

British Lords mount drug legalization offensive

by Mark Burdman

During the month of August, the British establishment, through the agency of members of the House of Lords and the main media representatives of the City of London, has radically escalated its campaign for the legalization of drugs, worldwide. The propaganda for drug legalization has been massive in Great Britain itself, while it has also been picking up steam in key Commonwealth countries, including Canada, Australia, and New Zealand.

Not surprisingly, one finds, at the center of such efforts, leading collaborators of George Soros. These individuals make no secret of the fact, that their policy is aimed, strategically, at forging a Europe-wide pro-drugs bloc against the United States, and against the Clinton administration's aggressive "War on Drugs" approach.

Huxley, Mill, and Mandeville

The propaganda barrage of the drug legalizers began to go into high gear on Aug. 9-10. Over that weekend, a five-year-old child was killed by drug gangs, in the English constituency of Bolton Southeast. The emotions unleashed by that tragic killing were cynically exploited by the drug lobby, to blame the child's death on the fact that drugs are illegal. Were this "prohibitionist" approach to end, crime would diminish, so the argument went.

On Aug. 10, the parliamentarian for the district in which the killing occurred, Brian Iddon, was interviewed on the U.K.'s "World This Weekend" television show. He argued for the creation of a Royal Commission on drug policy, and for the launching of a national debate on the subject. Iddon's appeal received extensive media coverage over the next couple of days.

Joining him on that show was Arnold Trebach, head of the Drug Policy Foundation in Washington, D.C. Trebach denounced the work of White House drug policy adviser Gen. Barry McCaffrey, as a failure, and advised Britain's Tony Blair government not to carry through on its Election Manifesto promise, to appoint a drug tsar for Britain.

There was more to those comments, than met the eye. The Drug Policy Foundation is financed by Soros, as one of many pro-drug projects that Soros is bankrolling in the United States. On Dec. 2 of last year, General McCaffrey had joined with a number of leading individuals in the U.S. "War on Drugs" effort, in testimony before a U.S. Senate committee, to denounce Soros for his role in financing referenda in Cali-

fornia and Arizona, favoring the decriminalization of drugs.

The promotion of Trebach on British TV was consistent with another pattern. In August, the London *Economist* and *Financial Times* have been going to great lengths, to defend Soros's speculation activities, against criticism of him by Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad and other Southeast Asian leaders, who are concerned with protecting their currencies against the havoc being wrought by Soros and other speculators. The pro-Soros advocacy was kicked off by an editorial in the *Economist* on Aug. 2, demanding a halt to attacks on "rogue speculators" by Mahathir and others.

The *Economist* is the principal mouthpiece for the drug legalization lobby, a function it has played for years. (See, for example, Mark Burdman, "Queen Knights Head of Pro-Drug 'Economist,'" *EIR*, Feb. 3, 1989.) Indeed, in its Aug. 16 edition, in a news article profiling the growth of drug-linked crime in Britain, the British magazine called once again for legalization of drugs.

As for the *Financial Times*, its pro-Soros efforts reached a crescendo, with an editorial entitled, "In Praise of Speculation." During July-August, the newspaper has published a series of commentaries by "libertarian/free market" fanatic Martin Wolf, arguing in favor of drug legalization.

On July 29, Wolf began the first part of his series, by quoting the late Aldous Huxley, author of *Brave New World*, and an enthusiastic user of hallucinogenic drugs, in favor of his argument: "Most men and women lead lives at the worst so painful, at the best so monotonous, poor and limited, that the urge to escape, the longing to transcend themselves, if only for a few minutes, is, and always has been one of the principal appetites of the soul." Wolf also quoted from the 1859 essay "On Liberty," by British East India Company propagandist John Stuart Mill, to back up his case.

Wolf followed up two weeks later, with a piece insisting that *all* drugs, and not just the "soft" ones like cannabis, should be legalized, because "vices must be tolerated." In private discussion, Wolf acknowledges that his argument derives, in significant part, from that 18th-century Anglo-Dutch pervert Bernard Mandeville, who promoted that "private vices" must be tolerated, since they necessarily lead to "public virtues."

The *Economist* and *Financial Times* pieces have been complemented by letters to the editor, news articles, etc., in such liberal papers as the *Guardian* and *Independent*, promoting the drug legalization agenda.

Lords for drugs

A major push for legalization is emanating from the House of Lords. The key figure in this, is one Lord Nicholas Rae, a medical practitioner. Two of his collaborators in the House of Lords are Lord Moyne, a scion of the influential Guinness family (drinks, financial operations); and Lord Mancroft, a reformed drug addict, who has recently been in the middle of a controversy surrounding the collapse of a “cyberspace bank” in Antigua, the which was being used for money laundering by Russian mobsters.

These men are backed by a cluster of Lords who stepped forward last year, to “robustly” protest the Clinton administration’s decisive action against Colombia’s cartel-run government of Ernesto Samper Pizano. Taking the lead in urging Her Majesty’s Government to “make representations” to the Clinton administration over its pressure upon the Samper government, with which Britain has such “excellent relations,” was Viscount Montgomery of Alamein (son of the late Field Marshal Montgomery), and Baron Pearson of Rannoch.

These *Samperista* Lords were also eager, at that time, to get the House of Lords to “debate” the value of legalizing drugs, while pushing the legalizers’ familiar line that it is the United States that is *the cause* of the global narcotics trade, with the lie that, as Viscount Montgomery lisped, “demand is what is causing the whole drug problem . . . and the biggest demand is something that exists in the U.S. *It comes from* the U.S., which is the world’s largest area of consumption. So, you only have supply because there is demand; it’s not the other way around.”

Two organizations

Lord Rae is involved with two organizations promoting the drug legalization offensive. One is the Drug Policy Review Group, composed of police officers, doctors, lawyers, judges, economists, clergy, and academics. For the past ten years, the DPRG has worked, on a confidential basis, drawing up reports for the European Commission and performing other functions. It has now decided to go public. It is headed by Dr. John Marks, a consulting psychiatrist. Marks is quite well known in Britain, for having pioneered a program in needle exchanges and free distribution of heroin in Liverpool. The DPRG wants to change Britain’s laws on drugs.

The other group that Rae is patronizing, based in Bristol, is called Transform, and draws upon the work of various lawyers, psychiatrists, and businessmen.

The drug legalizers are counting on support, inside the Blair government, from Clare Short, minister for overseas development, who has gone on record supporting “drug decriminalization.” In the Conservative Party opposition, they are counting on support from Alan Duncan, the chief adviser to the recently elected head of the Conservative Party, Margaret Thatcher protégé William Hague. Duncan is a pro-free trade maniac, who, in his former incarnation, worked for wheeler-and-dealer Marc Rich, the fugitive from U.S. justice.



An addict in Frankfurt, Germany. While human lives are ruined by the drug scourge, British oligarchs call for a “more relaxed” treatment of narcotics by the authorities.

‘The British view has always been different from the American’

As per the referenced House of Lords’ diatribe against American policy in Colombia, the following Aug. 15 comments, from a leading British proponent of the legalization of drugs, should be highlighted:

“American policy has always been the driving force behind prohibition of drugs, arguably since the beginning of this century. The beginning of the prohibition of heroin and other dangerous drugs was the treaty agreement in Shanghai, just before World War I, with the United States. Until that time, drugs were legalized, and that approach was supported by the British Empire. After all, we had fought two Opium Wars, to allow the export of opium from India, into China.”

This individual stressed: “British policy has always been much more relaxed than the American policy. Opium was very widely consumed in Britain, in the late nineteenth-early twentieth century, and not least by the upper classes. . . . The whole general attitude to drugs in British society, and among the British elites, has been quite remarkably *relaxed*. It only changed, here in Britain, in the 1980s, and that was partly due to the influence of the United States. There is a very widespread view, in Britain and *other* European countries, that the American model of prohibition, with the tendency toward violent invasions of other countries, military-style actions, police raids, etc., is *very destabilizing*. The historical British view has always been very different from the American, and my estimate, is that it will diverge even more now. I suspect this new government here, will probably be more open to changes in policy, and will take a much more relaxed approach.”