

Why drug legalization advocates should be foiled

by Gretchen Small

Dealing with Drugs: Consequences of Government Control

by the Pacific Research Institute for Public Policy, Ronald Hamowy, ed.
Lexington Books, Lexington, Mass., 1987
\$40.00 hardbound, 385 pages.

Dealing with Drugs is must reading—for law enforcement officials preparing files on the operations of the narcotics business before striking at the enemy. This book is not the “scholarly work” its editors would have its readers believe, but a weapon in the dope mob’s war against civilization. Its assignment, to undermine the morale of government and the public, until surrender to the dope mafia is accepted.

Work on this book began at the Pacific Research Institute for Public Policy in San Francisco, California in 1984. Those involved in the project described the Institute’s task force on drugs as the flagship program in a strategy to legalize narcotics use, production, and trade within the United States by 1990. Once the U.S. capitulates, legalizing the dope business in the rest of the world will follow rapidly, these people argue.

Progress achieved under the Carter administration toward making legalization “thinkable,” was buried by President Reagan’s promise to carry out a war on drugs, members of the project explained in 1985. Thus, we have adopted a new timetable for legalization, they said. Now, our job is to convince the public that war is futile, that the drug epidemic too large, and the drug mafia too powerful to be defeated. If that is accomplished by the end of Reagan’s second term, then there is a good chance that, no matter who is elected in 1988, narcotics will be legalized before the next administration ends.

Dealing with Drugs, finally released in 1987, marshals every argument the legalization lobby has ever designed to overturn the war on drugs. Knowing the thinking behind the book’s publication, I began reading through its pages with an eye on my counterattack, concerned to identify some new, devious argument upon which the war on drugs might flounder.

None were found. If useful at all, *Dealing with Drugs* is a reminder that our nation has failed to crush the narcotics empire, not because of its great power or sophistication, but through our own cowardice. Try as they might to appear “scholarly,” none of the authors is able to hide the fact that they, personally, are committed drug-users, angrily attacking any who would argue that mankind has a higher purpose in existence than that of seeking individual “pleasure.”

Recognizing the enemy’s propaganda

The reasons given in favor of “complete abandonment of all prohibitory laws” against drugs are familiar:

- It costs too much to run a war on drugs. This is a favorite argument of the Milton Friedman types, who estimate the value of human life through “cost-benefit analysis.”

- Anti-drug programs historically have been motivated by racism. Politicians who hated the Chinese sought “to protect whites from what was commonly regarded as a loathsome Oriental vice,” or hated marijuana because they disliked Mexicans. This script is lifted straight from British imperial history books, which justified the Opium Wars by arguing that the British were simply defending the inherent love of addiction of “Orientals.”

- “Drug control has become a ‘new and subtle form of U.S. intervention abroad.’ ” This argument, the main thesis of **Jonathan Marshall** in his chapter, “Drugs and United States Foreign Policy,” is the favorite line of South America’s communists and narco-terrorists these days. Marshall credits

the ex-president of the Colombian Association of Financial Institutions, Ernesto Sámper Pizano, as the source of this formulation. That places the "Made by the Mob" label squarely on this argument: Sámper Pizano admits freely he accepted money from coke czar Carlos Lehder, when he was treasurer of the 1982 presidential campaign of Alfonso López Michelsen.

● "Some drugs make people feel good." This is how **Randy E. Barnett** began his chapter on "Curing the Drug-Law Addiction," but, in fact, it is the argument most repeated throughout the book. These fellows don't mean *some*, they mean *all* drugs, beginning with those they call "bread-and-butter drugs" (alcohol, cannabis and opiates, which **Norman Zinberg** assures us "can be depended upon to give a consistent but relatively flexible effect"), and extending to those killing U.S. high-school students by the dozens every day.

"The jury is still out on PCP," Barnett writes; "If you're having trouble getting a feel for PCP, you're in good company. . . . One-third of PCP users say its unique, another third say it's like the hallucinogens or marijuana, and the last third isn't sure. . . . More research is needed." Contributor **Thomas Szasz** admits heroin is more dangerous than aspirin, but only because "it gives more pleasure to its users than does aspirin [and] is therefore more likely than aspirin to be taken for the self-induction of euphoria." **Arnold Trebach** berates the media for creating the myth that crack (a cocaine-derivative which kills brain cells at first use like a lobotomy) is a new national disaster!

The argument in defense of LSD, however, takes the cake. **Lester Grinspoon** and **James Bakalar**, writing on "Medical Uses of Illicit Drugs," cited the following testimonial of one woman as an example of the "impressive case studies" which show how LSD can cure neurosis:

I found that in addition to being, consciously, a loving mother and a respectable citizen, I was also, unconsciously, a murderess, a pervert, a cannibal, a sadist, and a masochist. In the wake of these dreadful discoveries, I lost my fear of dentists, the clicking in my neck and throat, the arm tensions, and my dislike of clocks ticking in the bedroom. I also achieved transcendent sexual fulfillment.

Watch out—these two advocate "systematic, publicly controlled experimentation" in drug use, among other things, to help us all overcome our fear of dying.

● Crime statistics can be lowered radically by dropping the estimated 25 million regular users of cocaine and marijuana from the lists of criminals, **Ronald Hamowy** argues in his introduction. Again, this is a rehash of Milton Friedman's *Free to Choose*.

What's the conclusion of all this?

Hamowy announces the time has come to "accommodate and adapt ourselves to drug use."

Arnold Trebach's chapter on "The Need for Reform of International Narcotics Laws" elaborates: "Compromise"

with the drug trade, will save us from suffering the "casualties . . . necessary to win final victory." Forget the idea that the narcotics epidemic can be defeated through a "World War II-style" alliance against "evil people," he says. It won't work, because drug laws do not "seek to repel foreign invaders," but "seek to prevent our neighbors . . . from obtaining chemicals and leaves that they wish to use on themselves to feel better."

The time has come for "balanced adjustments and compromises." Nations "can start thinking in terms of specific

Try as they might to appear "scholarly," none of the authors is able to hide the fact that they, personally, are committed drug-users, angrily attacking any who would argue that mankind has a higher purpose in existence than that of seeking individual "pleasure."

compromises and adjustments . . . A small group of drug-law reformers has been gaining strength in the United States and in other countries recently. If they can achieve some political stature as a centrist and moderate force . . . if enough good people . . . come forward soon enough . . . our current war against drugs can be averted and *the war itself ended.*"

That point, where I have added emphasis, is indeed the bottom line of what the mafia seeks.

How the Mont Pelerin Society figures in

Should this book be taken seriously? The answer is an emphatic "Yes."

Consider **Robert J. Michaels's** analysis of "The Market for Heroin Before and After Legalization." This chapter reveals the kind of planning that has already begun toward legalization, and the kind of economic conditions under which mass addiction could be considered "productive."

Standard market analysis must be applied to heroin, Michaels writes, with the premise that "to organize a firm of any kind is not a trivial task. . . . In an illegal firm, a complex organization will be more costly to achieve than in an equivalent legal enterprise."

If legalized, brand names and advertising for "the product" could be introduced. "Legalization with advertising would stabilize quality and lower price. . . . One expects

that the legal market will be characterized by a lower equilibrium price, higher output, and more dependable quality. . . . Additionally, we do not know (but have reason to suspect) that large-scale commercial production will lead to cost-saving innovations. . . . The illegal market wastes incredible amounts of economic resources, apparently only because of illegality, rather than monopoly."

Michaels acknowledges that "there is a good likelihood that both the price-lowering and quality-certifying effects of advertising will operate in ways that increase use." This will be *useful*, he argues, because drugs enhance productivity of labor, as opium addiction allowed Chinese coolies to withstand back-breaking labor.

The period between the Civil War and World War I, says Michaels, "was the period of America's greatest sustained proportional economic growth," precisely because "it was characterized by low unemployment rates, legal opium, and a large population of habitual users."

These nuts hold leading positions in American academia today. Michaels teaches economics at California State University at Fullerton. Szasz is professor of Psychiatry at the State University of New York at Syracuse. Zinberg teaches psychiatry at Harvard Medical School, and is director of psychiatric training at the Cambridge Hospital in Massachusetts. Grinspoon is an associate professor of psychiatry at Harvard. Trebach heads American University's Institute on Drugs, Crime and Justice, and serves as a consultant to the U.S. Department of Justice. And so it goes for the other six contributors.

An investigation into the Pacific Research Institute leads us to the financial interests behind the drug legalization project: the Swiss-based Mont Pelerin Society and the crowd of rabid free-enterprisers which it has spawned across the globe. Mont Pelerin leader Friedrich von Hayek sits on the board of the Pacific Research Institute, along with James Buchanan, the economist who won a Nobel Prize for his work in putting together the Gramm-Rudman program to bury the U.S. economy.

The Pacific Research Institute is just one of over a dozen institutes set up from Israel, to Great Britain and Peru with the aid of an outfit in San Francisco called the Atlas Foundation. Atlas, founded by a British Mont Pelerin member Anthony Fisher, boasts on its advisory board such notables as J. Peter Grace, William Simon, Milton Friedman, and the American Enterprise Institute's Michael Novak.

Each of these institutes (Lima's Institute for Liberty and Democracy, London's Adam Smith Institute, etc) is dedicated to promoting the legalization of the "underground economy," and an end to government "interference" with all economic activity.

While it is true that legalizing the "underground economy" would free for use an estimated \$500 billion generated annually through the drug trade, it would be a mistake to think that economic greed is the prime motivation of these people. No, it is the very premises of Judeo-Christian civili-

zation itself which they seek to overturn. As they repeatedly tell us, John Stuart Mill wrote the creed that they follow in their drive to impose "a truly liberal society" upon us.

Throughout *Dealing with Drugs*, the *right* of the individual to commit evil, if that is "an activity they deem desirable," is demanded. Szasz's concluding chapter, "The Morality of Drug Controls," provides the crowning glory of this argument. Drug use, like free sex, is justified as a "primal act of defiance of God's authority," Szasz writes, despite "traditional Judeo-Christian cultures." The "right to drugs" is guaranteed in our Constitution.

"According to the formula made famous by the Caesars, the masses of mankind need only two things: *panem et circenses*, bread and circuses. This is still true. Today, farms and factories supply us with our 'bread,' while drugs and drug controls give us our 'circuses.'" That view of man, expressed by Szasz, captures the slavery in which we all will live, if these libertarians succeed.

LaRouche: Treat drug lobby as enemy force

In his 1985 proposed War Plan against drugs in the Western Hemisphere, Lyndon H. LaRouche specified the legal grounds upon which the legalization lobby can, and must, be treated as an enemy force. His argument was premised on "the principle that collaboration with the drug-traffic or with the financier or political forces of the international drug-traffickers, is treason in time of war." The relevant articles of the 15-point plan specify:

"11. The primary objective of the War on Drugs, is military in nature: to destroy the enemy quasi-state, the international drug-trafficking interest, by destroying or confiscating that quasi-state's economic and financial resources, by disbanding business and political associations associated with the drug-trafficking interest . . . and by detaining, as 'prisoners of war' or as traitors or spies, all persons aiding the drug-trafficking interest. . . .

"14. In addition to corruption of governmental agencies, the drug-traffickers are protected by the growth of powerful groups which advocate either legalization of the drug-traffic, or which campaign more or less efficiently to prevent effective forms of enforcement of laws against the usage and trafficking in drugs. Investigation has shown that the associations engaged in such advocacy are political arms of the financial interests associated with the conducting of revenues from the drug-traffic, and that they are therefore to be treated in the manner Nazi-sympathizer operations were treated in the United States during World War II."