

POLITICS & GOVERNMENT

thor could not force Lorenzo to read it. The young lord received a gift of greyhounds on the day a messenger took *The Prince* to the Medici palace; the hounds intrigued him far more than questions of governance. Only when the republicans regained power would *The Prince* get attention—as a turncoat's antirepublican creed.

Thus, Machiavelli "outfoxed" himself with a Machiavellian deception that even his fellow republicans could not penetrate, Dietz concludes. In the end, the archschemer himself saw the problem: "If I do sometimes happen to say what I think, I always hide [the truth] under so many lies that it is hard to recover."

Drug Screening?

"Screening for Drug Use: Technical and Social Aspects" by John Grabowski and Louis Lasagna, in *Issues in Science and Technology* (Winter 1987), National Academy of Sciences, 2101 Constitution Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20418.

Drug screening is now becoming standard practice among U.S. government agencies, backed by a National Institute on Drug Abuse survey indicating that at least 37 million Americans take illicit drugs at an annual cost in lost productivity of \$34 billion. The Pentagon has tested its employees for a decade. Newcomers include the FBI and the CIA. In the private sector, more than a third of the *Fortune* 500 and many small companies now have antidrug programs. Average cost per individual test: \$35 to \$50.

Grabowski, a psychologist formerly with the National Institute on Drug Abuse, and Lasagna, dean of the School of Medicine at Tufts University, wonder if this war on drugs makes sense. Will its "cumulative health care and social costs" eventually parallel the estimated loss in productivity?

The question of "social costs" arose last year, when the Plainfield, N.J., fire department locked its employees in the firehouse for a surprise urine sample collection. The firemen sued. A federal district court found "harassment, coercion, government excesses . . . and intrusions in constitutional rights." But surprise attacks may be the only way to catch dedicated users; urine can be altered to foil testing procedures (one entrepreneur has developed a "safe" urine sample), and some narcotics, like cocaine, can go up the nose Sunday and be out of the body Monday.

Grabowski and Lasagna anticipate a major unforeseen medical consequence of screening: Employees who take drugs for medical or behavioral conditions such as anxiety, seizures, eating disorders, or insomnia may test "positive" and be forced to explain their condition, inviting discrimination by both bosses and peers. Fear of being fired or demoted could also deter people from following prescribed treatments.

The authors suggest that selective, regular testing of those civilians in critical positions (pilots, bus drivers, locomotive engineers, stockbrokers, surgeons, anesthesiologists) has more "practical and historical merit" than does universal testing. Unless it can be clearly justified to the public, any drug screening will encourage cheating and yield nothing but "mistrust"

POLITICS & GOVERNMENT

and "a perception of intrusion."

They offer a final point: Drug use is "endemic" human behavior. The few cultures lacking naturally occurring psychoactive substances have taken them up "with a vengeance" when exposed. The slogan "Just Say No to Drugs" may only add to the allure of alcohol. With an estimated toll of \$66 billion in annual lost human productivity, alcohol already does almost twice as much damage as drugs.

Noisier Senators

"Senate Styles and Senate Decision Making, 1955-1980" by Barbara Sinclair, in *The Journal of Politics* (Nov. 1986), Univ. of Fla., Gainesville, Fla. 32611.

Dale Carnegie thought you had to win friends to influence people, and in the U.S. Senate of the 1950s, you did. It was an intensely "clubby" place. Freshman senators tried to apprentice themselves to influential senior members, become experts on matters before their committees, and generally make themselves liked. Senior senators practiced consensus-building—doing favors and winning friends.

Today's senators rarely practice what Dale Carnegie taught. Indeed, according to Sinclair, a sociologist at the University of California, Riverside, members rarely know one another well, and cordial personal relations are no longer deemed essential. "If I'm not the most popular guy in the Senate," remarked Howard Metzenbaum (D.-Ohio) a few years ago, "well—I can live with that." Most senators can, notes Sinclair.

The senators' new style of "unrestrained activism" has given rise to "generalists": interlopers who offer amendments to many bills reported out by other members' committees. In the 84th Congress (1955-57), few senators did so. By the 90th (1967-69), two-thirds of the senators en-



During the 1950s, some senators got bad marks for hamming it up on the Senate floor. Today, a majority are "unrestrained activists"; the floor has become a showcase for the ambitious. Cartoon by Mark Alan Stamaty.