

## American Association for the Advancement of Science

*Science* serves its readers as a forum for the presentation and discussion of important issues related to the advancement of science, including the presentation of minority or conflicting points of view, rather than by publishing only material on which a consensus has been reached. Accordingly, all articles published in *Science*—including editorials, news and comment, and book reviews—are signed and reflect the individual views of the authors and not official points of view adopted by the AAAS or the institutions with which the authors are affiliated.

**Publisher:** Richard S. Nicholson

**Editor:** Daniel E. Koshland, Jr.

**News Editor:** Ellis Rubinstein

**Managing Editor:** Patricia A. Morgan

**Deputy Editors:** Philip H. Abelson (*Engineering and Applied Sciences*); John I. Brauman (*Physical Sciences*)

## EDITORIAL STAFF

**Assistant Managing Editor:** Monica M. Bradford

**Senior Editor:** Eleanor Butz

**Associate Editors:** Keith W. Brocklehurst, Martha Coleman, R. Brooks Hanson, Barbara Jasny, Katrina L. Kelnner, Edith Meyers, Linda J. Miller, Phillip D. Szuroni, David F. Voss

**Letters Editor:** Christine Gilbert

**Book Reviews:** Katherine Livingston, *editor*; Susan Milius

**Contributing Editor:** Lawrence I. Grossman

**Chief Production Editor:** Ellen E. Murphy

**Editing Department:** Lois Schmitt, *head*; Mary McDaniel, Patricia L. Moe, Barbara P. Ordway

**Copy Desk:** Joi S. Granger, Jane Hurd, MaryBeth Shartle, Beverly Shields

**Production Manager:** James Landry

**Assistant Production Manager:** Kathleen C. Fishback

**Art Director:** Yolanda M. Rook

**Graphics and Production:** Holly Bishop, Julie Cherry, Catherine S. Siskos

**Systems Analyst:** William Carter

## NEWS STAFF

**Correspondent-at-Large:** Barbara J. Culliton

**Deputy News Editors:** Roger Lewin, Colin Norman

**News and Comment/Research News:** Mark H. Crawford, Constance Holden, Richard A. Kerr, Eliot Marshall, Jean L. Marx, Joseph Palca, Robert Pool, Leslie Roberts, Marjorie Sun, M. Mitchell Waldrop

**European Correspondent:** Jeremy Cherfas

**West Coast Correspondent:** Marcia Barinaga

## BUSINESS STAFF

**Circulation Director:** John G. Colson

**Fulfillment Manager:** Ann Ragland

**Business Staff Manager:** Deborah Rivera-Wienhold

**Classified Advertising Supervisor:** Karen Morgenstern

## ADVERTISING REPRESENTATIVES

**Director:** Earl J. Scherago

**Traffic Manager:** Donna Rivera

**Traffic Manager (Recruitment):** Gwen Canter

**Advertising Sales Manager:** Richard L. Charles

**Marketing Manager:** Herbert L. Burklund

**Employment Sales Manager:** Edward C. Keller

**Sales:** New York, NY 10036; J. Kevin Henebry, 1515 Broadway (212-730-1050); Scotch Plains, NJ 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); Chicago, IL 60914: Jack Ryan, 525 W. Higgins Rd. (312-885-8675); San Jose, CA 95112: Bob Brindley, 310 S. 16th St. (408-998-4690); Dorset, VT 05251: Fred W. Dieffenbach, Kent Hill Rd. (802-867-5581); Damascus, MD 20872: Rick Sommer, 11318 Kings Valley Dr. (301-972-9270); U.K., Europe: Nick Jones, +44(0647)52918; Telex 42513; FAX (0647) 52053.

**Information for contributors** appears on page XI of the 30 June 1989 issue. Editorial correspondence, including requests for permission to reprint and reprint orders, should be sent to 1333 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005. Telephone: 202-326-6500. **Advertising correspondence** should be sent to Tenth Floor, 1515 Broadway, New York, NY 10036. Telephone 212-730-1050 or WU Telex 968082 SCHERAGO, or FAX 212-382-3725.

## The War? Program? Experiment? on Drugs

After reading the headlines and editorial columns of newspapers on the President's new drug program, the average Martian visiting this planet would conclude that people are very indignant about the drug problem. No amount of money, no amount of discipline, no amount of sacrifice is too much to require for the successful waging of this war. On the platitudes, everyone is marching in step.

When it comes to the specifics, however, it is quite clear that no one is willing to give up a single prerogative, or even worse, a single preconception, in order to attack drugs. But because no one admits to such provincialism, it becomes necessary to create criticisms that will effectively compromise the program into nothingness and thereby save face. How is this done?

Easy. First of all, you announce that you are vigorously for the program, whatever it is, but that it does not go nearly far enough. Heroic person that you are, you are willing to sacrifice untold millions of other people's money to fight drugs. There is, of course, no intention of coupling the demand for money with increased taxes. When this is clarified it is necessary to come up with the proposal that all "discretionary" money in the budget be cut across the board and diverted to the new program. If increasing taxes is unlikely, then the notion that farmers, scientists, environmentalists, and lawyers would willingly cut their programs to contribute to a dubious war on drugs is even more unlikely.

The second way you undermine a program is to demand that certain massive and impossibly utopian ideals must be accomplished first. Drug use, you say, comes out of poverty, lack of education, and unhappy personalities, and these underlying ills must be addressed. Concentrate first on improving education and second on eliminating poverty. Finally, suggest a massive subsidy of psychiatry so that we can understand human nature. Improving education, eliminating poverty, and understanding human nature are certainly desirable goals. To imply, however, that they are preconditions to starting a drug program is a misdirection that helps none of them.

The drug program recently unveiled by the Executive Branch is far from perfect. It could use more money and it could use more boldness, but it is at least a useful experiment, and should be labeled as such. A program implies one knows the answer. An experiment suggests that this is one of several possible approaches. A program invites self-defeating compromise. An experiment should be designed to help the problem while at the same time producing data that are useful and convincing.

The program's emphasis on street crime is a direction that has been suggested by capable social scientists. It is a law and order approach and may be the last such attempt that has a chance of making a dent in the drug problem before the country reluctantly decides that prohibition for drugs is no more effective than it was for alcohol. If the country were mature enough for social experiments, we might institute tough laws for 5 years and then try legalization for another 5 years, collect the data on the two outcomes, and base a final policy on the results. Because that is politically impossible, then the best approach in the current climate seems to be to try punishment plus directed education as an experiment of the "get tough" category.

The program has a certain amount of consistency, and it is a plan for which the Executive Branch, which must direct it, has enthusiasm. A minimal requirement would seem to be ongoing analysis of the program's degree of success, to decide whether to continue in the same direction or to seek new directions if the program is not succeeding. The appropriate time to expand the program would be when that feedback starts coming in. The program should contain an educational component on drug use and evaluate the problems of poverty, minorities, and civil rights in relation to drug use, but it should not be compromised by ancillary requirements relating to the general ambience of society.

The experiment will be acceptable only if accompanied by a scientific detachment that says, "The get-tough experiment is under way. If it fails, legalization is next." The country is faced today with a situation similar to prohibition. Those who read history know well how ineffective the law was in that case. But many say drugs are different from alcohol, so let's do the experiment and collect the data.—DANIEL E. KOSHLAND, JR.