CONCLUSION

If opponents of the drug war want to have an impact, rather than focusing on the perfect policy or waiting for revolutions in the public's thinking, we have to reach out to new people, find working compromises, and advance concrete proposals. . . . At the same time, if it is true that any successful challenge to the drug war, even on a relatively narrow issue, threatens an overly rigid paradigm, so much the better. We can't count on overthrowing the generals with modest peace offerings. But in the very strange world of U.S. drug policy, it might just happen.

Dave Fratello
"The Medical Marijuana Menace"
Reason Online, March 1998

I do not have the answer to the drug-policy dilemma other than to keep moving ahead pretty much as we have been. . . . If we are going to make policy for this difficult and tragic problem with simplistic solutions that can fit into 30 second TV sound bytes, then I would definitely prefer a real drug war, with swift and certain punishment of casual drug users, to a drug legalization surrender.

Joel W. Hay
"The Harm They Do to Others: A Primer on the External Cost of Drug Abuse," in Melvyn B. Krauss and Edward P. Lazear, eds., *Searching for Alternatives: Drug-Control Policy in the United States* (1991).

A Blueprint for Peace: Ending the War on Drugs

Ted Galen Carpenter

Ted Galen Carpenter is vice president for defense and foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute.

The following selection originally appeared in "A Blueprint for Peace: Ending the War on Drugs" in *Bad Neighbor Policy: Washington's Futile War on Drugs in Latin America* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

The United States has waged an intense war on drugs both at home and abroad for more than three decades. Throughout that period, domestic support for the effort has been consistent and strong. Although there have been a few prominent critics in the United States, their voices usually have been drowned out by calls for the expenditure of more funds and the adoption of ever-harsher measures to overcome the scourge of drugs. Latin American critics have been even rarer and quieter. Few wanted to incur Washington's wrath by criticizing the drug war, and the fate of the handful of individuals who dared to do so did not encourage emulation.

There are signs, though, that the strategy of intimidation used by drug warriors is beginning to lose its effect. For the first time since the late 1970s, there appears to be a reasonable chance that the prohibitionist strategy eventually could be overturned. Such prominent businessmen as financier George Soros, Peter Lewis, the chairman of Progressive Insurance, Inc. (the nation's fifth largest auto insurer), and John Sperling, a wealthy entrepreneur, have funded a variety of initiatives that challenge the sacred cows of the drug war. They have

promoted various measures that embody a strategy of "harm reduction" and treatment, not jail. As the *Wall Street Journal* noted, since 1996 the three men have spent more than $20 million "on a state-by-state campaign to chip away at the hard-line policies" of the war on drugs.[1] Most of their efforts have focused on two issues: allowing the medical use of marijuana and curbing the authority of law enforcement agencies to seize property from accused drug law violators without a conviction for that crime.

Their financial support has enabled opponents of the drug war to put referenda on the ballots in various states permitting the use of marijuana (and in some cases other now-illegal drugs) for medical purposes. Indeed, by the end of 2000, nine states—Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Maine, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington—had adopted such measures. One of the more revealing pieces of evidence of waning public enthusiasm for an across-the-board prohibitionist strategy is that initiatives on making medical exceptions to the drug laws were approved by voters—and usually adopted by wide margins—in state after state. Another indicator was the approval by California voters in the November 2000 elections of Proposition 36, an even more ambitious proposal that sought to bar state judges from sending people to prison after their first or second conviction for drug use or possession. Instead, such nonviolent offenders would be directed into treatment programs.

Signs of change are surfacing elsewhere as well. At the beginning of 2001, the government of Jamaica appointed a commission to examine the possible legalization of marijuana; interestingly, a majority of people appearing before the commission favored legalization. Among those who testified were representatives of the Medical Association of Jamaica, the Scientific Research Council, the Jamaica Manufacturers Association, and the National Democratic Movement, the country's

1. David Bank, "Counterattack: Soros, Two Rich Allies Fund a Growing War on the War on Drugs," *Wall Street Journal*, May 30, 2001, p. A1.

third largest political party.[2] In September 2001 the commission issued a report recommending the decriminalization of marijuana, despite U.S. warnings that passage of such a measure by Jamaica's parliament could lead to the country's decertification under the 1988 Drug Abuse Act and the imposition of economic sanctions.[3]

In addition to the growing roster of domestic critics in the United States, some Latin American officials are beginning to advocate an end to the drug war, even though they risk denunciation and harassment from Washington for doing so. One prominent convert is Uruguayan president Jorge Batlle. "During the past 30 years [the drug war] has grown, grown, grown, every day more problems, every day more violence, every day more militarization," Batlle told a nationwide radio audience in February 2001. "This has not gotten people off drugs. And what's more, if you remove the economic incentive of [the drug trade] it loses strength, it loses size, it loses people who participate."[4] Although the president pledged continued cooperation with antidrug efforts until the laws are changed, having a head of state condemn the logic of the drug war caused Washington no small amount of concern.

Although few other Latin American officials are as bold as Batlle, several have dared to criticize the drug war as a failure and hint at their support for legalization. A little more than a year before he became Mexico's foreign minister, Jorge Castañeda wrote a scathing commentary in *Newsweek* proclaiming the war a failure. "It's hard to find a place where the war on drugs is being won," Castañeda concluded. "Indeed, the time is uniquely propitious for a wide-ranging debate between North and Latin Americans on this absurd war that

2. "Jamaica Looks at Crime of Marijuana Use," Reuters, May 23, 2001.

3. Canute James, "U.S. Worried as Jamaica Rethinks Marijuana Stance," *Financial Times*, September 4, 2001, p. 3; and David Gonzalez, "Panel Urges Legalization of Marijuana in Jamaica," *New York Times*, September 30, 2001, p. A9.

4. Quoted in Sebastian Rotella, "Uruguayan Leader Urges Legalizing Drugs," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, February 11, 2001, online edition.

no one really wants to wage." Moreover, "In the end, legalization of certain substances may be the only way to bring prices down, and doing so may be the only remedy to some of the worst aspects of the drug plague: violence, corruption, and the collapse of the rule of law."[5]

Perhaps the most surprising critique came from Castañeda's boss, Mexican president Vicente Fox, in a March 2001 interview in the newspaper *Unomasuno*. Alluding to the violence and corruption that drug trafficking has spawned, Fox stated that the solution might be eventually to legalize drugs. He added an important caveat, however. "When the day comes that it is time to adopt the alternative of lifting punishment for consumption of drugs, it would have to come from all over the world because we would gain nothing if Mexico did it but the production and traffic of drugs . . . continued here" for lucrative markets where the substances remained illegal.[6] Even with that caveat, Fox's comments caused more than a little consternation in official Washington.

Perhaps most significant, at "ground zero" in the war on drugs (Colombia), criticism of the prohibitionist strategy is mounting. Some of the critics are now openly advocating the legalization of drugs. In the summer of 2001 Liberal Party senator Viviane Morales submitted a bill to the Colombian congress calling for legalization. "The main ally of narcotrafficking is prohibition," Morales states bluntly. Another influential Colombian politician, Guillermo Gaviria, governor of powerful Antioquia province, insists that his country should lead an international debate on legalization. Although there is little chance that Morales's legislation will pass in the near future, the fact that a serious legalization campaign in Colombia surfaced at all in the face

5. Jorge G. Castañeda, "How We Fight a Losing War," *Newsweek*, September 6, 1999, electronic version.

6. Quoted in John Rice, "Mexican President Vicente Fox Discusses Drug Legalization in Newspaper Interview," Associated Press, March 19, 2001.

of vehement opposition from the United States and the Pastrana government is remarkable.

A few countries are abandoning the prohibitionist strategy, despite pressure from Washington not to do so. The Netherlands has had de facto decriminalization of marijuana for years, even though that policy has been a frequent target of wrath from U.S. officials.[7] Indeed, Dutch authorities in one town now plan to open "drive-through" drug shops to better accommodate the drug tourists who flock to that country from jurisdictions (especially Germany) with far more restrictive drug laws.[8] Recently the government of Belgium decided to legalize the possession of small quantities of marijuana for personal consumption. Growing marijuana plants for personal use also would be permitted.[9] The government of Canada is seriously considering the decriminalization of marijuana, making possession a civil rather than a criminal offense. In May 2001 the House of Commons established a committee to examine the merits of decriminalization, and Justice Minister Anne McLellan is openly encouraging the debate. Advocates of decriminalization include members of the principal conservative political party, the Canadian Alliance, as well as the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.[10] Two months later the Canadian government made it legal for terminally ill patients, as well as some patients with

7. For a discussion of the Netherlands policy and U.S. hostility toward it, see Ineke Haen Marshall and Henk Van De Bunt, "Exporting the Drug War to the Netherlands and Dutch Alternatives," in Jurg Gerber and Eric L. Jensen, eds., *Drug War American Style: The Internationalization of Failed Policies and Its Alternatives* (New York: Gardner, 2001), pp. 197–217; and Robert J. MacCoun and Peter Reuter, *Drug War Heresies: Learning from Other Vices, Times, and Places* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 238–264.

8. "Dutch to Open Drug Drive-Thru Shops," Associated Press, May 1, 2001; "Dutch Approve Coffee and Pot for German Tourists," Reuters, May 31, 2001; and Suzanne Daley, "The New Reefer Madness: Drive-Through Shops," *New York Times*, May 28, 2001, p. A4.

9. "Belgium Agrees to Legalize Cannabis," Associated Press, January 19, 2001.

10. Joel Baglole, "O Cannabis: Ottawa May Soon Ease Up on Its Marijuana Laws," *Wall Street Journal*, June 5, 2001, p. A18.

chronically debilitating conditions such as multiple sclerosis, to use marijuana to alleviate their symptoms.[11]

Even Portugal, not known as a bastion of radical libertarian thinking on law enforcement issues, is rethinking its position on the drug war. Although the government maintains a harsh policy toward traffickers, it has adopted a far less punitive approach to drug users. A new law that went into effect in July 2001 eliminates the threat of prison for possession of small quantities of any drug, not merely marijuana. Punishment is confined to fines or mandatory community service. While the Portuguese law does not constitute legalization or even true decriminalization, it is a major step for a socially conservative country.

Potentially as significant as the episodes of reform overseas and the adoption of medical marijuana initiatives in the United States is the evidence of growing ambivalence about the drug war itself on the part of the American people. Underlying that ambivalence is the widespread belief that the drug war has been a failure. A detailed public opinion survey conducted by the Pew Research Center in February 2001 confirmed that point. Not only did 74 percent of respondents agree that the drug war is being lost, but the same percentage agreed with the statement that "demand is so high we will never stop drug use."[12] Equally revealing, only 6 percent considered illegal drug use to be the nation's most pressing problem. That compared to 37 percent in a similar survey conducted in 1990.[13]

Respondents also were less than enthusiastic about the supply-side campaign. Some 68 percent believed that Latin America would never be able to control the outflow of drugs. When asked whether

11. Jim Burns, "Canada Legalizes Marijuana for Medicinal Purposes," CNS News.Com, July 30, 2001, E-Brief@topica.email-publisher.com.

12. Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, "74% Say Drug War Being Lost," February 2001, part 1, p. 1.

13. Ibid., p. 3.

the U.S. government should provide more, less, or about the same amount of financial assistance to help drug-producing countries stem the flow, only 11 percent wanted to give more aid; 42 percent advocated giving less aid. Their response was only slightly more favorable when queried specifically about military aid: 23 percent favored giving more aid; 28 percent wanted to reduce the level of assistance.[14]

Although despondency about the drug war did not necessarily translate into a surge of support for outright legalization, there were also signs of softening public attitudes about criminalizing drug use. As many respondents (47 percent) agreed with the statement that "too many people are put in jail for drug offenses" as disagreed. And by a narrow plurality (47 percent to 45 percent) respondents thought that eliminating mandatory jail sentences would be "a good thing."[15] In addition, only 49 percent favored retaining criminal penalties for possessing small quantities of marijuana, and by better than a three-to-one margin (73 percent to 21 percent), respondents supported permitting doctors to prescribe marijuana to their patients.[16] That result suggests that the victory of medical marijuana initiatives in several states was not a fluke.

Although such survey data hardly reveal a popular mandate for drug legalization, they do reveal the profile of a public that is war weary, pessimistic about the efficacy of drug-war tactics in the future, and supportive of a limited legalization of some drugs under some conditions—especially medical marijuana. That is not the profile of American public opinion likely to gladden the hearts of committed drug warriors. It suggests a public that is gradually becoming receptive to alternative policies.

An admission by former DEA chief Jack Lawn underscores one reason why the drug war should be ended: "With all of our efforts, with the military in their aircraft and Coast Guard cutters and heli-

14. Ibid., part 2, p. 4.
15. Ibid., p. 1.
16. Ibid., part 1, pp. 2–3.

copters, traffickers will just move to a third country to get things done. They don't lose money. They don't lose hours. I don't think they have lost anything substantial in the last 20 years."[17]

Laws and other policy initiatives must be judged by their consequences, not their intentions. By that measure, the war on drugs over the past three decades has been a colossal failure. The international drug traffickers have been barely inconvenienced while societies in drug-producing and drug-transiting countries have experienced a massive upsurge in corruption and violence. In at least one drug-source country (Colombia), the entire social and political system is in peril. On the domestic front, the sole achievement has been a decline in recreational use of illegal drugs by casual, occasional users. Even assuming that the decline is the result of the prohibitionist strategy and not the effect of educational campaigns about the health consequences of drug abuse, the benefit has been achieved at enormous cost. We have filled our prisons with drug offenders, diverted criminal justice resources and personnel away from serious crimes to wage the drug war, and badly damaged the Fourth Amendment and other portions of the Bill of Rights.[18]

The only realistic way out of this policy morass is to adopt a regime of drug legalization. And contrary to the alarmists in the prohibitionist camp, that option is not a venture into terra incognita, replete with unimaginable horrors. Although the fact is largely forgotten, now-illicit drugs were once legal in America. At the beginning of the twentieth century, there were virtually no restrictions on opiates, cocaine, or marijuana.

Even the first "antidrug measure" approved by Congress was quite modest and reasonable. In 1906 Congress enacted the Pure Food and Drug Act, which required that labels on medicine list any narcotic content. (Some American consumers had unwittingly become

17. "Drug Wars: Part 2," PBS, *Frontline*, October 10, 2000, transcript, p. 35.

18. For a good, concise discussion, see "Collateral Damage: The Drug War Has Many Casualties," the *Economist*, July 28, 2001, pp. 12–13.

dependent on patent medicines containing opiates or cocaine.) It was not until the adoption of the Harrison Narcotic Act in 1914 that the United States took a major step toward drug prohibition. (It may be more than coincidental that it was about this same time that the movement for a national prohibition of alcoholic beverages also began to gather steam.) Yet although the Harrison Act outlawed normal commerce in opiates and cocaine, even that legislation permitted medically prescribed uses of those drugs, and addicts were still able to obtain drugs legally from physicians and clinics. Only after a dubious decision by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1919, ruling that providing morphine to an addict with no intention to cure him violated the Harrison Act, and the passage of subsequent amendments to the law by Congress, did prohibition become complete with regard to opiates and cocaine.[19]

Marijuana remained legal even longer. Not until the passage of the Marijuana Tax Act in 1937 did that drug join the rank of banned substances.

Granted, America was not free of drug-related problems under a regime of legalization. For example, in the early years of the twentieth century there were an estimated 300,000 opiate addicts—often individuals who had become dependent on patent medicines.[20] Yet that was still a relatively small portion of the population. And America was certainly not plagued with the violence, corruption, economic distortions, and abasement of the Bill of Rights that have accompanied the prohibitionist regime. Legalization may not be a panacea, but it certainly beats the alternative.

It is time to terminate the prohibitionist strategy. We need an

19. The definitive accounts of early twentieth century drug policies are David T. Courtwright, *Dark Paradise: Opiate Addiction in America Before 1940* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982); and David F. Musto, *The American Disease: Origins of Narcotics Control*, expanded edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987).

20. Mathea Falco, *The Making of a Drug-Free America: Programs That Work* (New York: Times Books, 1992), p. 17.

entirely new policy, not merely an effort to repackage the war on drugs as a "compassionate crusade," as Asa Hutchinson, the new head of the Drug Enforcement Administration, seeks to do. The first step ought to be to end the browbeating of our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere to take actions that create massive problems for their societies and undermine the stability of democratic institutions. It is bad enough if we inflict the many follies of prohibition on ourselves; we should at least have the decency not to inflict them on others.

Washington's supply-side campaign against drugs has not worked, is not working, and, given economic realities, will not work. That is not to suggest that the influence of the drug trade is a benign one or that Latin American countries would not be better off if the trafficking organizations were less powerful. The exaggerated importance that the drug trade has acquired is an economic distortion caused by foolish policies adopted in Washington and the drug-source countries themselves. Immediate steps can and should be taken to eliminate that distortion.

Latin American governments should move more aggressively to deregulate their economies and spur economic growth, thereby creating new opportunities for those people who are now involved in the lower echelons of the drug trade. Although some governments took promising steps in that direction during the 1990s, the trend has stalled and in some places (e.g., Venezuela, Peru, and Argentina) even reversed. Adopting policies that promoted real growth in the private sector of the economy (as opposed to sterile government-directed economic development programs funded by U.S. aid dollars) would give new options to those who now see drug trafficking as the only path to prosperity.

The United States also can take steps to reinforce the benefits of such reforms. The adoption of the North American Free Trade Agreement provided important new economic opportunities for Mexico. Creating a hemispheric free trade agreement would extend such opportunities to other societies. Latin American representatives have

long complained that U.S. import quotas on sugar, textiles, and an array of other products have retarded the development of their economies. Although those officials often ignore the fact that many of the problems with their economies are self-inflicted, their complaints have some validity. U.S. import restrictions needlessly injure Latin American business enterprises as well as U.S. consumers, and a hemispheric free trade zone would be an important step toward eliminating such inequities. More than a decade ago economist Scott MacDonald aptly observed, "Protectionism, in itself, is a dangerous force, but in the drug trade, it is negative reinforcement in the movement from legal products to illicit products."[21]

Certainly Latin American leaders recognize the importance of more open access to the U.S. market for their legal products. In arguing for renewal and expansion of the Andean Trade Preferences Act, Peru's vice president, Raúl Diez Canseco, told a forum in Colombia that such a deal could lift his country's exports to the United States to some $2.5 billion within five years. That growth in turn would create 140,000 jobs in Peru's apparel industry and up to 400,000 new jobs in the agricultural sector. Foreign Minister Diego García Sayán added that it was absolutely essential that textiles be included in the renewed pact, arguing that in many former drug-producing areas, textiles were becoming an alternate economic way of life.[22]

Yet even if the governments of drug-source countries enact the most comprehensive and worthwhile economic reforms and Washington adopts unusually enlightened trade policies, drug commerce will continue to play a disproportionate role in many Latin American countries unless the United States ends its futile experiment in drug prohibition. Without that action, drug trafficking still will carry a risk

21. Scott MacDonald, *Dancing on a Volcano: The Latin American Drug Trade* (New York: Praeger, 1988), p. 150.

22. Jude Webber, "Peru to Push Powell for New Anti-Drug Flights," Reuters, August 21, 2001; see also George Gedda, "Colombia Chief Seeks Trade Benefits," Associated Press, November 8, 2001.

premium that drives up the price and the profit margin. Traffickers still will be able to pay farmers more than they can make from alternative crops or alternative occupations. Because ruthless individuals who do not fear the law tend to dominate black markets, the drug trade, in both its international and domestic incarnations, will remain largely the domain of violence-prone criminal organizations. Without legalization in the United States, the threat that such organizations pose to the governments and societies of source countries will abate only marginally, even if other reforms are enacted.

Drug legalization—treating currently illicit drugs as alcohol and tobacco are now treated—would provide important benefits to the United States: It would eliminate a significant portion of the crime and violence that plagues the streets of our major cities. It would halt the clogging of the court system with charges against nonviolent drug offenders and the clogging of our prisons with such inmates. Most important, abandoning the drug war would stop the alarming erosion of civil liberties.

Ending the war on drugs also would aid the effort against a real threat to America's security and well-being: the threat posed by international terrorism. Terminating the prohibitionist strategy would deprive terrorist organizations of an important source of revenue. (. . . the Taliban regime in Afghanistan, for example, derived a substantial portion of its income from narcotics trafficking.) Equally important, ending our latest fling with prohibition would free up thousands of personnel and billions of dollars for waging the war against terrorism. Imagine if all the well-trained personnel working for the DEA (to say nothing of the talent being wasted in state and local antidrug units) could be reassigned to antiterrorism missions.

The long-term benefits to Latin American societies from abandoning a prohibitionist strategy also would be substantial, although the short-term economic effects of a price decline might be adverse. No longer would Latin American nations suffer the massive distortions to their economies, the political corruption, and the escalating

violence that accompany the lucrative black market in drugs. No longer would the governments of those countries have to dissemble in a futile attempt to satisfy the conflicting demands of the United States and their own citizens. No longer would Washington engage in the demeaning spectacle of alternately bribing and threatening its neighbors to get them to do the impossible.

Compassionate Crusade

Asa Hutchinson

Asa Hutchinson recently served as administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration and currently serves as undersecretary for Border and Transportation Security at the Department of Homeland Security.

The following selection is an excerpt from a speech given at the 2001 Drug Abuse Resistance Education Conference in Los Angeles, California (August 1, 2001).

In my view, there is not a more important issue facing our nation than how to solve the drug problem. That's one reason why I said "Yes" to the President, gave up a Congressional seat, and took on this responsibility. I can't think of a better way to serve the American people than serving in the fight against drugs.

I have seen the problem of drugs as a member of Congress and as a federal prosecutor and I personally know the toll drugs take on families and communities.

When I was a teenager in the late 1960s, I thought drug abuse was something that happened in New York, and Chicago, and Los Angeles. Not in Springdale, Arkansas. The only time I heard drugs mentioned was when I turned on the evening news. Today, drugs are in every nook and cranny of America, whether it is Ecstasy in the teen scene, heroin in the city or meth in the heartland. . . .

I learned that you can't escape the drug problem by moving to rural America. In today's America there is no place in which drugs are not readily available. If you live in America, you can't escape

drugs. The best thing you can do, the only thing you can do, is stand your ground, lock arms with your neighbors, and fight.

I might be new to the DEA, but I'm not a stranger to this effort. From my experience as a prosecutor, parent, and Congressman, I know two things I want to emphasize as DEA's Administrator. One is a greater sense of urgency; the second is a greater sense of balance.

Let me begin by telling you what I mean by a greater sense of urgency. As a Congressman for the past five years, I've been concerned that America is losing its sense of urgency in the fight against drugs.

There was a time when we called it a "war" against drugs. In the mid-1980s, when many neighborhoods were devastated by crack cocaine, when University of Maryland basketball star Len Bias died of a drug overdose on the eve of what could have been a brilliant pro career, when DEA Special Agent Kiki Camarena was tortured and murdered by traffickers in Mexico: that's when this nation decided to give its drug policies a battlefield intensity.

Guess what? The greater sense of urgency worked. From 1985 to 1992, drug use was cut in half. But somewhere along the line we lost that sense of urgency. Too many people who should have known better got complacent.

And I am sure you felt the results of that complacency. You can't be expected to do the tough work you do on the front lines without the material and moral support you need to get the job done. What's more, it's tough for you to walk into a classroom of young people and tell them about the dangers of drugs if the entertainment and fashion industries are glamorizing drug use, and if well-known political and opinion leaders are recommending legalization.

Let me tell you what America needs—What America needs is a new crusade against drugs, a crusade with equal intensity and compassion. Each year, about 50,000 Americans lose their lives from drug-related causes. That's almost as many Americans as lost their lives in eight-and-a-half years in the Vietnam War.

There are a lot of threatening issues out there that should concern us—issues like declining test scores in education and terrorism at home. But no issue presents such a serious and immediate threat to this country as the resurgence of some illegal drugs (e.g., Ecstasy, LSD) among America's young people. We simply cannot continue to allow 50,000 of our fellow Americans to die every year as a result in part of the greed of international traffickers: those who traffic in human misery to satisfy their own quest for illegal profits at the expense of the next generation.

But the problem extends beyond individual traffickers and users. When an addict injects heroin into his veins, he is not only changing the chemistry of his body. Little by little, he is changing the values of society.

I'm often asked why it's necessary to pick on some harmless addict who is just going to go off by himself and shoot up drugs. What's the harm? All he wants is a little pleasure in this world.

But the fact is, the image of the lone drug user is a myth. Drugs destroy families, they destroy neighborhoods, and if we don't get a grip on them, they can destroy the character of this nation.

You may remember a news story from 1987. It concerned a lawyer and his companion, who was a book editor and author. They lived in a New York City apartment with two adopted children. The news story related a horrifying case of physical abuse. The lawyer was charged with throwing his six-year-old adopted daughter against a wall, then sitting in front of the girl, smoking cocaine with his companion, while the girl lapsed into a coma and eventually died.

When police arrived at the apartment, they also found a 17-month-old boy, soaked in urine, encrusted with dirt, tethered by rope to a filthy playpen. The incident got a lot of press coverage because it involved two people—a lawyer and a book editor—who you'd think would know better.

I'll bet virtually everyone in this room could draw on their own

experience in law enforcement to tell me a similar story. The individuals involved may not have had the high profiles to get them into the *New York Times*. But the moral of each one of those stories is the same: You can't serve your addictions and serve your family or other people at the same time.

The message our young people should be getting is clear: Drug use hurts you, and it hurts everyone around you. And we will do everything we can to help you resist the temptation to experiment with drugs.

When I say "do everything we can," I mean a crusade calling on every sector of society and using every resource that is available. This is a crusade with three fronts. There is always the debate between supply and demand resources.

When it comes to resources, we don't need a competitive fight, we need a cooperative strategy—one that uses enforcement, prevention, and treatment in a coordinated approach. I pledge to work to bring that balanced approach and assure cooperation.

Let me emphasize: Prevention and treatment cannot get the job done without enforcement. Enforcement is absolutely necessary. Enforcement sends the right signals to people who are tempted to try drugs. Young people should know their government believes drug use is a serious problem for them and for the society around them—that it's not just an alternative lifestyle. The law is our great moral teacher, and if we fail to enforce the law, we fail to teach and we succeed only in diminishing the character of this nation.

If young people get the message that society winks at drug use, then America will have surrendered to the weaknesses of our culture.

Recently, there's been a lot of talk about treatment, and there should be. I think there is a real need for more treatment facilities, and especially for efforts to make treatment programs as effective as possible. We all know there is a treatment gap, and we do not have the facilities for all who need help, especially young people. To help

remedy this problem, I can tell you that President Bush included $3.4 billion in the '02 budget for treatment.

There are now roughly 1.5 million people using cocaine at least once a month. Another 350,000 are hard-core meth users. And about 200,000 use heroin. For them, treatment is a must. But availability of treatment does not necessarily result in treatment.

Some of you may have seen the film *Traffic*. The message that came out of that film was that enforcement isn't working, that the only solution is treatment.

Yet, the man who wrote the film had been a drug addict himself. In an interview with the *New York Times*, he said that he entered treatment only after his heroin dealer, his back-up dealer, and his back-up, back-up dealer were arrested on the same weekend. Treatment was important for the screenwriter, but it was enforcement that convinced him to seek treatment. His case is a perfect illustration of why we need a balanced policy in the fight against drugs. Enforcement and treatment work together.

Treatment works for some people, as it did for the screenwriter. But all too often it takes repeated stays in clinics over a period of years to finally cure an addiction to drugs. In the meantime, those who go through it are wasting the best, most productive years of their lives on overcoming addictions when they should be establishing careers and building families.

That's why I fully support drug courts. I had the opportunity to visit some here in Los Angeles a while back, and I saw how effective they are in helping those people who need help the most. The long, intensive counseling period is monitored by the courts. Relapses in drug use are punishable by imprisonment, which provides a powerful incentive for staying on the straight and narrow. These drug courts have an incredible success rate, and many lives are made whole again. It's important to remember that law enforcement triggers this whole drug court process.

Why is this battle—this compassionate crusade—worth fighting? I've heard it said that a man's character will determine his future, and so it is for the nation. What we do on the drug issue will impact not only families and communities, but also the character of our nation.