

and ruled by fear—fear of being “put down” by others, of weakness, of bodily injury, and of getting caught. They are excessively concerned with health and body image. They are extremely pretentious and unable to tolerate any criticism. Lying is congenital and comes as naturally as breathing. Offsetting their ruthlessness are erratic shows of sentimentality. The criminal insists on think-

ing he's a “good person” and does not consider himself to have done anything bad. “Right” is “what's right for him at the time.” And on and on. The picture that emerges from volume 1 is of a group who are incredibly active, hypocritical, walking a tightrope on the edge of reality, conning, lying, manipulative, amazingly resourceful, evasive, secretive, alert, unpredictable, and virtually devoid

of any redeeming human qualities. Criminals are a bundle of paradoxes—“I can change from tears to ice in a minute,” boasts one. The authors contend that the apparent contradictions arise from attempts by normal (“responsible”) people to understand criminals according to their own value systems.

So, they say, the only way to understand criminals is to abandon pre-

## Briefing

---

### Support Growing for a Department of Education

---

The big push is now on for the creation of a separate Department of Education, called for by Jimmy Carter in his campaign and explicitly mentioned in his State of the Union address on 19 January.

Federal expenditures in education have tripled since the mid-1960's, and the time appears riper than it ever was for the establishment of an education department. Carter is the first president to actively promote the idea. A bill introduced by Senator Abraham Ribicoff (D-Conn.) has 57 cosponsors and there are reportedly 100 House members solidly behind the idea.

It is not yet clear what specifically the President wants, although it has been reported that he favors a broad new Department of Education and Human Development, which would entail massive transfers of programs—including manpower training and juvenile justice—from all over the government.

The Department of Education outlined in the Ribicoff bill would be somewhat less extensive, but among the programs it would take over are HEW's Office of Civil Rights, its Head Start program, the Agriculture Department's child nutrition programs, the HUD college housing loan program, the schools run by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the educational directorate of NSF, and the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities. (The NFAH would be guaranteed a degree of autonomy, but “the artists are raising hell,” says a Senate staffer.)

The proposed changes are obviously going to be stirring up an awesome array of political battles. The Administration is divided—HEW Secretary Joseph A. Califano, Jr., has said he'll go along with anything the President wants, but he's al-

so made no secret of the fact that he wants education to stay where it is. He thinks it needs to be linked with health and welfare and that there are too many people reporting directly to the President already.

In the education community, organizations representing higher education have not gotten terribly worked up over the proposed change, although they tend to be supportive. The two big teachers' unions, the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), oppose each other on the issue. The NEA supports the Ribicoff bill and believes education will get better funding if it is uncoupled from the standard uncontrollable budget items that make up 70 percent of the HEW budget. Besides, says an NEA spokesman, “We're the only major country in the Western world that doesn't have a ministry of education.” The AFT is said to oppose the new department because the NEA is for it, but an AFT spokesman said it was feared a secretary of education would not have much status and that a separate department would be a “moving target” for budget cutters.

More on the Administration stand is expected to be revealed shortly in a special presidential message to Congress on education.

---

### HEW Soon to Ban Use of Prisoners in Research

---

The time seems to be at hand where virtually all biomedical and behavioral research on prisoners in this country—except that designed for the well-being of the subject—will come to an end.

The practice has declined dramatically over the past decade, particularly since the Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research swung into action in 1974.

In 1976 the Bureau of Prisons declared a prohibition on research in federal prisons. And on 5 January the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare issued regulations based on commission recommendations. The proposed rules prohibit HEW from supporting such research “if the research did not represent minimal risk research on incarceration or on penal institutions, and was not intended to improve the health of individual prisoners.”

HEW secretary Joseph Califano has also directed the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to develop regulations that would extend the principle to new drug testing done by pharmaceutical companies.

The policy has been so long in the works that it seems unlikely to affect the operations of the drug companies who have conducted the bulk of prison research. The commission found that prison research was only conducted in seven states anyway; more recently, an FDA spokesman told *Science* that drug companies were conducting prison research in only three locations around the country.

Although institutionalized populations are desirable for phase I drug testing (clinical dose-ranging studies with healthy humans) a spokesman for the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association says drug companies have by and large found other satisfactory subjects among their employees, medical students, and college students. He also says some companies are finding great pools of willing volunteers among students in Europe.

The prime reason for cessation of prison testing is the belief, now very widely held, that true “informed consent” is impossible to obtain in a prison setting. The only real opposition to the new policy has come from prisoners themselves. Many resent the loss of a potential income source as well as the chance to do something worthwhile.

Constance Holden