

Japanese methods will not work in the United States. (Jumping jacks and push-ups have not been a big hit.) But most will,

and it is these methods, not Japanese culture, that account for Japan's enviable industrial success.

SOCIETY

How We Won The War on Drugs

"Against the Legalization of Drugs" by James Q. Wilson, in *Commentary* (Feb. 1990), 165 E. 65th St., New York, N.Y. 10022.

Most Americans probably don't remember the nation's last war on drugs. We won it.

Wilson remembers it well. In 1972, he was appointed chairman of President Richard M. Nixon's National Advisory Council for Drug Abuse Prevention, charged with drawing up a strategy to combat what was at that time the nation's leading drug scourge: heroin. (Today, he is a political scientist at UCLA.) Then, as now, some prominent authorities—notably, Milton Friedman, a conservative Nobel prize-winning economist—argued that a war against drugs was futile, unjust, or too costly. They favored legalization.

But they were ignored, and the war against heroin was a reasonable success. Today, says Wilson, we have half a million heroin addicts, the same number that we had in 1972. What happened? Heroin lost its appeal to young people as they saw more and more users suffer overdoses, hepatitis from dirty needles, and other mishaps. In surveys of Harlem youths who had sampled the drug, two thirds pointed to health risks as a reason for steering clear of it, and nearly all cited a bad experience with the drug.

While such street-level "drug education" was important, Wilson says, government efforts to restrict the supply of heroin—by reducing Turkish opium

cultivation and shutting down heroin-processing plants in and around Marseilles—were crucial. As Friedman and other critics had predicted, new sources soon developed (chiefly in Mexico). But Wilson believes that the scarcity and high price of heroin during 1973–75 broke the momentum of the heroin epidemic.

Back in the 1970s, important evidence that the price and availability of a drug strongly influences use came from a study of Vietnam veterans by Lee Robins of Washington University. She found that most of the veterans who had been regular heroin users overseas gave up the habit once they returned home. Why? Because the drug was much harder to get and laws against its use were more strictly enforced.

At least one country *did* try legalization. In 1960, there were 68 known British heroin addicts, and all of them received legal, prescribed doses of the narcotic. By 1968, the number had grown 30-fold, to 2,000—and there were probably many more unregistered addicts, since most clinics by then were offering methadone, not heroin.

If the United States had legalized heroin, Wilson believes, it would now have several million addicts rather than several hundred thousand. If it legalizes cocaine, which he considers a more destructive drug, the results could only be worse.

Searching for The Leisure Class

"The Work Ethic—Then and Now" by Seymour Martin Lipset, in *The Public Interest* (Winter 1990), 1112 16th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, and "Time Squeeze" by John P. Robinson, in *American Demographics* (Feb. 1990), 108 N. Cayuga St., Ithaca, N.Y. 14850.

Two of the great complaints of our era are that Americans don't work as hard as they used to and, paradoxically, that life has

grown unbearably hectic. Obviously both complaints can't be justified; according to these articles, neither is.

Alarms about the decline of the work ethic are old hat, notes Lipset, a Stanford political scientist. In 1495, the English Parliament passed a law regulating working hours, worrying that workers were "late coming unto their work, early departing therefrom." Today's complaints sound much the same, but the fact is that the average work week has remained about 39 hours per week since 1945. Add school and commuting time, however, and it has jumped from 40.6 hours in 1973 to 46.8 hours.

This is not the way prophets of the affluent society expected things to turn out. Americans were supposed to work less and play more. One reason they have not, according to Lipset: "Almost all surveys indicate that the vast majority of Americans—over 80 percent—are satisfied with their jobs." Indeed, 85 percent say they would continue to work even if they had enough money to retire. And the proportion of people who say they work primarily for the paycheck is declining; one's job is now an outlet for self-expression.

That brings us to the fabled workaholic. According to Robinson, a University of Maryland sociologist, the proportion of Americans who say they "always feel

rushed" rose from 25 percent in 1965 to 32 percent in 1985. Diaries kept by his 5,000 subjects show that those who complain about feeling harassed do in fact spend more hours at work than the average person does. But they also spend more time caring for their children and bathing and grooming themselves. They devote more time to watching and participating in sports, and they spend more time on organizational activities (except church-going). They spend much *less* time in front of the television, and somewhat less time sleeping, eating, or visiting friends.

Demographics may explain part of the modest increase in the number of people who feel harried. Those most likely to feel that way are aged 35 to 54, a group whose numbers are increasing and whose members are especially busy. Another explanation Robinson offers is that Americans now have a much bigger menu of leisure activities available to them, and thus much less time just to sit around and do nothing.

Although Robinson does not say so, feeling busy is also a sign of the times. The group whose complaints about being pressed for time rose most sharply—from five percent in 1965 to 21 percent in 1985—was "nonemployed" men.

Petticoat Jeff

"Intemperate Men, Spiteful Women, and Jefferson Davis: Northern Views of the Defeated South" by Nina Silber, in *American Quarterly* (Dec. 1989), 701 W. 40th St., Balt., Md. 21211.

One month after General Robert E. Lee surrendered at Appomattox on April 9, 1865, the *New York Times* reported that Jefferson Davis, the former president of the Confederacy, had donned one of his wife's dresses and fled into the woods of southern Georgia to elude federal troops. After he was captured (soldiers spotted his boots beneath his skirt, according to the *Times*), he was said to have complained indignantly about his pursuers' efforts to "hunt down women and children."

That legend—along with the willingness of northerners to believe it—exemplified northern attitudes towards southern men after the Civil War, writes Silber, a historian at the University of Delaware. North-

erners depicted southern men as an emasculated, cowardly lot in order to assert the superiority of their own way of life and to establish "ideas of northern control over a weakened and submissive South."

The assault on southern manliness actually had roots in the antebellum era. The industrialization of the North, Silber argues, fostered new attitudes toward masculinity. The measure of a man in Yankeeedom was his ability to get ahead, and that called for an emphasis on restraint and self-control. Southern men, and southern aristocrats in particular, seemed, as one northerner wrote, full of "pride, indolence, luxury, and licentiousness." The old masculine virtue of honor now seemed