

PROLIFIC POLICY WONKS

Think Tank Thoughts

From the mouths of Fellows

Joseph D. McNamara

General Colin Powell once said a soldier's duty is to kill the enemy. The first duty of the police is to protect human lives including the lives of people unfortunate enough to be addicted to drugs. In addition, every week somewhere across the country there is another police scandal related to the drug war—corruption, brutality and even armed robberies by cops in uniform as well as consistent violations of civil rights by officers who feel that anything goes in a war. It is not surprising that when law enforcement officials spend two days analyzing the drug problem, they conclude that the drug war is futile. If the president and the Congress take the time to reflect on drugs the way the top cops did, they too would support a study of how to find peace and an honorable end to the war on drugs.

McNamara is a former San Jose police chief and is currently a research fellow at the Hoover Institution.

Michael J. Boskin

To be sure, the defense cuts—plus the Clinton team's deception of shoving non-defense items into the defense budget—are how Clinton funds his social agenda. Reversing these policies means that other federal spending must be subject to even tighter control to move toward a balanced budget. That won't be easy. But we should all be pointing out to President Clinton—and other politicians of both parties—that Californians will not accept a radical defense downturn that endangers our national security and which has the byproduct of wreaking far more havoc on California's economy than necessary.

Boskin chaired the council of economic advisers during the Bush administration and is currently a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution. This statement was excerpted from a longer article originally published by the Los Angeles Times.

Thomas Sowell

A vast amount of legal, political, academic and journalistic activity depends on the grand dogma of our age, that groups would be evenly or randomly distributed in statistics for all kinds of institutions if it were not for discrimination. Those who believe this dogma are not expected to supply a speck of evidence and those who challenge it can supply all the evidence they want without making a dent.

Thomas Sowell is a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution. This statement was excerpted from a longer article that originally appeared in Forbes magazine.

draws a six-figure salary as a "director emeritus" even while he shovels abuse at his successor. In recent months, Campbell has blasted Raisian in a series of letters to a number of publications for allegedly raising too little money, spending too much money and not keeping up the record of progress that Campbell, who served as chairman of President Reagan's Intelligence Agency Oversight Board during the Iran-contra mess, says he left in place.

Despite the criticism, or perhaps because of it, Raisian seems intent on crafting a new image for the institution. During a nearly two-hour interview, the former aide to Ronald Reagan's indicted but later absolved labor secretary, Ray Donovan, patiently rejected the oft-hurled accusation that Hoover is little more than a partisan Republican organization operating under the cover of a house of scholarship.

In rejecting the charge, Raisian has his work cut out for him: a cursory look at 10 recent stories on Hoover from papers like the *New*

York Times and the *Wall Street Journal* contained eight instances when the word "conservative" was appended to Hoover's name, as in "meanwhile, at the conservative Hoover Institution . . ." Even more telling, the Hoover's own publication, "The Hoover Collection," which contains reprints of op-eds penned by Hoover scholars during the last year, is loaded with trenchant criticism aimed at targets like President Clinton, congressional Democrats and former Democratic gubernatorial nominee Kathleen Brown. Remarkably, the 85-page book of "nonpartisan" work contains not a single sentence critical of any living or dead Republican official.

"I think that is more a function of the fact that most of the focus tends to be on executive-branch politics," Raisian counters. "If you go back a bit more, before last year, I'm sure you'll find many examples where our scholars have been critical of Republicans," he says.

And to be sure, there are a few such examples, such as the time

Continued on next page