

# JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES



MARY H. FERGUSON  
Editor

SHELLY ELLIOTT  
Production Editor

NICOLETTE TRIANTAFELLU  
Copy Editor

EDWARD G. FELDMANN  
Contributing Editor

SAMUEL W. GOLDSTEIN  
Contributing Editor

BELLE R. BECK  
Editorial Secretary

DAVID BOHARDT  
Director of Publications

L. LUAN CORRIGAN  
Assistant Director of Publications

## EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

JOHN AUTIAN

HERBERT A.  
LIEBERMAN

NORMAN R.  
FARNSWORTH

DAVID E. MANN, JR.

WILLIAM O. FOYE

GERALD J. PAPARIELLO

WILLIAM J. JUSKO

EDWARD G. RIPPIE

The *Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences* (ISSN 0022-3549) is published monthly by the American Pharmaceutical Association (APhA) at 2215 Constitution Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20037. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing office.

All expressions of opinion and statements of supposed fact appearing in articles or editorials carried in this journal are published on the authority of the writer over whose name they appear and are not to be regarded as necessarily expressing the policies or views of APhA.

**Offices**—Editorial, Advertising, and Subscription: 2215 Constitution Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20037. All Journal staff may be contacted at this address. Printing: 20th & Northampton Streets, Easton, PA 18042.

**Annual Subscriptions**—United States and foreign, industrial and government institutions \$60, educational institutions \$60, individuals for personal use only \$30; single copies \$5. All foreign subscriptions add \$5 for postage. Subscription rates are subject to change without notice. Members of APhA may elect to receive the *Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences* as a part of their annual \$80 (foreign \$85) APhA membership dues.

**Claims**—Missing numbers will not be supplied if dues or subscriptions are in arrears for more than 60 days or if claims are received more than 60 days after the date of the issue, or if loss was due to failure to give notice of change of address. APhA cannot accept responsibility for foreign delivery when its records indicate shipment was made.

**Change of Address**—Members and subscribers should notify at once both the Post Office and APhA of any change of address.

**Photocopying**—The code at the foot of the first page of an article indicates that APhA has granted permission for copying of the article beyond the limits permitted by Sections 107 and 108 of the U.S. Copyright Law provided that the copier sends the per copy fee stated in the code to the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 21 Congress St., Salem, MA 01970. Copies may be made for personal or internal use only and not for general distribution.

**Microfilm**—Available from University Microfilms International, 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106.

© Copyright 1980, American Pharmaceutical Association, 2215 Constitution Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20037; all rights reserved.

## SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION IN FORMULATING PUBLIC POLICY

In the August issue of this journal, we published an editorial relating to the publicity and controversy surrounding the issuance of a report, entitled "Toward Healthful Diets," by the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council. Although our editorial touched on the significant recommendations concerning human diet, health, and nutrition contained in the report, we directed our principal focus at the alleged bias and conflict-of-interest charges which were widely discussed in the public press.

We also expressed our sorrow at the damage this brouhaha was having on the public image of the prestigious sponsoring organization. In fact, the editorial was entitled "Maintaining NAS-NRC Credibility," because of our emphasis on this aspect and our gratuitous suggestions as to how the NAS-NRC might reorient its committee appointment process to minimize future reoccurrences.

The NAS President, Philip Handler, responded to our comments and we are pleased to publish his letter in the *Open Forum* section of this month's journal. His letter serves to bring out several points that were not included in our editorial—either (a) because of our inadvertent oversight, or (b) because those points were personally unknown to us. In the first category, Dr. Handler correctly points out that even those scientists who have disagreed with the report recommendations "have not found the Board's work or its assessment unsound or unscientific." In the second category, Dr. Handler explains that the problem of apparent bias "cropped up through news reports that stopped short of the full truth" by pointing out that some members were identified with one side of the issue but neglecting to point out that other members were equally identified with the other side of the issue. Hence, Dr. Handler tells us, the Board did, in fact, have the balanced "mix of people" that we urged in the conclusion of our editorial.

Referring to the technical dispute concerning the FNB report, President Handler poignantly states in his letter, "The scientific disagreement has turned not on the evidence but on what advice to offer the public at large under these shaky circumstances."

Whether, as scientists, we like it or not, and whether or not we feel that is how decision-making should operate, this last observation of Dr. Handler's reflects more and more how the system of public policy is functioning in today's world.

Indeed, in early October a symposium—and by sheer coincidence also sponsored by the NAS-NRC—was held on the subject of "The Role of Scientific Information in Decision-Making." The announcement publicizing the conference explained that 10 years ago words like benzene, DES, 2,4,5-T, and chlorofluorocarbons were found only in chemistry textbooks. But today they are seen in front-page stories in newspapers across the country. All of these terms became familiar for the same reason—the government has restricted the use of these substances based on scientific evidence of adverse effects.

The symposium further brought out that the pertinent scientific information is only a single dimension in a total process that involves many considerations including legal, economic, environmental, political, statistical, and various other factors.

We feel that it is important for all of us to recognize that such is the total process by which public policy decision-making is performed today. Indeed, this is how the process currently operates under the best of circumstances; often there is no scientific input at all and the decision may simply turn on one or two of these other factors, such as the political considerations.

At any rate, the day is now gone when public policy decisions are determined solely by scientific data and technical findings. Moreover, leaving our bias for science aside for the moment, this writer is inclined to conclude that this latter development is a good thing. For all its virtues, science provides too narrow a perspective, and the best decisions are going to be those that embody all considerations—including, but not limited to, the scientific aspects.

—EGF