

alternate—even less ambitious—proposal to be prepared in anticipation of the Bennett plan being stillborn in Congress.

Whatever the motives behind Thornburgh's reported guerrilla warfare against the White House plan, the result is that the Drug Enforcement Administration, designated by Bennett to be a lead agency in the federal anti-drug effort, is in reported disarray, a situation that must be repaired if the anti-drug effort is to go forward.

### Modest goals, initial successes

Held up against the LaRouche 15-point war plan, the Bush administration's National Drug Control Strategy falls short of an all-out war effort. In an appendix to the written plan produced by William Bennett's office, a series of two-year and ten-year objectives are spelled out. In 10 different categories of drug use, the Bush administration hopes to decrease drug usage by a mere 10% over the next two years and by only 50% over the next decade.

Perhaps the most glaring omission from the report and from the President's nationwide address is the total absence of any mention of narco-terrorism. Pentagon sources have complained bitterly that since 1985, there has been a de facto ban on any discussion of the involvement of Soviet-sponsored insurgency groups in the drug trade—even in Ibero-America. These gag orders have been linked to the Reagan and Bush administrations' giving of absolute priority to the "new détente" with the Soviet Union since the emergence of Mikhail Gorbachov.

Even with these flaws, largely through the valiant effort of the Colombian government of President Virgilio Barco, cited by President Bush on TV, the activities of the drug cartel have already been disrupted. Drug enforcement officials report that drug flows from Ibero-America into the United States between late July and the first week in August were down to a trickle, as the result of intensive crackdowns and seizures of drug barons' assets in Colombia. President Barco's restoration of the extradition treaty with the United States scored its first major victory on Sept. 6 with the arrival in Atlanta, Georgia of Eduardo Martínez Romero, a major money launderer for the Medellín Cartel who was arrested in Colombia during the initial crackdown following the Galán assassination.

Perhaps the single biggest test of the Bush war on drugs will come over the issue of the involvement of the major commercial banks in the laundering of drug money. The Bennett plan talks tough about drug money launderers and gives priority to intelligence relating to dope cash flows. On the other hand, Attorney General Thornburgh's most recent appointment as special assistant is Robert Mueller, the former chief assistant U.S. Attorney under William Weld in Boston and the man who engineered the 1985 coverup of the Bank of Boston when that staid Boston Brahmin institution was caught by the Treasury Department washing over \$1 billion in dirty money into Switzerland.

## Bankers back mafia demands for drug

Even before the ink had dried on U.S. drug czar William Bennett's plan of action against illegal drugs, the international dope lobby was on its hind legs, crying that cocaine, heroin, marijuana and their derivatives should be legalized. Spokesman from the "right" and the "left," from Milton Friedman to Jimmy Carter's cocaine-pushing adviser Peter Bourne, from the prestigious London *Economist* to the National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws (NORML), have issued nearly identical arguments that the war on drugs has been lost, powerful banking institutions to launder over \$500 billion in illegal drug money each year, must be protected.

Great Britain's *Economist* magazine led the charge the week before the administration's announcement, with an editorial and feature story on what it snidely termed "Mission Impossible." The magazine offered the same defeatist nostrums which British opium traders have always served up to every colonial government which has ever attempted to protect its population from drugs. Equating drugs and alcohol, the *Economist* warned that "prohibition's failure is more dangerous yet, both for individual drug takers and for societies corrupted, subverted and terrorized by the drug gangs. . . . Demand creates supply, despite the panoply of international conventions and national laws. . . . Repeal them, replace them by control, taxation and discouragement. Until that is done, the slaughter in the United States, and the destruction of Colombia, will continue."

The London *Financial Times* focused its criticism on the President's assertion that "crack . . . is murdering our children," by retorting that "these evils are caused not by drugs themselves, but by the fact that they are sold in an unregulated, gang-infested black market." In order to avoid the costs of fighting the drug cartels, the *Financial Times* proposes to "decriminalise drug abuse itself, while expanding education and treatment. Addicts would then be able to register and obtain drugs, on a maintenance basis, through official channels. In this way the link that binds the addict to the black marketeers would be cut, though the trade itself would remain illegal."

In the United States, the same people who guided Presi-

# by issuing legalization

dent Jimmy Carter's pro-drug policies over a decade ago have been creeping out of the woodwork in hopes that their "Brave New World" may yet be realized. "Free enterprise" guru Milton Friedman wrote in an open letter published in the *Wall Street Journal* on Sept. 7: "Decriminalizing drugs is even more urgent now than in 1972, but we must recognize that the harm done in the interim cannot be wiped out. . . . Alcohol and tobacco cause many more deaths in users than do drugs. . . . Every friend of freedom . . . must be as revolted as I am by the prospect of turning the United States into an armed camp, by the vision of jails filled with casual drug users, and of an army of enforcers empowered to invade the liberty of citizens on slight evidence."

Friedman concluded with an astounding bit of twisted reasoning: "Had drugs been decriminalized 17 years ago, 'crack' would never have been invented (it was invented because the high cost of illegal drugs made it profitable to provide a cheaper version) and there would today be far fewer addicts." He doesn't bother explaining how his "free market" for drugs would stop "crack" from getting into every school-child's lunchbox.

On the other end of this remarkably monochromatic political spectrum, Jimmy Carter's former drug policy adviser Dr. Peter Bourne argued in the *London Times* of Sept. 6, "It makes no sense for the government [of Colombia] to have the country's largest source of foreign exchange outside the legitimate economy. Cocaine should be made a legitimate export, regulated and taxed by the government. Negotiations should begin immediately with the traffickers for an end to the violence and killing, in return for amnesty and their establishment as legitimate businessmen. . . . For the U.S., this could well mean ultimately legalizing cocaine use."

Bourne attempted to argue that, "Even with the advent of crack, the percentage of addicts, compared to the total number of users, remains small." And for those who won't swallow that lie, he had an even bigger one, namely, that drugs are somehow necessary for creative work: "And no one now dares mention the part that chronic cocaine use may have played in the creative genius of Sigmund Freud, Samuel Taylor Coleridge and others."

Drug legalization was also the featured article in the Sept. 1 issue of *Science*, the weekly magazine of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. An exhaustively verbose, nine-page argument for legalizing drugs, complete with 78 footnotes, was put forward by Ethan A. Nadelmann, assistant professor of Politics and Public Affairs at Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs. Under the title "Drug Prohibition in the United States: Costs, Consequences, and Alternatives," the author claims that legalization "increasingly merits serious consideration as both an analytic model and a policy option."

Nadelmann takes the position that the best way to fight any crime, is simply to make it legal. "A drug legalization strategy would certainly deal a severe blow to this link between drugs and crime." Speaking of the "most dangerous consequences of the drug laws," Nadelmann bemoans the "harms that stem from the unregulated nature of illicit drug production and sale." And what are these? "Marijuana smokers smoke cannabis that was grown with dangerous fertilizers, sprayed with the herbicide paraquat, or mixed with more dangerous substances."

Nadelmann also lies that "most of the nearly 40 million Americans who illegally consume drugs each year do no direct harm to anyone else. . . ." Think of the billions of new revenues that would be available if drug sales could be taxed: "The quality of urban life would rise significantly. . . . More ghetto residents would turn their backs on criminal careers and seek out legitimate opportunities instead . . . and foreign governments would reclaim the authority that they have lost to the drug traffickers."

## Richard Dennis's Illinois operations

Meanwhile, Washington, D.C. was the scene of a circus of pro-drug antics orchestrated by an organization calling itself the Drug Policy Foundation, which sponsored a series of seminars and press conferences featuring spokesmen from a wide coalition of pro-drug organizations. Under the direction of Arnold Trebach, a longtime drug advocate from American University, the foundation has been granting hundreds of thousands of dollars to pro-legalization politicians such as Baltimore Mayor Kurt Schmoke. The foundation enjoys the support of notables such as Harvard professor Lester Grinspoon, Patrick v. Murphy of the Police Foundation, Luigi del Gatto of Italy, Ethan Nadelmann of Princeton University, and science quack Carl Sagan of Cornell. Affiliated organizations include the American Civil Liberties Union and the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, both of which have issued enthusiastic calls for drug legalization.

The finances for this effort have been provided by a Chicago commodities speculator named Richard Dennis, who has put a large portion of his \$200 million fortune at the disposal of this and related outfits. Dennis serves on the board of the Cato Institute, a leading libertarian think tank, and is

an editor of the magazine of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, a foundation set up by Robert Hutchins, a high priest of the "New Age" cult. Dennis is also on the boards of the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations and the ultra-liberal People for the American Way.

Dennis is also the financial angel for the pro-drug wing of the Democratic Party in the state of Illinois. The LaRouche movement in that state has built an electoral organization which has repeatedly demonstrated popular support for the anti-drug platform of its candidates. In response, the Illinois drug lobby has mobilized a 10-year-long campaign to harass and outlaw the movement, culminating in fraudulent prosecutions of political fundraisers being coordinated by the Attorney General's office. In 1986, when Adlai Stevenson III was confronted with the option of running for governor alongside two popular LaRouche-associated candidates, it was Richard Dennis who provided the funds which enabled Stevenson to run on a third-party ticket.

### Who benefits?

Despite the libertarian fantasies of tax revenue bonanzas to be gained by legalizing drugs on the street, the real financial value of the drug trade is realized by the international banking cartels which dominate the money flows associated with the trade. The failure of successive U.S. administrations to seriously attack these havens, reveals the devastating fallacy behind those who say that we have already lost the war on drugs. On the contrary, the war on drugs has not yet begun in earnest, and will not do so until harsh measures are taken to shut down those money flows.

What the drug-legalizers fear now more than anything else, is that the Bush administration will take that step. Their concern is that *any* disruption of the huge pyramiding of indebtedness over the past few years will trigger an uncontrollable banking collapse. As the *Economist* put it, "The world is awash with crypto-dollars, avoiding tax or evading exchange-controls; it is impossible to sort out the drug money from the rest."

And there is certainly growing pressure toward going after the big international and New York-based drug money establishments such as Merrill Lynch and Chase Manhattan. Senior military officials and former Reagan administration anti-drug specialists have told this news service that the big limitation they see in the Bush program is a weak attack on the money-laundering facilities. "You can't hit this problem until you hit the banks—and I don't mean the little banks in Miami—I mean you have to take down Chase Manhattan," was the way one put it. Also, the heroic stand of Lyndon LaRouche and his associates against the drug bankers, has given others the courage to speak out.

One of the chief demagogical arguments of the drug-legalizers, is that the only alternative to legalization, would be a repressive police state which would trample on fundamental Constitutional and human rights. Typical was the

argumentation of the London *Times* that President Bush "realizes that criminal sanctions can curb demand only through an extraordinary increase in the police presence. As the U.S. moves down this path, the implications for personal freedom will become increasingly obvious. In the end, the price for treating a public health problem as a crime should prove too much for even the present level of public hysteria to tolerate."

The ironic truth is that the same political forces which have so far refused to treat the drug traffickers as an enemy power subject to *martial* law, have been busily engaged in transforming U.S. *civil* and *criminal* law into a means turning the United States into a police state. Attorney General Richard Thornburgh, for instance, has delivered speech upon speech in the past weeks extolling the ability of the Department of Justice to tackle the drug-trafficking problem the same way it has tackled every other problem—with the aggressive use of RICO (racketeering) and related conspiracy statutes, and increased dependence on asset forfeiture techniques of dubious legality.

This constitutes perhaps the weakest flank in the Bush administration's announced policy against drugs, and is summed up by the fact that the man whom the drug lobby hates the most, Lyndon LaRouche, remains in jail on the orders of those who work for the pro-legalization financial and political circles.

---

## Documentation

---

### LaRouche's anti-drug plan

*On March 13, 1985, Lyndon LaRouche addressed a Mexico City conference on the illegal drug traffic. This is an abbreviated summary of his 15-point "war-plan."*

1) The international drug traffic has become an evil and powerful government in its own right . . . upon which we must declare war . . . which we must win in the same spirit the United States fought for the unconditional defeat of Nazism between 1941 and 1945.

2) . . . The mandate given to law-enforcement forces deployed in support of this war, must be 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. . . .

3) A treaty of alliance for conduct of war, should be established between the United States and the governments of Ibero-American states which join the War on Drugs alliance. . . .