

Dennis's comment demonstrates better than anything else, that this operation is a front for interests who are involved in the commercial profit from drug addiction.

At an Aug. 31 press conference, the Drug Policy Foundation addressed the violence which has accompanied the spread of drugs in the Western Hemisphere, and, predictably, blamed the violence on law enforcement agencies. "A warlike, violent strategy carried out by the government would eventually provoke a warlike, violent response by those involved in the drug scene," threatened Trebach. Without wincing, he lied that "now, U.S. drug violence is almost exclusively confined to turf wars between rival gangs and competing drug traffickers. Almost no violence is directed purposely at the police or at authority figures."

Trebach went still further, predicting that the drug traffickers would begin striking at public figures in the United States. "The increased vigor of the American drug warriors, and the fact that Colombian traffickers are particularly vicious, means that a drug battle of unheard-of proportions may soon begin in the United States."

On Sept. 11, Oliver "Buck" Revell, head of the FBI's anti-terrorist and counterintelligence operations, told the Congress that he could not rule out the probability that such a wave of violence would occur, and said that if it did, the FBI would not be able to stop it. His remark is all the more startling in the light of Revell's repeated assurances over many years, that the FBI has domestic terrorism under complete control.

The domestic potentials for this violence already exist in such FBI-controlled assets as Jewish Defense Organization terrorist Mordechai Levy, who was just released from jail in New York City, where he was being held after a shootout with the police, during which he shot an innocent bystander. It should also be remembered that Dana Beal, who was present at William Bennett's National Press Club speech, in 1981 helped to organize a meeting to plan opposition to the Reagan administration's War on Drugs, under the campaign slogan "Shoot Bush First."

And sure enough, only two days after Revell's prediction, syndicated columnist Jack Anderson reported that the Secret Service is taking seriously a reported plot by the Medellín Cartel to assassinate President Bush by November. Ten cartel assassins are allegedly hiding out on a ranch in the Mexican state of Chihuahua, waiting for false identification papers to get them into the United States. Once they get there, they are expected to make Wheeling, West Virginia their base of operations for terrorist assaults, Anderson reports. Bush Drug Policy Director William Bennett and Attorney General Richard Thornburgh are also on the assassins' hit list. Anderson's sources told him that the assassins have "high-powered rifles and 'explosives already in place.'"

A more dubious news source, the sensational tabloid *The Globe*, reports that the cocaine cartel has also targeted First Lady Barbara Bush for assassination.

Documentation

A rogues' gallery of drug legalizers

One of the biggest lies about the advocates of drug legalization is that they have no connections to the drug mafia. But if one looks at the U.S. and British legalization advocates alongside their co-thinkers in Colombia, it is overwhelmingly evident that such a distinction is absurd. Below we list some of Dope Inc.'s most prominent international spokesmen.

Antonio Caballero, widely read Colombian news columnist. In the Aug. 29 *El Espectador*, he wrote that the mafia's billions "come from a single factor: that the drug trade is illegal. If the drug trade were legal it would yield less than the sale of coriander. Thus the war [against drugs] should be the total and universal legalization of the production, distribution, and consumption of coca."

Fabio Ochoa, father of three brothers who lead the Medellín Cartel along with **Pablo Escobar** and **Gonzalo Rodríguez Gacha**. Ochoa told the Colombian daily *La Prensa* Sept. 5, 1989: "My sons and all the Colombian drug traffickers are repentant and want peace, they want dialogue. I know that because I am a friend of many, many of them. . . . Drug trafficking can be halted by legal means."

Joaquin Vallejo Arbelaez, prominent Colombian economist. In a commentary appearing in the daily *El Tiempo* on Aug. 31, he argued that "the only solution, although it will scandalize many, is free trade of the drug, as was done with alcohol after the tormenting period of Prohibition between 1920 and 1932."

Augusto Zimmerman Zavala, director of the weekly Peruvian magazine *Kausachum*. In its Sept. 5 issue, he wrote: "Peru can escape the crisis if it sells coca leaves. . . . because, according to the economic laws of capitalism itself, all demand generates supply. . . . If the United States government proposes to spend \$3.5 billion in fighting the drug trade over the next year, with this same sum it could buy 90% of the coca leaf production of Peru and Bolivia."

The U.S. Information Agency (USIA). The March 1989 issue (No. 85) of its magazine *Facetas*, distributed to U.S. embassies in Ibero-America, carried an article favorably citing the arguments of such legalization advocates as Baltimore

Mayor **Kurt Schmoke**, journalist **William F. Buckley, Jr.**, economist **Milton Friedman**, and Prof. **Ethan A. Nadelmann** of Princeton, who insist, according to *Facetas*, that “the most efficient way of confronting the international drug trafficking monopolies is to bankrupt them by legalizing drugs.”

Alfonso López Michelsen, former President of Colombia between 1974-78. He told the *Miami Herald* and various Ibero-American journalists that he considers dialogue with the drug mafias to be “inevitable.” In 1984, López secretly met with the heads of the Medellín Cartel and negotiated a deal whereby they would repatriate their billions in drug-dollars in exchange for a political amnesty. The Colombian government rejected his proposal.

Ernesto Samper Pizano, Colombian presidential candidate. He is known as Colombia’s leading drug legalization advocate, having authored and lobbied for the original proposals for marijuana legalization back in 1977, when he was president of the National Association of Financial Institutes (ANIF). He has since added cocaine to his legalization proposal. Samper was López Michelsen’s campaign manager during the former President’s second bid for power in 1982, and has publicly admitted to having accepted substantial campaign donations from convicted drug trafficker **Carlos Lehder**.

Milton Friedman, monetarist economist. His open letter to U.S. drug czar William Bennett in the Sept. 7 *Wall Street Journal* reads in part: “Decriminalizing drugs is even more urgent now than in 1972. . . . Postponing decriminalization will only make matters worse, and make the problem appear even more intractable. Alcohol and tobacco cause many more deaths in users than do drugs.”

The Economist, a London-based weekly, mouthpiece of the British financial elite. In the issue appearing in the first week of September, it editorialized: “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 Financial Times, daily mouthpiece of British financial elite. Its Sept. 9 editorial advised: “Decriminalize 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.”

Dr. Peter Bourne, drug policy adviser to President Jimmy Carter. He wrote in the Sept. 6 *London Times*, “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. . . . For the U.S., this could well mean ultimately legalizing cocaine use.”

The fallacious case for legalization

by John Grauerholz, M.D.

A critical flank in the international drug cartel’s war against those who would resist it, is the propaganda which it seeds behind enemy lines, using arguments with the appearance of rationality in order to undercut citizens’ will to fight them, and if possible, to recruit the gullible into their own ranks. Even the casual passing on of these arguments to family and friends, can give important aid to the drug traffickers. Therefore, let us refute them, one by one.

1. *Legalization of drugs will not lead to increased drug use.*

This is one of those perennial assertions which continues to survive in spite of a total lack of evidence to support it, and despite the fact that, in every instance in which it has been tried, it has been proven wrong. Back in the early 1960s, Great Britain decided to control an allowing physicians to legally dispense heroin to those already addicted, in order to decrease the incidence of crimes committed by addicts seeking funds to support their addiction. The theory was that if heroin were legally available to the addict population, then the inducement to commit crime, and to recruit other addicts, in order to support the drug habit, would be eliminated. But the crimes continued, the use of heroin continued to spread, and the policy was ultimately abandoned.

On the other hand, during approximately the same period, the government of Japan responded to a problem of widespread amphetamine abuse by a rigorous law enforcement campaign, combined with sanctions against users, and significantly curtailed the extent of the problem.

In the United States, we have the exemplary history of the methadone maintenance program in New York City. The major accomplishment of this program was to have methadone surpass heroin as a cause of death, while having no impact on the spread of heroin use, and no long-term change in the rate of criminal activity following methadone maintenance treatment. In fact, methadone itself became an object, if not *the* object, of criminal activities of drug addicts, with over half of the dispensed dose being sold on the street to other addicts for abusive use.

2. *Outlawing drugs will be no more successful than prohibition of alcohol.*

The comparison between drugs and alcohol is totally