. A significant fringe benefit is the Suggestion for Further Reading section which appears at the end of each of the ten major divisions of this comprehensive volume.

I recommend this volume to all mental health professionals as background. As they struggle with issues of autonomy and rights of patients, this book will provide a comprehensive reference point.

HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH: A HANDBOOK FOR INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARDS. By RA Greenwald, MK Ryan, and JE Mulvihill. New York: Plenum Press, 1982. 286 pp. No price available.

Reviewed by Ernest D. Prentice, PhD

In response to the Federal Regulations 45CFR 46, every major institution in the United States involved in human subject research has organized an Institutional Review Board (IRB). Each IRB operates according to the federal regulations. However, within the framework of these regulations, IRBs are free to develop individual operational procedures. This freedom, in turn, has generated a great deal of uncertainty over the question of what constitutes an optimal method of IRB operation. Consequently, IRBs vary greatly in administrative structure and, more importantly, are often inconsistent with respect to ethical and scientific review. *Human Subjects Re-*