

On the right

The need for more drugs

By WILLIAM F. BUCKLEY

A professor at the University of California charged last week almost parenthetically that 10,000 deaths from malaria in Ceylon in 1968 can be attributed to the late Rachel Carson, whose book "The Silent Spring" brought on the crisis of ecology, to be distinguished from the ecology crisis. The latter is what we all know about. The former is what happens when one's concerns for the ecology become fanatical. When this happens, for instance, you find yourself saying that it is better to prohibit the use of DDT, because the chemical fallout may poison our grandchildren's clams, than to kill the mosquitoes who may give malaria to our grandchildren's grandparents like tomorrow. The need for balance in the ecological wars is very great.

As also in the related world of drugs. We are, one gathers, very soon to hear that the big scare of a few years ago about cyclamates was exaggerated. It isn't known — or, more accurately, I do not know — whether this means that further research has discredited the research that discredited cyclamates. Or whether a balanced application of the cost-benefit ratio, as the scientists call it, establishes

that whereas for everyone who drinks 50 cyclamated Tabs per day and runs the risk of contracting cancer, there are 10,000 who take less than 50 cyclamated drinks per day who are scheduled to die from whatever it is that avoirdupois does to you, which might not have happened if you drank Tabs rather than Cokes.

Professor Stephen de Felice wrote last year a book called *Drug Discovery — The Pending Crisis* (Medcom Press), in which he records his dismay over the paralysis in drug development caused largely by the Kefauver-Harris Bill that came in ten years ago after the thalidomide crisis. It was then that a few deformed children were born, as the result of the use of that drug. What followed, Dr. de Felice says, in his writings and speeches, was something akin to hysteria. Moreover, the intellectual basis of the laws that transformed the Federal Drug Administration into an agency for suppressing scientific discovery, is incoherent. Much more is known about the deleterious effects of alcohol, say, or tobacco, than was ever suspected about cyclamates. "The effort now required to evaluate a new investigational drug in man would eliminate the Pasteurs, Jenners, Ehrlichs, and Domagks from our

drug discovery system," says Dr. de Felice, pointing out that for all the explosions in drug discovery during the forties and fifties, which should have resulted in exponential progress during the sixties, very little of radical therapeutic nature was in fact discovered during the sixties.

Professor Milton Friedman recently called attention to a cost analysis of the FDA's program done by Professor Sam Peltzman of UCLA, in which the professor attempted by ingenious means to put a dollar value on the net result of the harsh anti-innovative legislation. He began by conceding all over the place that the human tragedy of a deformed child cannot be measured in dollar terms. But it can be measured in terms of a child who was scheduled to die an awful death, but was cured by drugs.

It is his assumption — which by the way Dr. de Felice challenges as being too optimistic — that the FDA cannot stop progress for very long, that brilliant new drugs will flow in from other quarters of the world. But he insists that there is at least a two year time lag directly traceable to the FDA's fanaticism.

Summarizing his findings, Friedman writes, "Peltzman estimates that post-

poning the introduction (of tuberculosis drugs) two years would have meant about 45,000 additional deaths from tuberculosis, and twice that number in additional persons with tuberculosis out of a much smaller population than today's." And then one of those unexpected, lugubrious developments one tends not to notice. The drug industry, one would think, would become a fierce lobby for experimentation, and the development of new, profitable drugs. It isn't. The reason: the FDA's stodginess, impartially applied, discourages the competition equally. Under the circumstances, the drug makers can plod along, primarily as producing companies, working old formulae. Presumably they will awaken when a foreign scientific firm comes in with a patented drug that captures the market.

Mr. Friedman permits himself, as is his mode, to consider the wisdom of abolishing the FDA. But he believes absolutely in the wisdom of repealing the 1962 amendment to the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, as should everyone who is scheduled to suffer or die from some disease or other whose abatement is as yet undiscovered, and that means, for the sake of caution, everyone.

(C) 1973 Washington Star Syndicate Inc.

Outrider

Against pornography

By GARRY WILLS

Some lawyer or other on the TV recently attacked the Supreme Court's decision on pornography as an assault on the view that sex is a natural part of life to be "accepted." Defending pornography is, therefore, defending sex.

That's nonsense, of course. Pornography is not the same as sex; it is in many ways opposed to it. For one thing, it is substitute sex — sex not so much directly engaged in, but spied upon. That is what makes the euphemism "adult" books or films so comical. Pornography resembles the small-child prurience of those unable to participate themselves in what tickles their curiosity.

Everyone has met the dreary male type who boasts of his "conquests." These boasts are not sex itself, but a form of pride and competitive envy feeding af-

terward on sex; degrading the object of the conquest to puff up the boaster's ego. Pornography goes even farther toward this dissociation of sex itself from opportunistic uses of it. Pornography gives its viewer the boast without the conquest, the prurient after-glimpse borrowed and passed around, the simulacrum serving for the thing.

Since pornography is dissociative in this way, it slides easily toward those demonic side-elements of sex that feed perversions — voyeurism, homosexuality, bestiality, masochism, exhibitionism, sadism, occultism, all the weirder and more twisted mysticisms that come about when men believe in a simple and innocent "nature." Those who get a borrowed kick from pornography often need kinkier, progressively more daring variations to excite them. It is probably impossible to

prove that pornography actually causes any of these things all by itself. But social acceptance of pornography gets translated into an increased acceptability for these things, in varying degree.

Since pornography draws on the intimate experiences of others, it encourages the invasion of privacy; and in its more blatant forms it becomes an invasion of privacy, a forcing of things on people who consider them distasteful. The whole level of decorum and humane civility has been lowered in New York City, over the last ten years or so, by the crude aggression on sensibilities that pornography fosters. In this sense, one does not need to prove that pornography leads to other, further evils. It is evil itself. It is not so much "corrupting" as corruption.

No, it will not do to pretend you are

defending the wholesomeness of nature when you praise pornography. Animals do not dress up in human skin and whip each other, or go in large audiences to watch one species try to copulate with a different kind. Man, when he tries to imitate the lower animals, just manages to become something lower than they are — it is one of the prices he pays for being man. Sex, since it represents the point where man merges in some way with blind natural drives, proves emphatically that the burden of reason is not to be blind.

But if defending pornography is not the same thing as defending sex, attacking pornography is not the same thing as agreeing with the Court. The Court's decision in this matter was unfortunate. (That calls for further treatment later.)

(C) 1973, Universal Press Syndicate

Letters

Red pusher

I think it's time everyone knew that RED CHINA IS THE LARGEST DRUG PUSHER IN THE WORLD! The evidence and statistics which support this charge are so well documented that they are absolutely irrefutable. In particular, there are three references which I believe your readers will find most enlightening. These are: *The Peking Connection: Communist China and the Narcotics Trade* by Allen Brownfeld. This was also printed up in the Congressional Record of August 17, 1972 by D. Waggoner — *Maoist China and Heroin* by Dr. Stephan Possony which is published by the Republic of China in Taiwan — and *The Chinese Communist Plot to Drug the World* which is published by the World Anti-Communist League with charts, maps, lists, pictures, and statistics.

These and other similar studies establish some rather disturbing realities in regard to this drug trade. For one thing, they indicate that over a million acres in Red China are devoted to the production of opium from which heroin is taken. This operation is under the direct control of Chou En Lai. Also, they show that there are at least 9 heroin refineries run by the government which produce this narcotic hell for export. Thus about 70 percent of the world's opium is grown in Red China and between 65 and 80 percent of the high grade heroin sold on the international market comes from Red China and

couldn't be supplied from another source.

So, where do they send it? Well, you name it. They set up business where ever they can create a demand. For the last 7 or 8 years they were providing high grade heroin for our soldiers in Vietnam at the lowest prices so they could addict as many

as possible. But of course their main target is the United States itself and the enlargement of the vast trade they've started here. This naturally brings us to the question of what we are going to do about it? Should we compliment the Maoist regime on its "agrarian reforms"

and give them more foreign aid — ignore the situation in the hope that it will somehow fade away — or use some common sense and initiative to cut the Red China connection!

Sincerely yours:-

Richard Paxton
Los Angeles, California

TRUE, WE HAVE BREAD ON THE TABLE, KATRINA, BUT REMEMBER THE POOR AMERICAN PEASANTS WHO HAD TO PAY FOR IT!