

Dear Editor/News Director,

The attached manuscript fills a huge void of knowledge about a medicinal and fiber plant that has been served mankind for thousands of years. It became the victim of a scourge of lies by self-serving politicians and industrialists in the 1930s, aided and abetted by the yellow journalism of the Hearst newspapers.

If your organization is beholden to the interests of petrochemical, pharmaceutical, timber, alcohol and tobacco interests, you will be tempted to belittle and disregard the facts herein. But if you have the open and inquisitive mind of a good journalist, and if you revere the truth and search for it, you will read this **MARIJUANA RESOURCE BOOK** and file it as a resource.

As **AGRICULTURAL HEMP**, this plant could revitalize rural America, bolster the economy, improve the environment, and greatly retard the pollution of our soil, air and water.

As **CANNABIS**, it could be restored to its rightful place in medicine which it occupied throughout U.S. history until it fell victim to 30s prohibitionists. It is proven effective for sufferers of stress and anxiety, nausea, glaucoma, muscle spasms associated with spasticity and epilepsy, asthma, anorexia and other ailments. Its potential for other illnesses is high, but research has been stymied by government edict.

As **MARIJUANA**, it is used regularly by 25-30 million Americans for relaxation from stress, muscle aches and pains, and migraine headaches; for a euphoric expanded consciousness that promotes creative thought and a sense of well being. With legalization, these otherwise law-abiding citizens would no longer be persecuted and thrown into jails which should be reserved for real criminals.

Overall, legalization would mean stopping the drain of our tax dollars in a disastrous, no-win drug war which has spawned all the problems that alcohol prohibition did. And this would be coupled with a lucrative new source of tax revenues. Now grown solely for recreational use, cannabis is one of the top three cash crops in America. Legalization would bring control of usage similar to our alcohol laws and put commerce in the hands of legitimate business.

Find out how our misguided paranoia, coupled with greed, has conspired to eradicate a natural plant which is very low in addiction and, contrary to government propaganda, actually promotes good health. Find out how the drug war is squandering our resources with no hope of "success," promoting corruption, and systemically assaulting just about every provision of our Bill of Rights. Just read this **MARIJUANA RESOURCE BOOK** and call NORML if you have any questions.

Jim Hemphill
Cinti NORML
513-521-2632

Cliff Barrows
Ohio NORML
614-385-4157

National NORML
Washington, DC
202-483-5500

The **MARIJUANA** Resource Book
Facts and Ideas about Marijuana/Hemp/Cannabis

CONTENTS

PROHIBITION:

A Short History of Marijuana Prohibition
Call for A Halt to Prohibition Oppression/Dr. Milton Friedman ...
Legalizers, Lawyers, Liberals, Libertarians Lash Drug Plan
Prohibition is Fueled by Lies, Ignorance and Greed
Hemp, Used for Centuries, Runs Afoul of 1930s Conspiracy
Towards A Sensible Drug Policy/The Progressive Review
'Chopper' Madness hits anti-marijuana warriors in California
Drug Deaths Rise As The War Continues
DEA Headline Lust Turned Me Into A Marijuana Activist
Drug War Has Made Hard Drugs Cheap, Violence Plentiful
Hidden Costs of Drug War: Monetary, Effects on Bill of Rights ...
Drug War Is A Failure; Let's Call A Truce Now/USA Today
Petition For A Cease Fire/Green Panthers!

LEGALIZATION:

Marijuana Should Be Made Legal/Don Fiedler, NORML
The Case for Legalization of Drugs
The Dutch Treat Themselves With Respect And It Works
Drugs and our Communities: A Plan of Action
Politicians Know Little About Life On The Streets/Mike Royko ...
Give Up The Drug War; Legalize Drugs Instead/USA Today
Let's Legalize Drugs Now/San Francisco Examiner
Kentucky Lawyer (Gatewood Galbraith) Continues Marijuana Battle .
High Times Interview: Gatewood Galbraith
Voices for Legalization
Drug Summit/Counter Summit in San Antonio/High Times

MEDICAL MARIJUANA:

Marijuana As Medicine/Official NORML Statement
Marijuana Myths - Questions and Answers
Findings of Fact/Favorable Ruling on Marijuana Rescheduling
by DEA Administrative Law Judge Francis Young
Washington Post Reports (2) on Judge Young's Findings
Licit and Illicit Drugs/Consumers Union Report
Marijuana is Medicine/Ruling of Florida Circuit Court
Marijuana in Medicine? It's Time is Here
Harvard Medical School Report on Marijuana
National Drug Reform Strategy/The Drug Policy Foundation
Marijuana: Medicine or Menace/Spinal Network Extra
History of Impartial Reports Urging Drug Policy Reconsideration..
Medical Evidence Piles Up For Legalizing Hemp
Just Say Yes: Our Relationship with Psychoactive Plants
Bureaucratic Terrorism/High Times
Pot Legalization Has Medical, Financial Benefits

OFFICIAL REPORTS:

National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse

Marijuana Smoking in Viet Nam/John Steinbeck IV from "In Touch"..

HEMP FOR AGRICULTURE

Hemp (and Kudzu) for Victory

BOOK REVIEWS/EXCERPTS:

Dealing with Drugs: Consequences of Government Control (1987) ...

Breaking the Impasse in the War on Drugs (1986)

Searching for Alternatives: Drug Control Policy in the US (1991).

Drugs in America: A Case for Victory/Vincent Bugliosi (1991)

The Search for Rational Drug Control

Why We Are Losing the Great Drug War (1986)

Undoing Drugs: Beyond Legalization

Drug Control in A Free Society (1984)

Invisible Hand: The Marijuana Business (1987)

ACTIVIST POLICY/RHETORIC:

The Truth About Marijuana/Jim Hemphill

Remarks/1992 Cincinnati Rally/Jim Hemphill

NORML -- Official Policy

An Overview of Marijuana Laws

Sample Letter to News Media

Sample Letter to Politician

Sample Letter on Agricultural Hemp

Marijuana: Progress or Prohibition/Speech to Civic Organization..

RECREATIONAL USE:

Checklist on Deciding Whether to Smoke Marijuana

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Tough Questions Answered Easily About Marijuana

MARIJUANA SHOULD BE MADE LEGAL

by Donald B. Fiedler

Former Director

National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws

(Reprinted from USA Today)

The combined populations of Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, and Arkansas still would not equal the conservative estimate of 25 million regular marijuana users in the USA today.

The recreational marijuana user is in the midst of the battle in the war on drugs. Why has our "kinder, gentler nation" arbitrarily designated a vast portion of our citizenry as enemies of the state? Why disrupt the lives of 25 million otherwise law-abiding countrymen?

Nearly 490,000 Americans will die this year from illnesses or accidents related to tobacco and alcohol. Both are addictive and legal. Yet, in litigation to make marijuana more accessible for medicinal purposes, Judge Francis Young, after reviewing extensive medical research, stated: "Marijuana is far safer than many foods we commonly consume." If there is no health explanation to perpetuate the illegality of marijuana, why do we include it in the war on drugs?

"Marijuana leads to harder drugs," the just-say-no crowd says. But studies show the only connection is the illicit classification of marijuana and harder drugs; legalize marijuana and the connection would be broken. Comparing marijuana to cocaine and heroin is like comparing Kaopectate to Ex-Lax. They do different things to you.

Many who don't use marijuana recreationally are being punished by the vigilante prohibition approach. Patients suffering from multiple sclerosis, glaucoma, epilepsy, anorexia and nausea accompanying chemotherapy are not generally allowed to use marijuana as medicine. Industry must ignore the byproducts of hemp, which produces marijuana as its flower. Its stalk has uses for cloth, paper, rope, methanol and as a solution to the "greenhouse effect." Meanwhile, untaxed revenue from marijuana sales is being lost, while we are foolishly taxed \$15 billion annually in enforcing the current zero-tolerance marijuana strategy.

Marijuana laws must encourage responsible use and responsible distribution -- a subject for another day.

AN OVERVIEW OF MARIJUANA LAWS

by the National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws

User penalties continue to be the focus of anti-marijuana legislation. Having conceded that interdiction of supply can not win the drug war, politicians are concentrating on applying a host of criminal and civil penalties to the marijuana user.

The federal government is the driving force behind these user-penalty initiatives. The most common tactic is the attachment of special anti-drug conditions to federal aid. Such conditions range from requiring college campuses to adopt "drug education" programs to mandating "drug-free" work-places for government contractors. The recent "smoke a joint, lose your license" law is illustrative of this strategy. Through requiring states to adopt a policy of drivers license suspension for drug offenders, the federal government hopes to bring yet more pressure to bear on the marijuana user.

The California and Missouri legislatures voted against drivers' license suspension, but the struggle is just beginning. NORML Chapters in both states worked with other groups to defeat the bills. Some states implemented license suspension penalties even before the federal government's initiative in this direction.

In Georgia, for example, legislation has been implemented that calls for the revocation of any state issued license. This includes professional licenses and vending licenses. (Similar provisions were included in the recently defeated Missouri "user-penalty" bill). In addition, the State Supreme Court of Georgia recently ruled that a positive urinalysis test was prima-facia evidence of possession, and therefore a criminal offense. Also known as "internal possession" or "use penalties," similar legislation has been passed in a number of states. Essentially, it allows police officers to determine if an individual is under the influence of a controlled substance and charge them accordingly. Some states have followed Georgia's lead (Nevada, for example) and included positive drug tests as criminal violations. Given that marijuana is the most easily detected substance, there is no question as to who is being targeted. Expect to see similar legislation in your state in the future.

The forfeiture of property for small amounts of marijuana is another favored tactic. Many states include provisions for automobile forfeiture even when only small amounts of marijuana

are found.

Real estate, too, is subject to forfeiture, especially in cultivation cases. While some states exempt simple possession offenders from forfeiture, cultivation is, with few exceptions, heavily sanctioned. Increasingly, law enforcement agents are seizing anything of value that is in the presence of drugs. Recent examples of seized property include silverware, stereo equipment, jewelry and art. If you are subjected to a drug raid, you can expect agents to enter your home and pick it clean. They will grab anything they take a fancy to and stuff it in their sack. A couple of months later, your property will be sold at auction, with the proceeds going to hire more cops, buy new equipment, and to making your life more miserable. Remember, the more they seize, the more money they get.

All this can occur even before you have been convicted of a criminal offense. Your home, automobile and family heirlooms can be seized and held even before criminal charges are filed. What's more,, you can not even avail yourself of these assets to retain legal counsel. This has two very serious consequences.

First, in civil cases (where the property issue is settled) the state is not required to provide an attorney for you. That means that you will have to hire an attorney (probably on a contingency basis since your assets are seized), and it could cost \$20,000 in fees to get back \$50,000 in property. Second, in criminal court, it is likely you will be forced to be represented by a public defender (again because your assets have been seized) who is under a great deal of pressure to plead you guilty and process you as quickly as possible.

For those of you who are planning to go to college, you should be aware that drug offenders are ineligible for federal assistance. This includes scholarships and student loans. A rapist or child molester can get a student loan, but an individual convicted of possessing a few grams of vegetable matter can not. Had enough yet?

Educate yourself and others. Exercising your rights is a matter of survival and responsibility. You must at all times refuse to consent or cooperate with the drug warriors.

For more information on this subject, including a full rundown of each state's marijuana laws, call NORML in Washington -- 202-483-5500.

And to get the facts on drug testing, marijuana and health, the many uses of hemp, and upcoming activist events, call NORML at 1-900-97-NORML.

DISTINGUISHED SCHOLAR MILTON FRIEDMAN
IMPLORES DEA TO HALT PROHIBITION OPPRESSION

Dr. Milton Friedman is the senior research fellow of the Hoover Institution at Stanford University and a longtime advocate of marijuana legalization.

Following are two articles by Dr. Friedman, the first an open letter in 1989 to then-drug czar Bill Bennett, reprinted from the September 7, 1989 issue of the Wall Street Journal:

Dear Bill:

In Oliver Cromwell's eloquent words: "I beseech you, in the bowels of Christ, think it possible you might be mistaken" about the course you and President Bush urge us to adopt to fight drugs.

The path you propose of more police, more jails, use of the military in foreign countries, harsh penalties for drug users, and a whole panoply of repressive measures can only make a bad situation worse. The drug war cannot be won by those tactics without undermining the human liberty and individual freedom that you and I cherish.

You are not mistaken in believing that drugs are a scourge that is devastating our society. You are not mistaken in believing that drugs are tearing asunder our social fabric, ruining the lives of many young people, and imposing heavy costs on some of the most disadvantaged among us. You are not mistaken in believing that the majority of the public share your concerns. In short, you are not mistaken in the end you seek to achieve.

Your mistake is failing to recognize that the very measures you favor are a major source of the evils you deplore. Of course the problem is demand, but it is not only demand, it is demand that must operate through repressed and illegal channels. Illegality creates obscene profits that finance the murderous tactics of the drug lords; illegality leads to the corruption of law enforcement officials; illegality monopolizes the efforts of honest law forces so that they are starved for resources to fight the simpler crimes of robbery, theft and assault.

Drugs are a tragedy for addicts. But criminalizing their use converts that tragedy into a disaster for society, for users and non-users alike. Our experience with the prohibition of drugs is a replay of our experience with the prohibition of alcoholic beverages.

I append excerpts from a column that I wrote in 1972 on "Prohibition and Drugs." The major problem then was heroin from Marseilles; today, it is cocaine from Latin America. Today, also, the problem is far more serious than it was 17 years ago; more addicts; more innocent victims; more drug pushers; more law enforcement officials; more money spent to circumvent prohibition.

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. The lives of thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands of innocent victims would have been saved, and not only in the U.S. The ghettos of our major cities would not be drug and crime-infested no-man's lands. Fewer people would be in jails, and fewer jails would have been built.

Colombia, Bolivia and Peru would not be suffering from narco-terror, and we would not be distorting our foreign policy because of narco-terror. Hell would not, in the words with which Billy Sunday welcomed prohibition, "be forever for rent," but it would be a lot emptier. (see related article)

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, certainly not immediately. 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. Decriminalization would not prevent us from treating drugs as we now treat alcohol and tobacco; prohibiting sales of drugs to minors, outlawing the advertising of drugs and similar measures. Such measures could be enforced, while outright prohibition cannot be.

Moreover, if even a small fraction of the money we now spend on trying to enforce drug prohibition were devoted to treatment and rehabilitation, in an atmosphere of compassion, not punishment, the reduction in drug usage and in the harm done to the users could be dramatic.

This plea comes from the bottom of my heart. Every friend of freedom, and I know you are one, 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.

A country in which shooting down unidentified planes "on suspicion" can be seriously considered as a drug war tactic is not the kind of United States that either you or I want to hand down to future

generations.

A FLASHBACK: This is a shorter version of a column by Dr. Friedman in Newsweek's May 1, 1972, issue, as President Nixon was undertaking an earlier "drug war."

"The reign of tears is over. The slums will soon be only a memory. We will turn our prisons into factories and our jails into storehouses and corncribs. Men will walk upright now, women will smile, and the children will laugh. Hell will be forever for rent."

That is how Billy Sunday, the noted evangelist and leading crusader against Demon Rum, greeted the onset of Prohibition in early 1920.

We know now how tragically his hopes were doomed.

Prohibition is an attempted cure that makes matters worse -- for both the addict and the rest of us.

Consider first the addict. Legalizing drugs might increase the number of addicts, but it is not clear that it would. Forbidden fruit is attractive, particularly to the young. More importantly, drug addicts are deliberately made by pushers who give likely prospects that first few doses free. It pays the pusher to do so because, once hooked, the addict is a captive customer.

If drugs were legally available, any possible profit from such inhumane activity would disappear, since the addict could buy from the cheapest source.

Whatever happens to the number of addicts, the individual addict would clearly be far better off if drugs were legal. Addicts are driven to associate with criminals to get the drugs, become criminals themselves to finance the habit, and risk constant danger of death and disease.

Consider next the rest of us. The harm to us from the addiction of others arises almost wholly from the fact that drugs are illegal. It is estimated that addicts commit one third to one half of all street crime in the U.S.

Legalize drugs, and street crime would drop dramatically.

Moreover, addicts and pushers are not the only ones corrupted. Immense sums are at stake. It is inevitable that some relatively low-paid police and other government officials -- and some high-paid ones as well -- will succumb to the temptation to pick up some easy money.

Legalizing drugs would simultaneously reduce the amount of crime and raise the quality of law enforcement. Can you conceive of any other measure that would accomplish so much to promote law and order?

In drugs, as in other areas, persuasion and example are likely to be far more effective than the use of force to shape others in our image.

NOTABLE QUOTES ...

by Garry Trudeau's Doonesbury, in which Mr. Butts, a talking cigarette talks to (former) drug czar Bill Bennett --

"Bill, Bill, look at yourself, man. Addicted to nicotine. At the same time, you're throwing away thousands in jail for using a drug far less dangerous than tobacco. How many deaths a year did the Surgeon General implicate me in? About 395,000. Right? And yet society has learned to live with me and my costs. Meanwhile, poor Mr. Jay (a marijuana cigarette) doesn't have a single death to his credit, and you spend billions failing to eradicate him. What gives?"

by William F. Buckley Jr., syndicated columnist, publisher of National Review, and advocate of drug legalization --

"What is gathering in America is a deep frustration. The people do not listen anymore to a George Bush promising at his inauguration to do away with the "scourge" of drugs. They do not tune in to hear the drug czar. They can only agree that no politician can be elected who recommends the one thing that hasn't been tried."

by Henry Gregory, Progressive Life Center, a private mental health agency in Washington, D.C. --

"The drug epidemic is very convenient for many of those in the power structure. It immobilizes the black population as much if not more than slavery."

by The Orlando (Florida) Sentinel (Feb. 13, 1989) --

"Of the 5,888 callers Sunday and Monday, 4,669, or 79%, agreed that it's time to talk about legalizing marijuana use."

**LEGALIZERS, LAWYERS, LIBERALS
LIBERTARIANS LASH DRUG PLAN**

(from The Washington Times, 1989)

Not everyone was rushing to enlist in President Bush's war on drugs yesterday.

Critics and debunkers included organizations that fear increased government intrusion into Americans' private lives, doubt the chances for success or believe the problem is not drugs but their illegality.

A sampling of comments shows the diversity of opinions arrayed against the president's \$7.9 billion anti-drug plan.

* F. Andy Messing Jr., executive director of the National Defense Council Foundation: "To propose spending \$8 billion against a \$500 billion a year industry worldwide -- \$150 billion of it being in the United States -- is like taking a bucket of water to a forest fire."

* Ira Glasser, executive director of the American Civil Liberties Union, called the president's initiative a "scandal" and a "hoax on the public" that won't reduce drug crimes but will increase assaults on constitutional liberties. Instead of the plan's emphasis on law enforcement, he said, the government should spend "maybe a billion" on a massive campaign to educate the public on the dangers of drugs.

* Arnold Trebach, president of the Drug Policy Foundation, said the plan would result in "more crime in the streets, more drug-trade murders, more drug abuse and more AIDS, and more invasions of constitutional rights." Crack cocaine first appeared "during the Reagan drug wars," he said, adding, "The message is that wars on drugs, while politically popular, produce perverse results."

* Neal Sonnett, president of the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, faulted the plan's "lock 'em up mentality." Its stress on penalizing casual drug users is "terribly misguided and foolhardy," he said, asserting that there is little correlation between casual users and violent crime.

* The Alliance for Cannabis Therapeutics, a patients rights group, expressed concern that "as the war on drugs escalates, seriously ill patients will be caught in the crossfire." ACT noted that a year has passed since a judge told the Drug Enforcement Administration its ban on marijuana was "unreasonable, arbitrary and capricious," but DEA still won't allow it. The group favors prescription use of marijuana for cancer, glaucoma and multiple

sclerosis patients.

* David K. Walter, Libertarian Party chairman: "Every war America has fought has left us with two legacies: less liberty and more cemeteries. The war on drugs is no exception. We already have less liberty as new laws attempt to monitor and restrict personal behavior, and the next step may be the unloading of body bags from Colombia ...

"The war in the streets will end only when we recognize the parallel between gangster shootings in the streets of Chicago in the '20s and the murders in Los Angeles and Washington, D.C. today. We must repeal drug prohibition as we repealed alcohol prohibition, thus wiping out overnight the enormous illegal profits that create an irresistible incentive for pushing drugs."

* The Rev. Andrew Leigh Gunn, senior pastor of St. Luke's United Methodist Church on Wisconsin Ave. NW, and spokesman for Clergy for an Enlightened Drug Policy: "We who are spiritual leaders of the country believe there should be compassion and understanding and good will, and intelligent and enlightened love toward those who are afflicted with this drug epidemic. But we have nothing of this."

* Donald Fiedler, director of the National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws (NORML): "Why spend billions of tax dollars chasing the marijuana smoker -- building jail cells, treatment centers and unemployment lines -- for citizens leading productive lives? Let the prohibition pendulum against marijuana stop. It has gone too far. The nation must find another cure for this drugophobia."

* Dr. Ron Paul, 1988 Libertarian presidential candidate and former Texas congressman: "In a free society, adults have the right to do whatever they wish, so long as they do not aggress or commit fraud against others."

"The fact is 3,600 people die each year from drug abuse. That's less than 4 percent of those doomed by alcohol, about 1 percent of those killed by tobacco ... Instead of spending tax money and assaulting civil liberties in the name of fighting drugs -- usually couched in childish military metaphors -- we should consider a policy based on the American tradition of freedom."

DEALING WITH DRUGS: Consequences of Government Control (1987)
edited by Ronald Hamowy

Expands the debate on drugs; authors are psychiatrists, criminologists, pharmacologists and economists

"There is good evidence that Anslinger (U.S. Commissioner of Narcotics) did not believe such arrant nonsense concerning the effects of marijuana. Several scientific studies, all of them familiar to the FBN, indicated, in the words of the Indian Hemp Drug Commission Report of 1893-94, that "the moderate use of hemp drugs is practically attended by no evil results at all." The commission also concluded that "moderate use ... produces no injurious effects on the mind" and results in "no moral injury whatsoever." Similar findings were reached by the Panama Canal Zone Study of 1925, which was charged with investigating marijuana use among American troops stationed on the Isthmus. Despite the concern of the military authorities that increasing use of the drug could well pose a threat to discipline, the members of the committee, including its military advisers, found that "there is no evidence that marihuana ... is a 'habit-forming' drug in the sense in which the term is applied to alcohol, opium, cocaine, etc., or that it has any appreciably deleterious influence on the individuals using it," and recommended that "no steps be taken by the Canal Zone authorities to prevent the sale or use of marihuana." -- pages 21-22

"There seems little doubt that Anslinger chose to neglect what scientific evidence existed concerning the consequences of marijuana use for purely political purposes." -- p. 22

"Among the recent studies to which Grinspoon and Bakalar (medical doctors) call our attention are those that suggest that marijuana is useful in the treatment of alcohol dependence and that, under certain conditions, it can act as an efficacious analgesic and an anticonvulsant. In addition, the authors report that cannabis appears to be of value in treating glaucoma and as an antiemetic. They point to the significant fact that the legal problems connected with research on the effects of marijuana, as with narcotics and other controlled substances, cannot but discourage such studies; further, official attitudes toward the recreational use of illicit drugs commonly spill over into a biased perception of the medical potential of these substances." -- p. 25

The greatest advantage of cannabis as a medicine is its unusual safety. The ratio of lethal dose to effective dose is estimated

on the basis of extrapolation from animal data to be about 20,000 to one. Huge doses have been given to dogs without causing death, and there is no reliable evidence of death caused by cannabis in a human being. Cannabis also has the advantage of not disturbing any physiological functions or damaging any body organs when it is used in therapeutic doses. It produces little physical dependence or tolerance; there has never been any evidence that medical use of cannabis has led to habitual use as an intoxicant." -- pages 212-213

"Certainly a cannabis habit would be preferable to an alcohol habit for anyone who could not avoid dependence on a drug but was able to substitute one drug for another. -- p. 214

"The potential of cannabis as a medicine is yet to be realized, partly because of its reputation as an intoxicant, ignorance on the part of the medical establishment, and legal difficulties involved in doing the research Studies done during the past ten years have confirmed a centuries-old promise. With relaxation of the restrictions on research and the further chemical manipulation of cannabis derivatives, this promise will eventually be realized. The weight of past and contemporary evidence will probably prove cannabis to be valuable in several ways as a medicine. -- p. 219

BREAKING THE IMPASSE IN THE WAR ON DRUGS
by Steven Wisotsky

A law professor takes a sobering look at the failures of the Drug War.

Greenwood Press, 1986

QUOTES

"Public criticism does not occur very often because seven decades of Government propaganda about the evils of drugs have deprived the public of the power of critical thought respecting drugs and cowed it into silence. Fear of arrest and prosecution silences users of illegal drugs (unless they get into trouble, in which case public confession and denunciation of drugs become obligatory). This "chilling effect" deprives the public of a critically important perspective -- the positive experience of successful, long-term, controlled drug users. People who do not use drugs but object to the status quo on groups of principle or cost also rarely speak out; most back off from the controversial nature of the issue, silenced by the powerful social stigma attached to those who "favor" drugs. In this respect, the Government's misleading and useless formulation of "the drug problem" as one arising from the substances themselves rather than human action renders intelligent discussion impossible." -- p. 174.

"Just as the war in Vietnam pursued a path of constant escalation up to a half-million troops until final collapse of public support, so too the War on Drugs spirals upward toward oblivion." -- p. 178.

"Nearly everyone starts with presumption of our present framework for controlled substances claims scientific rationalization, i.e. that illegal drugs carry that status because they are more dangerous than legal ones, both the regulated and the unregulated kind. Of course, nothing could be further from the truth. Both marijuana and cocaine, for example, fell into the prohibitionist net without any serious legislative inquiry or medical research, based largely on racial or ethnic prejudices and irrational fears of a nonexistent crime wave. In essence, the drugs we have outlawed represent the habits of alien cultures. By the same token, if we did not give cultural approval to alcohol and tobacco and instead applied the controlled substances framework to them, we would have to place them on Schedule I as dangerous drugs with "no accepted medical use" and "a high potential for abuse" leading to "severe physical or psychological dependence." -- p. 185.

SEARCHING FOR ALTERNATIVES:

Drug Control Policy in the United States (1991)
Edited by Melvyn B. Krauss and Edward P. Lazear
Hoover Institution Press, Stanford University

"After a detailed analysis of all the factors entering into the costs and benefits of the marijuana laws, he (scholar John Kaplan) concluded that in this case there was 'an enormous disparity between the costs and benefits of the marijuana laws' and that 'the social and financial costs directly and indirectly attributable to the criminalization of marijuana far outweigh the benefits of this policy.' In the circumstances, he said, 'the only responsible course of action ... is a liberalization of the marijuana law so extensive as to constitute an abandonment of primary reliance on the criminal law in this area.' -- p. 22

"It is safe to assume that making marijuana legally available would yield many positive consequences: dramatic reductions in marijuana arrests and governmental expenditures on marijuana interdiction and domestic enforcement of marijuana laws; tax revenues amounting to billions of dollars annually; reduced risks from adulterated marijuana; elimination of the violence associated with illicit marijuana trade; easy availability of marijuana for medical purposes; and so on." -- p. 243

"Two decades ago, half the population was addicted to tobacco, now less than one-third is. That is very significant because nicotine is perhaps the most addictive drug available (yes, even more addictive than cocaine) and because it is still controlled very loosely -- that is, it is available over the counter and in vending machines, it is advertised, and it is subsidized by the government. No doubt under present political realities even marijuana, the safest currently illegal drug, would be controlled more stringently than tobacco. In addition to seeing reductions in the use of both alcohol and tobacco, we have also seen movement to safer, less potent forms of the drugs, nonalcoholic beers, wine coolers, low-tar and low-nicotine cigarettes."

"Another example of the relaxation of laws not causing increased use is the decriminalization of marijuana. By 1978, eleven states encompassing one-third of the population had decriminalized marijuana. In addition, over 30 other states had enacted conditional discharge laws which allowed first offenders to be placed on a brief period of probation and, when that was completed, to have no criminal record. This relaxation of laws did not result in increased use. Indeed, since 1978 there has been a dramatic decline in marijuana use among all age groups, particularly adolescents. I am not claiming the change in laws caused the decline, but relaxation of the laws did not prevent a

decline in use." -- p. 264

"There are two reasons prohibition actually encourages the use of illegal drugs. The first is the "forbidden fruit" glamorization of illegality. This is particularly powerful among youth going through their rebellious teenage years. The second affects adults as well as youth -- black market profits. This is especially true in our ghettos where there is little hope or opportunity for success. Decriminalization does away with both these causes and thus we should not be surprised that reform might actually result in a decline in drug use." -- p. 265

"Repeal of drug prohibition respects the decision-making ability of each individual. The individual is responsible for his or her own health and well-being, rather than the government. When presented with the true risks of drug use most individuals will make sensible choices. We are a health-conscious society. One need only look at our concern with cholesterol, or eating oat bran, or sales of workout tapes to recognize that most people do not want to hurt themselves. Decriminalization, entered into with caution, will not inevitably result in massive increases in drug use." -- pages 265-266

"To begin, I would completely decriminalize marijuana tomorrow and require only that a cigarette weighing 500 mg to 1.0 gram of marijuana would deliver 12 to 20 mg of delta-9-THC. It would be available for purchase to those over 18 with certain restrictions as to time of sale. The use of legal marijuana would be accompanied by strong penalties for driving under its influence. I would encourage the development of alternative delivery systems that so that delta-9-THC could be consumed by methods other than combustion, volatilization and inhalation.

"The benefits would be profound. At no cost in increased toxicity, there would be 600,000 to 700,000 fewer arrests in the United States and perhaps \$5 billion could be saved in actual police work. Delta-9-THC could be used for its therapeutic effects and we could more easily plan our decriminalization of other psychoactive substances. Those millions of people who would safely use the drug would no longer be exposed to criminals to obtain it. A young man I know, under amnesty, would be released from a life sentence in a federal prison for smuggling marijuana."

"Our drug policy is best described as perverse. It promotes what it wishes to stop -- the corruption of youth -- and it helps those it wishes to punish -- retail and wholesale marketers of drugs. The only reason such a policy can continue is that it is not evaluated as policy. We could ask for proof of deterrence and evidence of a proper return on interdiction investment, but we do not truly wish to evaluate our drug policy. We continue this policy because it is a crusade -- a holy war designed to buttress

fondly desired moral goals and outcomes. Since drug use is a sin, we must condemn it by law, because making it legal would seem to bespeak a longing for sin. We can evaluate a policy by what it does and accomplishes. We evaluate a crusade by how it makes us feel about ourselves. Ironically, our drug policy, although using the language of health and compassion, is harmful and corrupt." - pages 417 & 421

NOTABLE QUOTES FROM ELSEWHERE

by Richard Cohen, Washington Post editorial writer (Dec. 18, 1989)
--

"In his Harvard speech, Bennett (former drug czar Bill Bennett) criticized intellectuals, especially those of the left, who pollute the nation's op-ed pages with cynicism about the War on Drugs and with their occasional calls for legalization.

"But Bennett, too, is an intellectual, at least has been certified as such -- Ph.D., University of Texas. Trouble is, in his present and seemingly permanent incarnation as a public official, he has forgotten the first obligation of an intellectual is to use his intellect. In Bennett's case, that would mean keeping an open mind and wondering what about legalization so intrigued George Schultz. He might, for a second, set aside his big brass drum and actually propose that legalization be studied, maybe a Presidential Commission?" (A comical reference to several other Presidential Commissions which have all recommended decriminalization of marijuana.)

by Jeff Greenfield, Universal Press Syndicate, August 28, 1989, on what President Bush won't tell us about the war on drugs --

-- He will not tell us that the idea of attacking the "casual user" is a joke. In a country that cannot find room in its prisons for all of the child abusers and killers, the notion of throwing a few million Americans into jails or into hopelessly overcrowded treatment centers is an insult to our intelligence.

-- He will not tell us that the real case against casual drug use is not that it will turn you into a raving, criminal lunatic. There are simply too many functioning executives, stockbrokers, teachers, journalists, steelworkers, venture capitalists and athletes using drugs to make that stick.

**WHY WE ARE LOSING THE GREAT DRUG WAR
And Radical Proposals That Could Make America Safe Again**

by Dr. Arnold S. Trebach
Professor in the School of Justice, American University
Founder of the Institute on Drugs, Crime and Justice in Washington,
D.C. and London

Macmillan Publishing Co. (1986)

QUOTES

"A balanced review of all the authoritative research during the past century documents no distinctive harm from marijuana. Its addictive threat comes from the fact that it is an intoxicant, but any intoxicant taken compulsively presents possible dangers to young people. Its threat to physical health comes from the fact that it is absorbed in the form of smoke, but any smoke, even from corn silk or chopped parsley, taken regularly into the body could eventually cause serious harm to some people. -- p. 78

"While there has been a national obsession with controlling marijuana, and while the war on drugs primarily nets marijuana offenders, there is unimpeachable pathological evidence that our youth and adults are in greater danger from many other legal drugs, some of which are totally uncontrolled by the law. As far as I can determine, it is almost impossible to take a fatal overdose of marijuana, even though such claims are often made by drug-war zealots. After several decades of massive marijuana use by an officially estimated total of 61,940,000 Americans at least once in their lives, it is at yet impossible to identify a single overdose, accidental, or suicide fatality caused primarily by marijuana use when there have been many such deaths identified from abuse of such substances as Darvon, Valium, Tylenol and aspirin! It is solid evidence such as this, issued by the Reagan administration and always ignored by the Reagans and ridiculed by their supporters as misleading, that leads me to the conclusion about the safety of marijuana as compared to other commonly used substances. As actually used by the great majority of consumers, marijuana appears to be one of the least toxic drugs that human beings take." -- p. 81.

(about the idea that marijuana leads to harder drugs)

"Repeated studies have documented, though, that the first mind-altering chemical most young people use is alcohol. On the basis of such irrefutable evidence, we could postulate that the major gateway drug for millions of our kids is not pot, but alcohol, that alcohol leads to all drugs, and that therefore we should have a war

on alcohol, starting with a new prohibition law. Other research suggests a similar role for tobacco, thus raising the possibility of another prohibition law based upon a different gateway drug." -
- p. 82

"I find little support for the gateway theory as applied to pot in any of the data issued by the government, including the massive surveys of residents of households put out periodically by NIDA. To me, they prove conclusively that (1) pot smoking usually leads only to more pot smoking; (2) many young people smoke pot a great deal, then get bored with it, and cut down or stop totally; (3) a minority of pot smokers move on to harder drugs or continue to smoke pot along with those more potent chemicals. I can find no causal link between, say, pot smoking and heroin injection or cocaine sniffing in these surveys. -- p. 83.

(on decriminalization of marijuana in The Netherlands)

"While Dutch criminal-justice and drug abuse experts are independent characters and openly disagree on many things, there is almost universal agreement among them -- including police leaders -- that they have largely solved the marijuana problem. Their optimism and my personal observation from wandering the streets and coffeehouses of Dutch cities are supported by objective survey research. The use of marijuana by Dutch youth has dropped since the Seventies. Today it seems to be substantially less than in those countries -- especially West Germany, Norway and the United States -- that have undertaken a campaign to castigate the Dutch with the objective of forcibly enlisting them in the war on drugs. -- p. 105.

"I now believe more than ever that if our governmental and social leaders were to provide a wide array of honest information about drugs and consciousness, and if they then combined that often-conflicting information with a more tolerant law-enforcement policy, millions of our people would be helped to make similar positive improvements in their own lives. So to those who believe we corrupt our youth, or our adults, by telling them the whole range of "truths" about drugs, my self-education of the past 14 years would say, no, they are very wrong. A free society is corrupted when national leaders make major policy decisions on the basis of a rigid refusal to consider the full spectrum of scientific and public opinion about an issue that so directly affects the personal lives of its citizens. -- p. 113.

UNDOING DRUGS: Beyond Legalization (1991)
by Daniel K. Benjamin and Roger Leroy Miller
BasicBooks, A Division of HarperCollins Publishers

How we, the people can retake America from the drug dealers, drug addicts and drug enforcement agents.

EXCERPT FROM A REVIEW by Alan Reynolds, Forbes columnist and Director of Economic Research at the Hudson Institute:

"An extraordinarily well-documented, calmly reasoned, yet devastating indictment of the many ways in which federal officials have abused the 'war on drugs' to trample the Bill of Rights, triple the Justice Department's budget in a decade, and divert scarce state and local police and prisons away from violent criminals toward victimless moral offenses. The authors' innovative solution to endless and escalating drug warfare should be as compelling to conservatives, who understand the importance of federalism, as it surely will be to libertarians, who deplore the rapid proliferation of police-state tactics by increasingly unconstrained federal prosecutors and enforcers."

QUOTES FROM THE BOOK

"Because of such considerations, ten state governments in America as well as the Netherlands in Europe, have made the decision to "decriminalize" the possession of small amounts of marijuana. Users who are caught don't end up with a criminal record, and generally pay a fine or perform community service instead of going to jail. Interestingly, the deterrent effect seems to have been maintained: There is no evidence of a surge in marijuana use in any of these locations, and use in the Netherlands actually declined significantly after decriminalization." -- pages 106-107

"Casual use of a drug that has remarkably few adverse effects when used casually was transformed into the largest single source of criminal records among the American citizenry As with the opiates, the fundamental problem with the approach of our government toward marijuana lies in its inability to balance beneficial consequences against adverse effects. Importantly, this is because the government fails to distinguish the use of marijuana from the adverse consequences of its use, just as the government has failed to make this distinction for the opiates." -- p. 167

"What rational explanation can one give for the striking contrast between governmental policies toward alcohol and toward marijuana? A charitable explanation (and one that is routinely offered) is that alcohol use is tolerated because it is so ingrained in American society that it would be impossible to halt. There is

merit in this argument as witnessed by our disastrous fourteen-year experience with Prohibition. Yet every month, 20 million Americans subject themselves to the risk of arrest because they use marijuana, and for tens of thousands of them each month, that risk becomes an arrest record. Each year, hundreds of millions of dollars and tens of thousands of hours of law enforcement are spent on the federal government's futile attempts to prevent people from using marijuana. This effort, and its lack of success, has been going on for more than fifty years, and if marijuana does not now qualify as being "ingrained" in American society, it is hard to imagine what would qualify. No government agency has ever presented any evidence to demonstrate that the efforts to prevent the use of marijuana are warranted on any grounds other than the fact that a 1937 law is still on the books.*"

* footnote -- One rationale given for the prohibition of the use of marijuana is that it is purportedly a "gateway" drug whose use somehow leads to the use of other, more dangerous drugs. This argument was originally used over sixty years ago when it was claimed that marijuana use somehow led to heroin use. In fact, surveys of heroin users reveal that it was their prior enjoyable experiences with alcohol and barbiturates --- not marijuana -- that led them to try heroin. -- p. 169

"Blanket attempts at the national level to eliminate the use of psychoactives failed with alcohol in America 60 years ago, just as they failed with caffeine in Arabia 1,000 years ago. Today's federal policies toward psychoactives are nothing more than a repeat performance of the failed policies of the past. Unless the American people change the way drug policy is made in our land, the adverse consequences of that policy will continue to outweigh its beneficial effects and we, the people, shall be the losers." -- pages 246-247

NOTABLE QUOTES FROM ELSEWHERE

by a New York Times editorial, Nov. 7, 1989 --

"Legalizing marijuana deserves discussion."

by Rep. George W. Crockett Jr. (D-Mich) --

"Decriminalization is the only solution. Our courts are burdened down with these drug cases and there is nothing they can do about it. And here we are talking about spending additional billions to build jails and prisons to send people to."

THE CASE FOR LEGALIZING DRUGS

by Richard Lawrence Miller

Praeger Publishers, 1 Madison Ave., NY, NY 10010

.....Explores the origins, purposes, and effects of America's drug war with documentation from chemists, biologists, pharmacologists, psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists, historians, prosecutors, police officers and drug users themselves.

QUOTES

"None of the classic reports on marijuana, reviewing findings from researchers around the world, have found any physical peril for users of the drug. Weil characterizes marijuana as an "active placebo," meaning that it produces trivial physical effects and that users' psychological reactions are created entirely by set and setting rather than by pharmacological action." -- p. 18

"Smokers worldwide use it for all purposes -- to concentrate, stimulate, relax -- a "universal drug" producing whatever effects a user wants Marijuana's pharmacological properties are so limited that an experienced user can perform any normal tasks without measurable impairment, whether or not the user is "under the influence. In a controlled experiment heavy marijuana use had no effect on productivity in "fairly demanding manual labor." Even some driving tests show the same number of errors by subjects who received a dose of marijuana and those who took no drug." -- p. 18

"Marijuana's safety can also be measured by its "therapeutic ratio," the difference between the size of dose needed for the desired effect and the size that produces poisoning. Marijuana is so safe that the therapeutic ratio has yet to be found, although it has been calculated in the thousands Deaths from marijuana overdose are no more common than deaths from drinking too many glasses of water at one sitting." -- p. 19

"None of the major inquiries into marijuana, before or after the 1960s, detected any long-term damage from moderate use." -- p. 19

"Some people claim that marijuana is a "gateway" drug, that using it leads to more dangerous substances. The weakness of this claim is demonstrated by history, reasoning and stark experience. -- p. 19

"Cheap Mexican labor threatened Anglo jobs during the Great Depression. As concern about Mexican-American labor competition grew in the West and Southwest, so did alarm about a new drug peril-- marijuana, then identified as "Mexican opium." Because

marijuana use was considered a Mexican custom in the Southwest, state criminalization of the practice was a lawful means to harass Mexican-Americans, forcing them into jail or out of the country. Either way they would no longer compete for Anglo jobs. This was the context of sudden demands for a federal law against marijuana in the late 1930s." -- pages 98-99

"In 1937 his (U.S. Commissioner of Narcotics Harry Anslinger) horror stories were questioned by Dr. William C. Woodward, who testified to Congress on behalf of the American Medical Association, which advocated continued legal availability of marijuana. Woodward noted that debate on outlawing marijuana relied on rumor and hearsay; federal agencies with solid facts had not been asked to provide them. If anti-marijuana legislation were to deal with a drug problem, Congress might have taken up Woodward's point. If the legislation's purpose were to harass certain segments of the population, Woodward's objections were irrelevant. Congress treated them as irrelevant and proceeded to ban marijuana." -- p. 99

"Drugs never merited attention until certain users were seen as problems. No one considered middle-aged Southern white women or Northern industrialists as hazards to society because they used opiates. Only when Chinese opiate users threatened wage levels and job availability did opium become a target of criminal sanction. Opium was a metaphor for Chinese ... Marijuana was first a metaphor for Hispanics, then for African-Americans, still later for youths who challenged social norms Thus severe criminal penalties, penalties that are depraved if we only consider pharmaceutical effects, begin to make sense. Penalties are not intended to discourage use. The point is to oppress scapegoats who are metaphors for society's ills, in which case punishment can never be too harsh.

"The drug war has continued for so long that people have forgotten its metaphorical origins. Instead, a fundamentalist attitude has evolved in which drugs themselves are viewed as evil, rather than a symbol for evil. Whenever fundamentalists control public policy in a diverse society, terrible turmoil results. The fundamentalists who control American drug policy have now targeted ordinary citizens for destruction -- if people can somehow avoid jail they are still to be denied jobs and even permission to drive an automobile. Fundamentalists have expanded attacks on outcasts into a war on everyone. Everyone is the enemy and must repeatedly produce body fluids to be tested for purity until contamination is found. Then punishment can begin. Such is the way of religious inquisitions." - p.103-104

DRUG CONTROL IN A FREE SOCIETY

by James B. Bakalar and Lester Grinspoon, Harvard Medical School

Cambridge University Press, 1984

QUOTES

"Alcohol prohibition in the 1920s and marihuana prohibition today may have produced the same nasty side effects: costs of arrest and punishment, growing disrespect for the law, organized criminal violence, police corruption and oppression, poisonous adulteration, and misrepresentation. The parallels are ridiculously precise ..."
p. 33.

"We concede that alcohol is a very dangerous substance and creates a vast health problem, while recognizing that it can also be a harmless indulgence. But apparently the strain of tolerating the ambiguity is too great, because we are unable to do the same for any other drug, even when there is little evidence that the drug could ever be as dangerous as alcohol." p. 33.

"There is another way in which the diagnosis of drug use as a symptom of personal inadequacy can be misleading. Learning to use a socially acceptable drug like alcohol is part of growing up; it is one of the symbols and rituals of adulthood. Marihuana, on the other hand, was until recently identified with youthful rebellion, that is, with immaturity. The rituals of marihuana use therefore had a different value, and one of the worries of parents whose children used the drug was that they were not growing up in the socially approved way. From this uneasiness, it was a short step to the judgment that anyone who used this "wrong" drug, following a slightly different ritual and passing into a slightly different social world, was emotionally immature, weak, unable to face problems -- even "fleeing" reality." Users of an unfamiliar drug are likely to be seen as menacing if they are far enough away, inadequate if they are too close to home. So a psychological judgment is made on a social situation." -- p. 44.

"Altogether, probably more than \$10 billion a year is spent to suppress drugs. Much of it is used to stop smuggling, but at most 10 percent of imported illicit drugs are seized. A relaxation of the marihuana laws in California saved at least \$7.4 billion in court costs in the first six months." -- p. 110.

INVISIBLE HAND: THE MARIJUANA BUSINESS (1987)

by Roger Warner

Beech Tree Books, William Morrow, 105 Madison Ave., NY, NY 10016

QUOTES

"For twenty years the government has used the same failed strategy over and over, chasing after drug suppliers while inadvertently helping them make huge profits. Adjusting the tactics hasn't helped much. For example, when DEA's budget for aid to state eradication was quadrupled, to a million dollars, the budget was worth as much as four pot gardens of the type I had seen in Humboldt County (California), instead of one. There simply wasn't enough money in the government to wipe out the pot garden nationwide." -- p. 22

"Underneath all the commotion (of the drug war), a policy based on law enforcement control can never get anywhere, because of simple economics. As long as citizens want drugs, and as long as those drugs are illegal, a black market will flourish. As long as the black marketers think they can make large profits, they will find ways to produce the drugs and sell them to consumers. Morality doesn't have anything to do with it. It is a matter of economics, of supply and demand." -- p. 270.

NOTABLE QUOTES FROM ELSEWHERE ...

by Ann Landers, syndicated columnist --

"Is legalization the answer? Lord knows what we are doing now is not working. The "war" against drugs has been a failure. The lady with all the answers doesn't have the answer to this one."

by the late Sen. Hubert Humphrey on April 25, 1977 --

"I believe that a realistic response to society to the use of marijuana definitely should include the reduction of penalties under existing laws relating to personal possession and use of marijuana. What is demanded today are extensive programs of drug abuse prevention and rehabilitation, with law enforcement being concentrated on the apprehension and conviction of the professional and criminal traffickers in dangerous drugs."

THE SEARCH FOR RATIONAL DRUG CONTROL

by Franklin E. Zimring and Gordon Hawkins

A comprehensive examination of the drug control policy process in the United States, how policy choices are identified, debated and selected, how consequences of governmental policy are measured and evaluated, and how we learn -- if we do -- from our mistakes.

Cambridge University Press, 1992

QUOTES

"The use of cannabis as an intoxicant can be traced "to the earliest beginnings of history." Marijuana was cultivated "throughout Asia and the Near East from the earliest known times to the present." In America, it was first cultivated for its fiber, and from the beginning of the seventeenth century until 1937 it was used in medical practice for a wide range of conditions and was listed in the United States Pharmacopeia as a recognized medicine in 1850, remaining on the list until 1942. It was sold "over the counter by drug stores at modest prices" in the form of fluid extracts. Ready-made marijuana cigarettes were also marketed as a remedy for asthma." - p. 70.

"Historically," John Kaplan reported, "the most significant argument for the prohibition of marijuana use has been that the drug causes its users to commit violent crime." This certainly was the argument that the Federal Bureau of Narcotics relied on in advocating antimarijuana laws. In 1937, before the passage of the Marijuana Tax Act, Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger stated, "How many murders, suicides, robberies, criminal assaults, hold-up, burglaries and deeds of maniacal insanity it (marijuana) causes each year especially among the young, can only be conjectured" (Kaplan, 1970, p. 89); the implication, of course, being that the missing number was very large indeed. In fact, as Kaplan concluded a careful review of all the evidence, "the total evidence of the case supports the view that marijuana inhibits rather than increases aggression." - p. 71.

The stepping stone theory has a history going back to the beginning of the century when it was used as an argument for prohibiting both alcohol and cigarettes. "Morphine," it was said, "is the legitimate consequence of alcohol, and alcohol is the legitimate consequence of tobacco. Cigarettes, drink, opium is the logical and regular series" (Townes, 1912, p. 770). In fact, as Kaplan pointed out, there is a positive correlation between the use of any drug and use of all other drugs" (Kaplan, 1970, p. 228), which may mean no more than that some people have personalities that predispose

them to drug use. Kaplan concluded, in relation to the association between the use of marijuana and the use of more dangerous drugs, than an important element may be that the criminalization of marijuana precipitates the use of other drugs by bringing the marijuana user into contact with the drug culture (Kaplan, 1970, p. 230). -- p. 72.

"From the standpoint of every significant social value except political compliance, marijuana is a relatively benign substance, and a major campaign to reduce its use would not produce obvious or significant benefits. It might also be politically dangerous. Many citizens concerned about the violent rot of inner-city, drug-impacted areas might have less charitable characterizations of a war on pot than "uncertain in benefits" when it became clear the anti-marijuana initiatives would come at the expense of resources devoted to either enforcement or treatment for cocaine and heroin." -- p. 181.

NOTABLE QUOTES FROM ELSEWHERE:

by Mike Royko, syndicated columnist --

"Not long ago, somebody took a public opinion poll on how people feel about controlled legalization of some drugs. The poll said 90% of those who responded were against any and all forms of legalization of any and all drugs that are now legal. When I read that, I shrugged and thought, 'so much for that idea.' But when I returned from a two-week vacation, I had a huge stack of mail on my desk, from people in all parts of America. More than 1,000 of them were responding to a couple of columns I did suggesting that maybe we should consider some form of decriminalization and control.

"To my surprise, about 80 or 90% agreed that the Bush Approach, which is the old Nixon approach, which became the Reagan Approach, doesn't have a prayer of succeeding.

"These letters weren't from bleary potheads. Many were from chiefs of police, judges, lawyers, physicians, local and federal narcs, beat cops, undercover cops, and people who have first-hand knowledge of the drug problem. Others were from thinktank scholars who have researched the subject in depth."

MARIJUANA/HEMP/CANNABIS:

**PROHIBITION IS FUELED BY LIES,
IGNORANCE AND GREED**

**LEGALIZATION MEANS FREEDOM TO
TAP HEALTH, ECONOMIC BENEFITS**

by Jim Hemphill, Cincinnati NORML

Lies, lies, lies. The big lie has rolled on since the 1930s.

When pharmacists were shocked to look up one day and see that cannabis sativa, used in many medicines, was suddenly outlawed by the most outrageous pack of lies ever heard in court -- by the same people who brought us alcohol prohibition.

The 1930s ... When the Hearst family, with its vast Pacific Northwest timber holdings, wanted to denude those forests for newsprint and outlaw a strong competitor for making paper --hemp.

The 1930s ... When the duPont family, another part of the greed clique, patented nylon and wanted to eliminate hemp as a competitor for making rope and twine. The ban came just in time to forestall the utilization of a newly patented harvesting machine for hemp that would have the crop highly competitive. In the battle between a natural plant, essentially a medicinal herb and fiber plant that contributes favorably to the environment, and the synthetic petrochemical and pharmaceutical industries, which have severely damaged the environment we know we won. And we all lost.

The 1930s ... When authorities trumped up blatant lies about the marijuana smoked by Mexican American laborers in order to protect the precious jobs held by Anglos during the Great Depression. They portrayed it as a "devil weed" that instigated acts of violence and lust. Later, the racist U.S. Commissioner of Narcotics, Harry Anslinger, used marijuana to attack African Americans as well.

A significant side benefit was the protection of all those enforcement jobs that went down the drain with repeal of alcohol prohibition.

Hemp/marijuana has been victimized ever since by lies, myths, half-truths, and greed.

Including the well-financed liquor lobby, which sees legalization as severely cutting alcohol consumption. It might. It would definitely reduce the tragedies of alcohol addiction, including the cost of addiction treatment, thousands of highway deaths each year

and the many related law enforcement and judicial headaches. At Cincinnati NORML, we are dedicated to the truth.

We're not ragtag hippies bitching to ourselves. We're responsible citizens who have smoked marijuana for many years -- without ill effects. As students, we have read and studied and become angry at the DEA's fascist entrapment tactics that continue to persecute smokers because it's easier than facing the genuine threat of the highly resourceful and very dangerous cocaine dealers.

The DEA is both outmanned and corrupt. They puff out their chests and appear to be effective by busting hemp smokers whose so-called crime hurts no one -- not even themselves. There is no victim. There should be no crime.

So why is marijuana illegal? Here are some of the reasons:

* The big lie, told for so long that people believe it. A lot of people are afraid of marijuana's effects, short and long-term. There is no valid reason to be.

* Self-serving politicians who can't afford to be advocates because of public attitudes based on the big lie. Too much public policy is based on prevailing ignorance and erroneous perception -- not facts, logic and wisdom.

* DEA and other law enforcement people who are ignorant of the truth about hemp, anxious for easy busts to justify their jobs, and to build their base of power.

* Drug hysteria. Vast numbers of people relate hemp closely to hard pharmaceutical drugs -- know no difference. Comparing the leaves and buds of this natural plant to the highly-concentrated pharmaceuticals produced in laboratories is like comparing ice water to battery acid.

* Fear of persecution. Millions of "closet smokers" are afraid to come forward. They would be targeted by law enforcement and risk losing their jobs. The big lie has created a big stigma.

* Laws and public opinion forged by the ignorant -- those who do not and have not smoked hemp. The people who know little or nothing about it are in control.

* Lies and conspiracy by the opposition. For example: The Partnership for a Drug-Free America -- heavily financed by beer, cigarette and pharmaceutical companies -- has been forced to pull a TV commercial allegedly showing the brain waves of a 14-year old after smoking hemp. THEY HAD TO ADMIT IT WAS THE BRAIN WAVES OF A PERSON IN A COMA. A spokesperson said it was "better to lie to the public" in order to protect them from "the dangers of marijuana."

Beer and liquor companies see vastly reduced revenues from legalization. Pharmaceutical companies are strongly dedicated by producing synthetic drugs. They can't make money from people smoking hemp buds and leaves for stomach disorders, headaches, chemotherapy-caused nausea, spasticity, anorexia, multiple sclerosis, epilepsy or to relieve the symptoms of glaucoma.

* Too many Americans have become apathetic about individual freedoms, as well as arrogantly self-centered and judgmental. Many prefer the more addictive and dangerous habits of tobacco and alcohol. They don't care about the civil liberty and freedom of cannabis smokers because it doesn't affect them. They are also "turned off" when they see hippie-like hemp advocates and don't realize that the nation's closets are full of responsible, well-groomed citizens who are afraid to step forward for legalization.

* Smoking hemp gives one temporary feelings of euphoric peace, love, brotherhood, passivity. Often, hemp smokers have just wanted to "lay back" and enjoy themselves and not risk arrest and imprisonment by fighting for legalization. They have been easy prey.

But passivity does not mean lethargy. Just as a drink or two doesn't hamper one from normal activities, neither does smoking a joint turn one into a lethargic derelict. The addictive personality who would lie around and smoke pot all day is the same personality who would and does do the same with alcohol and tobacco. It is not within the substance; it is within the personality.

Don't overestimate the power of the substance. As Willie Nelson says: "An asshole can smoke marijuana and he'll still be an asshole."

Cinti NORML advocates the legalization and responsible usage of hemp for adults -- if the individual chooses to use it, with basically the same civil controls as with alcohol.

IF WE COULD ONLY GIVE YOU ALL OF INFORMATION AT ONCE but we can't. You have to read other reports in this collection to get all the facts. Meantime, send us your toughest questions and we'll deal with them: Cinti NORML, Box 3557, Cinti, OH 45202.

**MEDICAL EVIDENCE FILES
UP FOR LEGALIZING HEMP**

In Washington, D.C., a DEA administrative judge has called marijuana "one of the safest and most useful therapeutic substances known to man."

After hearing days of testimony from medical authorities, he could find no reason not to lower the classification of marijuana on DEA's scale of dangerous narcotics. He openly criticized the DEA's insistence that it be kept in the same classification as heroin.

The DEA chose to disdain both the evidence and the ruling and continue its police state tactics to eradicate hemp and persecute its users.

The court battle continues. The DEA is now being charged to come up with reasonable evidence why it will not accept Judge Francis L. Young's ruling in the marijuana rescheduling petition of Sept. 6, 1988.

But the wheels of the judicial system grind very slowly and DEA fascists continue to violate common sense, individual rights and freedoms in its hysterical drive to absolutely destroy this valuable medicinal plant.

Recent media stories, however, surely will help the cause of justice, such as the following front page article in USA Today, headlined "Some cancer MDs still prescribe pot."

"Almost half of cancer doctors responding to a survey have suggested patients smoke illegal marijuana for nausea caused by chemotherapy. Pills containing a synthesized version of pot's active ingredient, THC, are available for medical use. But some experts believe smoking marijuana is more effective for treating nausea.

"At issue is an ongoing administrative and legal dispute concerning whether marijuana in smoked form should be available," said Richard Dolbin and Mark Kleinman of Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government, Boston, in a letter to Annals of Internal Medicine.

They sent surveys at random to 2,430 oncologists. Of the 1,035 who responded:

- * 44% had recommended pot to at least one patient.
- * 48% would prescribe it for cancer patients if legal.
- * 54% said smoking it should be legal for medical purposes.

Since less than half of the doctors responded, those who did may have been biased. But Dolbin believes the conclusions are still valid: "The findings don't necessarily mean 50% of doctors want to prescribe marijuana, but ... a very substantial minority find the medical use to be both safe and effective," he says.

The federal government has said most doctors do not support marijuana smoking for medical reasons.

The article produced no evidence that this statement was true. The 68 pages of rescheduling petition evidence is public record. Write Cinti NORML if you want a copy. More on this battle in upcoming issues.

NOTABLE QUOTES

by R.W. Sweet, Federal District Judge (December 12, 1989) --

This issue is one of control and responsibility. Government and laws exist in my view to accomplish for the citizen what he or she cannot accomplish for themselves or to punish those who do unto others what others abhor. Given my experience, I support the thought expressed by John O'Sullivan in 1837 that, "The best government is that which governs least."

.... Marijuana (gives) a sense of relaxation and ease. What then is wrong? As to marijuana, particularly today, the answer is nothing. It is reported to be our fourth most important cash crop. In 1972, President Nixon's Commission on the drug laws recommended the regulation and taxation of marijuana, a recommendation repeated in 1982 by the National Academy of Science. Whatever can be said about heroin, cocaine and synthetic drugs, 27 years is long enough to learn that the prohibition against marijuana should be abolished.

.... if we are not willing to be our brother's keepers, then we will have to become our brother's jailers, and that's not an acceptable alternative to a nation which professes to prize personal liberty."

BLUE RIBBON COMMISSIONS SUPPORT DECRIMINALIZATION OF MARIJUANA

But the same mentality that spawned witch hunts, racism and McCarthyism persecutes users

The policy of jailing people for marijuana use is based on a premise that marijuana is a dangerous drug. Yet blue-ribbon commissions repeatedly find that the notion is untrue.

This includes commissions appointed by the British government in 1898, the U.S. government in 1972, the Canadian government in 1974, the Australian government in 1977, and the U.S. again in 1982.

It dramatically illustrates that panels of intellectuals who are experts in law, medicine, psychiatry and other fields are no match for powerful corporations guided by greed and self-interest, and gutless politicians who posture and cater to prevailing ignorance which has long been perpetuated by lies.

One such example of a commission which studied everything known or suspected about marijuana and made some strong recommendations on behalf of decriminalization was the National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse, which published "Marihuana: A Signal of Misunderstanding" in 1972. (Government agencies continue to prefer the "marihuana" spelling.

A strong support staff of researchers helped the Commission, which was chaired by Raymond Shafer. The Commission included a number of members of Congress, medical doctors and other experts in fields related to marijuana's chemistry, as well as its legal and social status.

The 184-page report includes much information on marijuana's history, its use and place in society. Call letters for the book in the Cinti public library are 362.293 U58 in the Education and Religion section.

At the end, the Commission made some telling observations and firm recommendations, including:

I. Reclassification of Cannabis

RECOMMENDATION: THE COMMISSION RECOGNIZES THAT SEVERAL STATE LEGISLATURES HAVE IMPROPERLY CLASSIFIED MARIJUANA AS A NARCOTIC, AND RECOMMENDS THAT THEY NOW REDEFINE MARIJUANA ACCORDING TO THE STANDARDS OF THE RECENTLY ADOPTED UNIFORM CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES LAW.

"....The consequence of inappropriate definition is that the public continues to associate marijuana with the narcotics, such as heroin. The confusion resulting from this improper classification helps to perpetuate prejudices and misinformation about marihuana."

The Commission, while stating that marijuana use should be discouraged, also made the following recommendation to lessen the penalty for possession and casual transfer:

POSSESSION OF MARIHUANA FOR PERSONAL USE WOULD NO LONGER BE AN OFFENSE. BUT MARIHUANA POSSESSED IN PUBLIC WOULD REMAIN CONTRABAND SUBJECT TO SEIZURE AND FORFEITURE.

CASUAL DISTRIBUTION OF SMALL AMOUNTS OF MARIHUANA FOR NO REMUNERATION, OR INSIGNIFICANT REMUNERATION NOT INVOLVING PROFIT WOULD NO LONGER BE AN OFFENSE.

To rationalize its reasoning the Commission stated under the heading: "Application of the Criminal Law to Private Possession Is Philosophically Inappropriate:"

"On the basis of this evaluation we believe that the criminal law is too harsh a tool to apply to personal possession even in the effort to discourage use. It implies an overwhelming indictment of the behavior which we believe is not appropriate. The actual and potential harm of use of the drug is not great enough to justify intrusion by the criminal law into private behavior, a step which our society takes only with the greatest reluctance."

The Commission stated that the application of the criminal law in private possession cases is "Constitutionally suspect" and reasoned at the end of its discourse:

"Accordingly, we believe that government must show a compelling reason to justify invasion of the home in order to prevent personal use of marihuana. We find little in marihuana's effects or in its social impact to support such a determination. Legislators enacting Prohibition did not find a compelling reason 40 years ago; and we do not find the situation any more compelling for marihuana today."

"The Commission found that total prohibition is "functionally inappropriate" and stated: "Apart from the philosophical and constitutional constraints outlined above, a total prohibition scheme carries with it significant institutional costs. Yet it contributes very little to the achievement of our social policy. In some ways, it actually inhibits the success of that policy."

"The primary goals of a prudent marihuana social control policy includes preventing irresponsible use of the drug, attending to the consequences of such use, and deemphasizing use in general. Yet an

absolute prohibition of possession inhibits the ability of other institutions to contribute actively to these objectives. For example, the possibility of criminal prosecution deters users who are experiencing medical problems from seeking assistance for fear of bring(ing) attention to themselves. In addition, the illegality of possession and use creates difficulties in achieving an open, honest educational program, both in the schools and in the home.

"In terms of the social policy objective of discouraging use of the drug, the legal system can assist that objective in three ways: first, by deterring people from use, second, by symbolizing social opposition to use; and finally, by cutting off supply of the drug.

"The present illegal status of the drug has not discouraged an estimated 24 million people from trying marihuana or an estimated eight million from continuing to use it. Our survey of the country's state prosecuting attorneys shows that 53% of them do not believe that the law has more than a minimal deterrent effect in this regard. Moreover, if the present trend toward passive enforcement of the marihuana law continues, the law will ultimately deter only indiscreet use, a result achieved as well by a partial prohibition scheme and with a great deal more honesty and fairness.

.... "Finally, prohibiting possession for personal use has no substantive relation to interdicting supply. A possession penalty may make enforcement of proscriptions against sale a little easier, but we believe this benefit is of minimal importance in the light of its costs.

... "As noted, most law enforcement officials, district attorneys and judges recognize the ineffectiveness of the possession penalty as a deterrent. Its perpetuation results in the making of what is commonly referred to as "cheap" cases that have little or no impact on deterring sale.

.... "In addition to the misallocation of enforcement resources, another consequence of prohibition against possession for personal use is the social cost of criminalizing large numbers of users.

....."Yet another consequence of marihuana possession laws is the clogging of judicial calendars. President Nixon has noted that one of the major impediments to our nation's efforts to combat serious crimes is the fact that the judicial machinery moves so slowly. Swift arrests, prosecution, trial and sentence would significantly improve the deterrent effect of law. Yet the judicial system is overloaded with petty cases, with public drunkenness accounting for about 50% of all non-traffic offenses."

"A final cost of the possession laws is the disrespect which the laws and their enforcement engender in the young. Our youth cannot understand why society chooses to criminalize a behavior with so

little visible ill-effect or adverse social impact, particularly when so many members of the law enforcement community also question the same laws. These young people have jumped the fence and found no cliff. And the disrespect for the possession laws fosters a disrespect for all law and the system in general.

"On top of all this is the distinct impression among the youth that some police may use the marihuana laws to arrest people they don't like for other reasons, whether it be their politics, their hair style or their ethnic background. Whether or not such selectivity actually exists, it is perceived to exist."

"For all these reasons we believe the possession offense is of little functional benefit to the discouragement policy and carries heavy social costs, not the least of which is disrespect and cynicism among some of the young. Accordingly, even under our policy of discouraging marihuana use, the better method is persuasion rather than prosecution.

"A criminal fine or similar penalty for possession has been suggested as a means of alleviating some of the more glaring costs of a total prohibitory approach yet still retaining the symbolic disapproval of the criminal law. However, most of the objections raised above would still pertain: the possibilities of invasion of personal privacy and selective enforcement of the law would continue; possessors would still be stigmatized as criminals, incurring the economic and social consequences of involvement with the criminal law; the symbolic status of marihuana smoking as an anti-establishment act would be perpetuated.

"On the other hand, a fine most likely would deter use no more than does the present possibility of incarceration. It would continue to impede treatment for heavy and very use and would persist in directing law enforcement away from the policy's essential aim, which is to halt illegal traffic in the drug.

"For all these reasons, we reject the total prohibition approach and its variations."

The Commission report provides rich reading on the subject, covering a great deal of medical and social implications. We urge everyone to read it.

It's unfortunate that the nation appoints learned commissions to study everything available on a subject and then generally ignores their findings and recommendations. It reminds one of the regrettable truth of an old public relations slogan: "Perception is Reality." And if the perception that marijuana is the "devil's weed," then it becomes "reality," true or not. And politicians will

always cater to public perception, even if formed by decades of lies and ignorance, over reality and truth.

So what things have happened since the Commission's report. Here are a few:

- * Another Commission report in 1982, which presented basically the same rationale.

- * Marijuana use has greatly increased. NORML estimates up to 35 million regular or occasional smokers in the U.S.

- * Police continue to abuse people's rights and make selective arrests based on who they don't like. Urine tests and property forfeiture laws are among the latest attacks on our civil rights. Virtually every section of our Bill of Rights is under attack because of the drug war.

- * Rather than be ridiculed for busting users, police often trick a user who casually transfers to friends into a single transaction and busts him or her as a "dealer."

- * Disrespect for the law continues to increase.

- * The courts are still bogged down almost hopelessly.

- * Police still take the "easy" route of busting marijuana growers and traffickers rather than concentrating on the major drug problems caused by cocaine, crack, and heroin. Legalizing hemp would force them to concentrate on narcotics.

- * The influence of major corporations is still strong. When the DEA recently cracked down on many lawn and garden shops for selling indoor growing equipment which "might" be used for marijuana cultivation, they ignored major companies like Westinghouse which manufacture the equipment. The idea that such equipment could be illegal because it might possibly be used for indoor marijuana also poses serious legal questions. One could also use it for growing tomatoes or flowers. By the same logic, they could go after cigarette papers and pipes, or plastic bags.

DOES ANYONE CARE?

ARE THINGS GETTING BETTER OR WORSE?

How can we tolerate a drug czar like William Bennett, who dismissed marijuana as something that just "makes you stupid." From the comments of this slovenly curmudgeon, apparently you don't have to smoke marijuana to be stupid. His successor is no better, towing the "Just say no and keep your head in the sand" attitude of the Bush League administration.

The great pity is that some people believe it! This writer is lucky in that, having smoked it for 23 years, we know it's a lie.

A word of warning.....

If we lie to our young people about marijuana, a relatively innocuous medicinal herb, they will think we're lying to them about truly dangerous drugs. If you believe in the so-called "stepping stone to harder drugs" idea, you should certainly consider this. The dangerous ones are all pharmaceuticals, highly-concentrated, laboratory-produced and all subject to overdose.

Compared to them, marijuana is like smoking the leaves and flowertops of a plant. More similar to tobacco than to pharmaceutical drugs. Like the Commission said, young people have leaped over the fence and haven't found a cliff. But millions have now discovered the truth about hemp, and in so doing, they have discovered the big lie.

Help promote truth; join Cinti NORML so that we can continue to publish the facts, hold rallies and challenge prohibitionists to public debates.

Annual dues also get you the national NORML newsletter and updates on activist activities. Even if you don't smoke hemp regularly, help protect all of our civil liberties. We're not promoting marijuana smoking; that's a matter of free choice. What we're promoting is precisely that freedom of choice, and freedom from the kind of prohibition which the U.S. also found to be a tragic mistake with alcohol.

HEMP CAN SERVE IN MANY WAYS

Facts from the Business Alliance for Commerce in Hemp

Hemp for Ecology -- Hemp is a soil-building plant that is excellent in crop rotation and, unlike cotton and corn, does not require heavy fertilization or pesticide use. In fact, an organic pesticide spray is derived from the plant.

With its many commercial uses, such as manufacture of paper and building supplies, hemp could reduce deforestation by 50% or more worldwide. It could replace a significant amount of plastics with cultivated cellulose, organic pulp and fiber. It could replace about half the petroleum we use as gasoline with clean-burning methanol fuel, and cut dependence on coal and nuclear powered electricity production through biomass pyrolysis. Its strong roots control erosion.

MARIJUANA MYTHS

Questions and answers about smoking marijuana in relation to physical and mental health

by Paul Hager, Hoosier Cannabis Re-legalization Coalition

Q -- Does marijuana cause brain damage?

A -- The most celebrated study that claims to show brain damage is the rhesus monkey study of Dr. Robert Heath, done in the late 1970s.

This study was reviewed by a distinguished panel of scientists sponsored by the Institute of Medicine and the National Academy of Sciences. Their results were published under the title, Marijuana and Health in 1982. Heath's work was sharply criticized for its insufficient sample size (only 4 monkeys), its failure to control experimental bias, and the misidentification of normal monkey brain structure as "damaged." Actual studies of human populations of marijuana users have shown no evidence of brain damage.

For example, two studies from 1977, published in the Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA) showed no evidence of brain damage in heavy users of marijuana. That same year, the American Medical Association (AMA) officially came out in favor of decriminalizing marijuana. That's not the sort of thing you'd expect if the AMA thought marijuana damaged the brain.

Note: the Committee on Substance Abuse and Habitual Behavior of the "Marijuana and Health" study had its part of the final report suppressed when it reviewed the evidence and recommended that possession of small amounts of marijuana should no longer be a crime. (TIME magazine, July 19, 1982)

The two JAMA studies are: "Absence of cerebral atrophy in chronic cannabis users," JAMA, 237: 1229-1230, 1977; and "Computed tomographic examination of heavy marijuana smokers," JAMA, 237: 1231-1232, 1977.

Q -- Does marijuana damage the reproductive system?

A -- This claim is based chiefly on the work of Dr. Gabriel Nahas, who experimented with tissue (cells) isolated in petri dishes and with researchers who dosed animals with near-lethal amounts of cannabinoids (i.e., the intoxicating part of marijuana).

Nahas' generalizations from his petri dishes to human beings have been rejected by the scientific community as being invalid. In the case of the animal experiments, the animals that survived their ordeal returned to normal within 30 days of the end of the experiment. Studies of actual human populations have failed to demonstrate that marijuana adversely affects the reproductive system.

See Marijuana and Health for the research. Also see the book, Marijuana Reconsidered (1978) by Lester Grinspoon.

Q -- Is marijuana a "gateway" drug that leads to hard drugs?

A -- This is a persistent myth. A real world example of what happens when marijuana is readily available can be found in Holland.

The Dutch functionally decriminalized marijuana in the 1970s. Since then, hard drug use -- heroin and cocaine have DECLINED substantially. Even use of marijuana has declined.

If marijuana were really a gateway drug, one would have expected use of hard drugs to have gone up. Actual studies of hard drug "addicts" reveal that they start with alcohol or tobacco more frequently than marijuana.

See "A Comparison of Marijuana Users and Non-users" by Norman Zinberg and Andrew Weil (1971). This showed a negative correlation between use of marijuana and use of alcohol. A recent article about the Dutch experience is in "The Economics of Legalizing Drugs" in "The Atlantic Monthly," Vol. 266, No. 5, Nov. 1990, p. 130.

Q -- Does marijuana suppress the immune system?

A -- This myth is based on studies where animals were given extremely high doses of cannabinoids. These results have never been duplicated in human beings. Interestingly, two studies done in 1978 and one done in 1988 showed that hashish and marijuana may have actually stimulated the immune system in the people studied.

See "Marijuana and Immunity" in Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, Jan-Mar, 1988; "Hashish smoking and T-lymphocytes," 1978, by Kalofoutis et al; "The significance of lymphocyte lipid changes after smoking hashish," 1978, "Peripheral Blood Lymphocyte Subpopulations and Mitogen Responsiveness in Tobacco and Marijuana Smokers," 1988, Journal of Psychoactive Drugs.

Q -- Some say smoking marijuana is much more damaging than smoking tobacco. What is the truth?

A -- Smoked marijuana contains more carcinogens than does an equivalent amount of tobacco (1.5 to 3 times). Marijuana, however,

unlike tobacco, actually dilates (enlarges) the air passages in the lungs which promotes self-cleaning.

This is one reason why cannabis has been found useful in the past in treating asthmatics. It should be remembered that a heavy tobacco smoker consumes much more tobacco than a heavy marijuana smoker consumes marijuana.

Two other factors are important. The first is that paraphernalia laws directed against marijuana users make it difficult to smoke safely. These laws make water pipes and bong, which filter some of the carcinogens out of the smoke, illegal and, hence, unavailable.

The second is that, if marijuana were legal, it would be more economical to have cannabis drinks like bhang (a traditional drink in the Middle East) or tea, which are totally non-carcinogenic. This is in stark contrast with "smokeless" tobacco products like snuff which can cause cancer of the mouth and throat.

Nicotine itself is very toxic in even small quantities. In contrast, the cannabinoids are relatively non-toxic. When all of these facts are taken together, it can be clearly seen that the reverse is true: marijuana is much safer than tobacco.

For more information on cannabis drinks, see Working Men and Ganja: Marijuana Use in Rural Jamaica by M.C. Dreher, Institute for the Study of Human Tissues, 1982, ISBN 0-897-27-025-8. for information on cannabis and actual cancer risk, see Marijuana and Health, Institute of Medicine, National Academy of Sciences, 1982.

Q -- Would legal marijuana lead to carnage on the highway?

A -- Although marijuana, when used to intoxication, does impair performance in a manner similar to alcohol, actual studies of the effect of marijuana on the automobile accident rate suggest that it poses less of a hazard than alcohol.

When a random sample of fatal accident victims was studied, it was initially found that marijuana was associated with relatively as many accidents as alcohol. In other words, the number of accident victims intoxicated on marijuana relative to the number of marijuana users in society gave a ratio similar to that for accident victims intoxicated on alcohol relative to the total number of alcohol users.

However, a closer examination of the victims revealed that around 85% of the people intoxicated on marijuana were also intoxicated on alcohol. For people only intoxicated on marijuana, the rate was much lower than for alcohol alone. This would suggest that legal marijuana would not pose as serious a hazard as legal alcohol.

For a survey of studies relating to cannabis and highway accidents, see "Marijuana, Driving and Accident Safety" by Dale Gieringer, Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, Vol. 20, Jan.-Mar., 1988.

Q -- Does marijuana flatten human brain waves?

A -- This is an out-and-out lie perpetuated by the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, which is heavily financed by beer and pharmaceutical companies. A few years ago, they ran a TV ad that purported to show, first, a normal human brainwave, and second, a flat brainwave from a 14-year old "on marijuana."

When researchers called up the TV networks to complain about this commercial, the Partnership had to pull it from the air. It seems that the Partnership faked the flat "marijuana brainwave." In reality, marijuana has the effect of slighting increasing alpha wave activity. Alpha waves are associated with meditative and relaxed states which are, in turn, often associated with human creativity.

This scientific revelation about alpha brainwaves accurately mirrors the "high" that marijuana smokers enjoy.

If you have any doubt about the big lie perpetuated about marijuana if you doubt that so many "responsible" authorities would tell blatant lies about marijuana ... the lie perpetuated by the Partnership group, heavily influenced by their own corporate profit motives, should convince you otherwise.

For more information on the Partnership ad, see Jack Herer's book, The Emperor Wears No Clothes, 1990, p. 74. For information on memory and the alpha brainwave enhancement effect, see "Marijuana, Memory and Perception," by R.L. Dornbush, M.D., M. Fink, M.D., and A.M. Freedman, M.D., presented at the 124th annual meeting of the American Psychiatric Association, May 3-7, 1971.

Q -- Does marijuana impair short-term memory?

A -- Yes, but this is misleading. Any impairment of short-term memory disappears when one is no longer under the influence. Often, short-term memory effect is paired with a reference to a discredited late 1970s study by Dr. Robert Heath in which he gave massive dosages to four monkeys, later refuted by studies with humans and sharply criticized by the American Medical Association. The AMA recommended the decriminalization of marijuana in 1977. Again, see Marijuana and Health and "Marijuana, Perception and Memory."

Q -- Does marijuana really linger in the body like DDT?

A -- Yes, true but misleading. Cannabinoids are fat soluble as are innumerable nutrients and, yes, some poisons like DDT. The essential nutrient Vitamin A is also fat soluble, but one never hears people who favor prohibition making this comparison. See Marijuana and Health.

Q -- It is said there are over a thousand chemicals in marijuana smoke? Is this something to worry about?

A -- The statement is true, but again misleading. The Aug. 31, 1990 issue of Science notes that of the over 800 volatile chemicals present in roasted coffee, only 21 have actually been tested on animals and 16 of these cause cancer in rodents. Yet, coffee remains legal and is generally considered safe.

It has been scientifically documented that even such natural foods as an orange contain thousands of separate chemicals.

See "Too Many Rodent Carcinogens: Mitogenesis Increases Mutagenesis" in Science, Vol. 249, Sept. 1, 1989, p. 943.

Q -- Has anyone ever died from a marijuana overdose?

A -- No -- unlike numerous other drugs such as alcohol and many pharmaceuticals. Animal tests have revealed that extremely high doses of cannabinoids are needed to have lethal effect. This has led scientists to conclude that the ratio of the amount of cannabinoids necessary to get a person intoxicated (i.e. stoned) relative to the amount necessary to kill them is 1 to 40,000.

In other words, to overdose, you would have to consume 40,000 times as much marijuana as you needed to get stoned. In contrast, the ratio for alcohol varies between 1 to 4 and 1 to 10. It is easy to see how upwards of 5,000 people die from alcohol overdoses every year and no one ever dies from marijuana overdoses.

It is also very unfair to say that marijuana smokers always smoke to intoxication. As with alcohol, they do not. Use of marijuana, like alcohol, coffee, sugar, and tobacco, can be used moderately and responsibly.

Cannabis and alcohol toxicity is compared in Marijuana Reconsidered (1978) by Dr. Lester Grinspoon.

This documented material is from the Hoosier Cannabis Re-Legalization Coalition. Send your questions, criticisms, refutations, etc. to: Cinti NORML, Box 3557, Cincinnati, OH 45202. Not only will we deal with your concerns in a future issue, we will also send you a written response.

We are firmly dedicated to publishing the truth to counteract the lies, ignorance and paranoia surrounding hemp/marijuana/cannabis, serving as a drug information network in the Cinti area.

We do not claim that marijuana is nectar from the Gods. We do proclaim, as did Administrative Law Judge Francis Young in a 1988 court ruling after hearing weeks of testimony, that it is "one of the safest, most effective therapeutic substances known to man." It is also a pleasurable, non-addictive euphoriant that enhances meditation and creative thinking.

If legalized, it could greatly reduce the multiple tragedies fomented on society by the liquor industry by reducing alcohol consumption and addiction. It could also reduce reliance on synthetic drugs such as tranquilizers that are more addictive and subject to overdose than marijuana.

Does that help you understand why big business liquor and pharmaceutical interests fight to maintain prohibition?

Does that help you understand why a number of researchers who are financed by pharmaceutical companies have towed the DEA government line to keep the grant money flowing? The web of greed runs deep.

A case in point....

The University of Mississippi's School of Pharmacy has the only legal marijuana crop in the U.S. The Drug Enforcement Association has given the School millions of dollars over the years for this project, which supposedly provides the substance to researchers throughout the world. The DEA also pays the School many thousands to test drugs seized on the streets. It pays thousands more to UM researchers for developing more effective urine tests, especially for the armed forces.

This all puts the School effectively in the hip pocket of adamant, job-protecting enforcement authorities for fear of losing the lucrative grants -- collectively the largest in this money-strapped University's history.

Therefore, there is a complete black-out of any research at the University which might put marijuana in a positive light. The atmosphere of negativism, bias and greedy self-interest is pervasive. The selective omission of anything even vaguely favorable about marijuana is replicated many times in many places in the U.S. and the reason is, plainly and simply, greed -- love of the almighty dollar.

Researchers anywhere and anywhere who ask for funding to explore possible benefits of this medicinal herb are denied both funding

and marijuana for experimentation. The system is determined to prevent any studies that might reflect favorably on the plant and adversely affect the stranglehold of synthetic pharmaceutical companies.

Many authorities still seem angry at the peace-loving, marijuana-smoking hippies who took to the streets in the 60s to undermine the VietNam war. It seems only common sense from our later perspective that they didn't want to go die in a miserable jungle on the other side of the world for misguided and macho-heavy idealism. History has proven them right for disdaining this futile and senseless war.

Many of these protestors did smoke marijuana, and it did give them a euphoriant feeling toward love and brotherhood, and an aversion to war, governmental and big business corruption.

Are those attitudes so wrong? Is that any reason to ban a valuable medicinal herb and cash crop in the 1990s?

Some think not. Some think there is too much drift toward a puritanical, arrogant, judgmental, fascist-like police state in this country today. The 50's had its McCarthyism. The 60's and 70's was evidenced by racism and police brutality meted out by people who should have been leaders and public servants. Today, we have such examples as the L.A. Police beatings, the Covington, Ky. police brutality, continued persecution of casual marijuana smokers and others to warn us that greed, bias, arrogance, and judgmental bullies are still very much with us.

A special warning even if you don't smoke hemp, when you protect the civil liberties of those who do, you are ultimately protecting your own.

A CIVIL LIBERTIES REQUEST --- SUPPORT NORML

This booklet is published by:
Cinti NORML
Box 3557
Cincinnati, OH 45202

Support our efforts by joining.
Annual membership: \$25 per year
Low-income membership: \$15
Staunch Supporter: \$50
Devoted Supporter: \$100

Name _____
Address _____
City, State _____
Zip _____

I want to be active. Here's my phone no. _____

We need your help to continue preaching the truth. We're after nothing less than to change the prevailing public opinion about marijuana among city and community leaders. WE DON'T WANT TO JUST TALK TO OURSELVES; WE WANT TO REACH AND INFLUENCE PEOPLE WHO CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE.

Membership also makes you a national NORML member and provides a subscription to the NORML national newsletter.

OFFICIAL NORML POLICY (partial):

DECRIMINALIZATION -- Removal of all criminal and civil penalties for private possession of marijuana for personal use. This includes other acts incidental to possession, including cultivation and transportation for personal use, and the casual, non-profit transfers of small amounts.

REGULATION -- A system of marijuana regulation which would include age restrictions, public health and agricultural controls and taxation of marijuana sold for profit. A well-planned program would discourage abuse, protect public health and safety, reduce crime associated with illicit distribution, and raise large sums of tax revenues. Regulation is the inevitable replacement of prohibition.

ADOLESCENT USE -- Strongly committed to the concept that growing up should be drug-free. NORML desires to help establish meaningful communication within the family based on honest and social consequences related to all drugs, including alcohol and tobacco. It is proper to restrict distribution of marijuana to adults only.

MEDICAL RESEARCH -- Fuller coordination of the marijuana research conducted by governmental and private agencies, in order to reduce narrowness or duplication of effort, assure diversity of approaches and new objectives, and to provide efficient integration of findings into the available body of knowledge.

Research should not be biased and should include studies of the potential benefits of marijuana. Years of research on possible harmful effects have yielded virtually nothing. It's time for fresh perspectives.

A complete drug policy statement by NORML is available by writing Cinti NORML.

Truth will eventually win out. So far, prohibitionists have refused to engage in public debate. They fear the truth and know they'll lose in direct confrontation. They hide behind a wall of lies, myths and half-truths. We have to flush them out!

In the meantime, check the sources, send your tough questions and accusations to the Cinti NORML p.o. box. Help us fight for truth by joining Cinti NORML and helping pay for printing and postage costs.

NOTABLE QUOTES

by Tom Wicker, syndicated columnist --

"By the estimate of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, the war on drugs will overwhelm the state's prison systems within five years, driving an average annual 13% growth rate in prison population, resulting in an estimated additional 460,000 inmates for a total of 1.13 million by 1994. At an average annual operating cost of \$25,000 per inmate per year, and a construction cost of \$50,000 per cell, the states will need 435 billion for prisons in the next half decade.

"It might be asked who really threatens effective criminal justice in America -- unnamed intellectuals who question the efficacy of imprisoning so many drug offenders, or the so-called drug czar, whose short-sighted war will further overcrowd and overwhelm the state prisons?"

HEMP, USED FOR CENTURIES, RUNS AFOUL OF 1930S LEGAL CONSPIRACY

For the uninitiated, marijuana refers to the dried leaves and flowers of the cannabis plant, containing the non-narcotic chemical THC at various potencies. It can be smoked or eaten to provide the user with a "high."

Marijuana has been used for thousands of years. Archaeologists report that cannabis was possibly the first plant cultivated by humans in about 8,000 B.C. and was used for linen, paper and garments. It was being smoked in India and China as early as 2700 B.C.

While field hands and working people have smoked the raw plant, aristocrats have historically preferred hashish made from the cured flowers. Turkish smoking parlors were popular in both Europe and America, as well as the Middle East and Far East, as recently as the turn of the century.

Laws were passed against hemp a year after the development of a machine to harvest and process hemp so it could compete commercially against businesses owned by Hearsts, the duPonts and other powerful families.

Prohibition also served to maintain the money and manpower of alcohol prohibitionists after that ill-fated prohibition attempt failed in the mid-30s.

It also served as a means to control dark-skinned minorities -- Mexicans in the Southwest, blacks in New Orleans -- who brought the custom of cannabis smoking with them into this country. Their influx took depression-era jobs from whites and fanned racist passions, helped mightily by the distorted rhetoric of federal Commissioner of Narcotics Harry Anslinger and the Hearst newspapers.

The full story of this remarkable conspiracy is included in The Emperor Wears No Clothes by Jack Herer.

NOTABLE QUOTE.....

"Prohibition goes beyond the bounds of reason in that it attempts to control a man's appetite by legislation and makes a crime out of things that are not crimes. A prohibition law strikes a blow at the very principles upon which our government was founded." -- ABRAHAM LINCOLN

HARVARD MEDICAL SCHOOL REPORT PUBLISHES FACTS ON MARIJUANA

Editor's Note: Here's the straight story -- scientific and medical judgements based on the whole body of evidence, reprinted in its entirety from one of the world's most respected medical research organizations, the Harvard Medical School, in its "Mental Health Letter," Volume 4, Number 5, November 1987.

MARIJUANA

The present generation of young people cannot remember when marijuana was an exotic weed with an aura of mythical power and mysterious danger. Although still illegal, it has become a commonplace part of the American social scene, used regularly by millions and occasionally by millions more. A realistic view of this drug is now more important and easier to achieve.

The use of marijuana reached a high point in the late 1970's and early 1980's, and has been declining ever since. In a 1978 survey, 38% of high school seniors said they had smoked marijuana in the last 30 days, and 11 percent said they used it daily.

By 1986 the number who said they had smoked it in the last 30 days had fallen to 23 percent -- lower than in 1975 -- and the proportion of daily users had dropped steadily to 4 percent

The trend among young people aged 18 to 25 is similar. On the other hand, more people over 25 may be using marijuana occasionally, and young people are still experimenting with it. In 1969, 20 percent of high school seniors had used marijuana at least once; in 1979, 60 percent had; and in 1985, 54 percent. The attitudes expressed in surveys show why habitual marijuana use is in decline. In 1978, 65 percent of high school students said they disapproved of it; in 1985, 85 percent disapproved. In 1978, 35 percent said it was very risky, and in 1985, 70 percent said it was.

The main active ingredient in marijuana is delta-tetrahydrocannabinol (THC), one of more than 60 related chemicals found in the resin that covers the flowers and top leaves of the cannabis (hemp) plant.

The leaves and flowers can be ground up in drinks or food, but more often they are dried and smoked in a cigarette or pipe. The pure resin can also be smoked, eaten or drunk. New breeding and cultivation techniques have raised the THC content of marijuana smoked in the United States as much as ten times over the last 20 years, from an average of 0.4 percent to 4 percent. Some varieties

now contain as much as 10 percent.

The effects last two to four hours when marijuana is smoked and five to twelve hours when it is taken by mouth. Although the intoxication varies with psychological set and social setting, the most common response is a calm, mildly euphoric state in which time slows and sensitivity to sights, sounds and touch is enhanced.

The smoker may feel exhilaration or hilarity and notice a rapid flow of ideas with a reduction in short-term memory. Image sometimes appear before closed eyes; visual perception and body image may undergo subtle changes. It is dangerous to operate complex machinery, including automobiles, under the influence of marijuana because it slows reaction time and impairs attention and coordination. This impairment continues for at least several hours after the feeling of intoxication has passed.

The main physiological effects of cannabis are increased appetite, a faster heartbeat, and slightly bloodshot eyes. Although the increased heart rate could be a problem for people with cardiovascular disease, dangerous physical reactions to marijuana are almost unknown.

Like other drugs, it produces a toxic delirium when taken at very high doses, especially by mouth. The symptoms are confusion, agitation, disorientation, loss of coordination and often hallucinations; the delirium ends when the drug passes out of the body. No human being is known to have died of an overdose. By extrapolation from animal experiments, the ratio of lethal to effective (intoxicating) dose is estimated to be on the order of thousands to one.

ANXIETY REACTIONS

The most common disturbing reaction to marijuana is acute anxiety, sometimes accompanied by paranoid thoughts. The user becomes fearful of dying or going insane, and may read hostility or ridicule into the gestures and words of companions. Mounting anxiety may lead to panic. The most likely victim of this reaction is an inexperienced user inadvertently taking a high dose in an unpleasant or unfamiliar setting. The best way to handle the anxiety and paranoia is calming support and reassurance.

The reaction is not a psychosis; there are no hallucinations, and reassurance would not be effective without an ability to test the reality of thoughts and perceptions. Some authorities also refer to a cannabis delusional disorder with feelings of persecution or jealousy. Whether or not this is distinguishable from the anxiety reaction, the treatment is the same -- reassurance and waiting for the drug effect to fade.

The anxiety reaction or delusional disorder is a milder version of the frightening LSD experience known as a bad trip. A truly nightmarish experience is rare under the influence of cannabis, because it is less potent than hallucinogenic or psychedelic drugs and the user is better able to control its effects.

Use of LSD and other psychedelic drugs is often followed by flashbacks -- the recurrence of emotions and perceptions originally experienced under the influence of the drug. They usually last only a few seconds and are not necessarily disturbing, but sometimes they become a persistent problem, which has been labeled post-hallucinogen perception disorder. Marijuana smoking may precipitate flashbacks in psychedelic drug users; a few reports suggest marijuana flashbacks also occur without the previous use of psychedelic drugs.

Some observers, mainly in India and North Africa, have reported a cannabis psychosis caused mainly by long-term heavy use of the drug. It is described as a prolonged psychotic reaction with symptoms that include delusions, hallucinations, inappropriate emotions and disordered thinking. In the descriptions, this psychosis is usually difficult to distinguish from schizophrenia, manic states, panic reactions, and other conditions. The reaction is rarely reported in the United States.

Given the many millions of marijuana smokers in this country, the evidence of it would probably be less equivocal if it occurred with any regularity. Some people may suffer a psychotic reaction to cannabis because they are vulnerable to psychosis under any stress or under any change in consciousness or body image. For example, marijuana smoking probably increases the danger of relapse in schizophrenic patients (although any effect of this kind must be distinguished from a desperate attempt at self-medication because symptoms of schizophrenia are already returning.)

LONG-TERM EFFECTS

In recent years, the psychological and physical effects of long-term use have caused the most concern. Studies are often conflicting and permit various views of marijuana's possible harmfulness. This complicates the task of presenting an objective statement on the issue.

One of the first questions asked about any drug is whether it is addictive or produces dependence. This question is hard to answer because the terms "addiction" and "dependence" have no agreed-upon definitions. **Two recognized signs of addiction are tolerance and withdrawal symptoms. These are rarely a problem for marijuana users.** In early stages, they actually become more sensitive to the desired effects. After continued heavy use, some tolerance to both psychological and physiological effects develops, although it seems

to vary considerably among individuals. Almost no one reports an urgent need to increase the dose to recapture the original sensation.

What is called behavioral tolerance may be partly a matter of learning to compensate for the effects of high doses, and may explain why farm workers in some Third World countries are able to do heavy physical labor while smoking a great deal of marijuana.

A mild withdrawal reaction also occurs in animal experiments and apparently in some human beings who take high doses for a long time. The symptoms are anxiety, insomnia, tremors and chills, lasting for a day or two. It is unclear how common this reaction is; in a Jamaican study, heavy ganja (marijuana) users did not report abstinence symptoms when withdrawn from the drug. **In any case, there is little evidence that the withdrawal reaction presents serious problems to marijuana users or causes them to go on taking the drug.**

In a more important sense, dependence means an unhealthy and often unwanted preoccupation with the drug to the exclusion of most other things. People suffering from drug dependence find that they are constantly thinking about the drug, or intoxicated, or recovering from its effects. The habit impairs their mental and physical health and hurts their work, family life and friendships. They often know they are using too much and repeatedly making unsuccessful attempts to cut down or stop. **These problems seem to afflict proportionately fewer marijuana smokers than users of alcohol, tobacco, heroin or cocaine.** Even heavy users in places like Jamaica and Costa Rica do not seem to be dependent in this damaging sense.

CAUSE OR EFFECT

It is often difficult to distinguish drug use as a cause of problems and drug use as an effect; this is especially true in the case of marijuana. Most people who would develop a dependency on marijuana would also be likely to develop other dependencies because of anxiety, depression or feelings of inadequacy. The original condition is likely to matter more than the attempt to relieve it by means of the drug. The troubled teenager who smokes cannabis throughout the day certainly has a problem, and excessive use of marijuana may be one of its symptoms.

The idea has persisted that in the long run marijuana causes some sort of mental or physical deterioration. In three major studies conducted in Jamaica, Costa Rica and Greece, researchers have compared heavy long-term cannabis users with non-users and **found no evidence of intellectual or neurological damage, no changes in personality and no loss of the will to work or participate in society.** The Costa Rica study showed no difference between heavy

users (seven or more marijuana cigarettes a day) and lighter users (six or fewer cigarettes a day). Experiments in the United States show no effects of fairly heavy marijuana use on learning, perception, or motivation over periods as long as a year.

On the other side are clinical reports of a personality change called the amotivational syndrome. Its symptoms are said to be passivity, aimlessness, apathy and uncommunicativeness, and lack of ambition. Some proposed explanations are hormone changes, brain damage, sedation and depression. Since the amotivational syndrome does not seem to occur in Greek or Caribbean farm laborers, some writers suggest that it affects only skilled and educated people who need to do more complex thinking.

The problem of distinguishing causes from symptoms is particularly acute here. Heavy drug users in our society are often bored, depressed and listless, or alienated, cynical and rebellious. Sometimes the drugs cause these states of mind and sometimes they result from personality characteristics that lead to drug abuse. Drug abuse can be an excuse for failure or a form of self-medication. Because of these complications and the absence of confirmation from controlled studies, the existence of an amotivational syndrome caused by cannabis use has to be regarded as unproven.

STEPPING STONE HYPOTHESIS

Much attention has also been devoted to the idea that marijuana smoking leads to the use of opiates and other illicit drugs: the stepping stone hypothesis. In this country, almost everyone who uses any other illicit drug has smoked marijuana first, just as almost everyone who has smoked marijuana has drunk alcohol first. Anyone who uses any given drug is more likely to be interested in others, for some of the same reasons.

People who use illicit drugs, in particular, are somewhat more likely to find themselves in company where other illicit drugs are available. None of this proves that using one drug leads to or causes the use of another. Most marijuana smokers do not use heroin or cocaine, just as most alcohol drinkers do not use marijuana.

The metaphor of a stepping stone suggests that if no one smoked marijuana it would be more difficult for anyone to develop an interest in opiates or cocaine. There is no convincing evidence for or against this. What is clear is that in many times and places marijuana has been used without these drugs, or these drugs have been used without marijuana.

It is hard to generalize about abuse or define specific treatments, because the problems associated with marijuana are so vague, and cause and effect so hard to determine. Marijuana smokers may be

using the drug to demonstrate rebelliousness, cope with anxiety or medicate themselves for early signs of mental illness. People with serious problems who have been smoking marijuana heavily should be persuaded to stop so that their problems can be more effectively dealt with by psychotherapy or other means.

HEALTH HAZARDS

Most recent research on the health hazards of marijuana concerns its long-term effect on the body. Studies have examined the brain, the immune system, the reproductive system and the lungs. Suggestions of long-term damage come almost exclusively from animal experiments and other laboratory work. Observations of marijuana users, and the Caribbean, Greek and other studies reveal little **disease or organic pathology associated with the drug.**

For example, there are several reports of damaged brain cells and changes in brain-wave readings in monkeys smoking marijuana, but neurological and neurophysical tests in Greece, Jamaica and Costa Rica found no evidence of functional brain damage. Damage to white blood cells has also been observed in the laboratory, but again, its practical importance is unclear. **Whatever temporary changes marijuana may produce in the immune system, they have not been found to increase the danger of infectious disease or cancer.** If there were significant damage, we might expect to find a higher rate of these diseases among young people beginning in the 1960s, when marijuana first became popular. There is no evidence of that.

The effects of marijuana on the reproductive system are a more complicated issue. In men, a single dose of THC lowers sperm count and the level of testosterone and other hormones. Tolerance to this effect apparently develops; in the Costa Rica study, marijuana smokers and controls had the same testosterone levels. Although the smokers in that study began using marijuana at an average age of 15, it had not affected their masculine development. **There is no evidence that the changes in sperm count and testosterone produced by marijuana affect sexual performance or fertility.**

In animal experiments, THC has also been reported to lower levels of female hormones and disturb the menstrual cycle. When monkeys, rats and mice are exposed during pregnancy to amounts of THC equivalent to a heavy human smoker's dose, stillbirths and decreased birth weight are sometimes reported in their offspring.

There are also reports of low birth weight, prematurity and even a condition resembling the fetal alcohol syndrome in some children of women who smoke marijuana heavily during pregnancy. The significance of these reports is unclear because controls are lacking and other circumstances make it hard to attribute causes.

To be safe, pregnant and nursing women should follow the standard

conservative recommendation and avoid all drugs, including cannabis, that are not absolutely necessary.

A well-confirmed danger of long-term heavy marijuana use is its effect on the lungs. Smoking narrows and inflames air passages and reduces breathing capacity; damage to bronchial cells has been observed in hashish smokers. Possible harmful effects include bronchitis, emphysema and lung cancer. Marijuana smoke contains the same carcinogens as tobacco smoke, usually in somewhat higher concentrations. Marijuana is also inhaled more deeply and held in the lungs longer, which increases the danger.

On the other hand, almost no one smokes 20 marijuana cigarettes a day. Higher THC content in marijuana may reduce the danger of respiratory damage because less smoking is required for the desired effect. This is true only as long as no significant tolerance develops, and as long as users do not try to get a proportionately more intense effect from a stronger form of the drug.

For further reading...

Lester Grinspoon, *Marihuana Reconsidered*, second edition, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1977.

William E. Carter, ed., *Cannabis in Costa Rica: A Study of Chronic Marihuana Use*, Philadelphia Institute for the Study of Human Issues, 1980.

Sidney Cohen, *The Substance Abuse Problems*, vol. 2, *New Issues for the 1980s*, New York, Haworth Press, 1985.

Vera Rubin and Lambros Comitas, *Ganja in Jamaica*, The Hague, Mouton, 1975.

Institute of Medicine, *Marijuana and Health*, Washington, D.C., National Academy Press, 1982.

ADDED COMMENTS ON THE HARVARD REPORT FROM A 20-YEAR SMOKER

From the Harvard Mental Health, no reasonable American could believe that smoking marijuana or even its commerce should be a criminal offense.

Yet as long as politics overrules learning and logic in this country, it will be an uphill battle to legalize it.

As a 20-year marijuana smoker, there are a few dimensions I can add to the Harvard report, with which I find no cause for disagreement. Reviewing the article, here, simply, are some observations:

* Statistics show that marijuana use is declining, although they are suspect because they come from government bureaucracy. Other government statistics show that seizures have been going higher and higher. This is a contradiction. How can usage be going down if seizures continue to go up? The answer is simple. Statistics are doctored to help the bureaucrats look good in their phoney-baloney jobs. Declining usage makes them look like they're winning the drug war; more seizures makes law enforcement look as if they're doing a good job. But the seizure statistics are about as reliable as Vietnam body counts. By the DEA's measurement, taking the usage statistics into account, every smoker in the U.S. should have smoked five lbs. of marijuana last year. I didn't get my share.

If usage is down -- and it is probably up -- this would probably not be a matter of choice in many cases. After years of persecution and prohibition, it has been difficult for many to obtain marijuana. Fear of the legal consequences has retarded usage by some, as has the stigma many attach to it because they believe the lies perpetrated about it over the years. Also, a lot of people being counted statistically are probably not so free to admit that they are smokers.

Many former smokers have determined it just isn't worth the hassle and risk, and many have just lost interest for various reasons. A number of users have told me that, rather than moving on to hard drugs, they just lost interest in smoking after some number of years and only do so occasionally if at all. On the other hand, new users are coming onto the scene all the time.

Some smokers have undoubtedly lost interest because they never learned to use marijuana to its best advantage, as a relaxing euphoriant which enhances sensual pleasures, provides fascinatingly different perspectives and enhances creative thinking. Often, people try to use it like alcohol because that's the closest thing they can think of with which to compare it.

Marijuana is very unlike alcohol in a number of ways and is best used for different purposes, although many people do enjoy mixing the two.

* The psychotic reactions noted in India and North Africa are undoubtedly from the smoking of hashish, a highly concentrated form of marijuana. Prolonged heavy use of anything is not something I would recommend to anyone. When will we learn that moderation and balance is an important key to successful living? And when will people learn that smoking marijuana is not always "getting stoned" just as drinking alcohol is not always "getting drunk." But if either of these conditions does happen to you, at least with marijuana there will be no rowdy and destructive behavior, no loss of motor visual faculties. And there will be no hangover.

* The idea that there are more advanced, potent types of marijuana today than in previous years is only partly true. And so what?

Many cannabis smokers laugh at that, and recall that there used to be some great marijuana out there, and they haven't seen anything that good in a long time. Much like the pressures of liquor prohibition over the years eventually ruined the quality of moonshine as its makers turned to quick and dirty forms, so too has marijuana prohibition, in some cases, led to higher prices, scarcity and the selling of very low quality product.

On the other hand, more skilled cultivation techniques and improved strains have also led to more potent marijuana in some areas.

In either case, increased potency is no cause for alarm by the prohibitionists. Smokers simply smoke less to get high. And they like that. When smokers say it only took one or two hits to get high, they think that's great! And the marijuana goes a lot further. They hate it when they have to smoke a lot to get high, and they denigrate the quality.

Smokers invariably smoke enough to get high and then stop. They know there is no future in smoking (or drinking) yourself into a stupor. Why?

More potent varieties are good --not bad.

* Smoking can be bad on the lungs. If there was no prohibition and the price of marijuana could come down, there would be enough supply to allow quantities to be used in concoctions like the Jamaican drink, ganja, or the famous Alice B. Toklas brownies.

Eating marijuana is generally much preferred to smoking it. But it requires a great deal more marijuana, and prohibition has sometimes made it a precious and scarce commodity.

* Often, we don't focus on our real problems. If a person uses marijuana, alcohol, hard drugs, tobacco, or whatever because of anxiety, depression, feelings of inadequacy, or because of being bored, listless, alienated, cynical, rebellious, frustrated with society, then these are the problems, not the substance they are using or abusing.

If we focus on the problems rather than on what the person is using to self-medicate himself for them, then we could make some real progress toward improving society.

* If some people can't "handle" marijuana, is that a reason why it should be a criminal offense for the vast majority of us to use it?

How would alcohol drinkers feel if their substance were outlawed?

We know that didn't work, don't we? Clearly, some people can't "handle" alcohol. Clearly, some people aren't responsible in automobiles. Some people aren't responsible at all. When will we realize that this is the problem, not these people's habits?

* If we were to begin studying marijuana objectively, instead of concentrating on waving the red alarm flag, we'd be much better off. We could confirm all of the medical uses of the herb. I have a strong notion that marijuana would be extremely useful in treating mental illness and many of the maladies of old age -- a number of those problems for which people smoke it in the first place. Doesn't that make sense?

But without objectivity, there is little chance of positive progress toward the true facts, and the successful blending of this useful medicinal herb and agricultural fiber crop into our society.

The research establishment won't help. It is a cruel fact that much research is paid for by vested interests -- those companies and agencies that are looking for specific results that support their agendas -- whether they be drug abuse agencies justifying their positions, law enforcement agencies justifying theirs, or private companies looking for product endorsements from scientists, such as entomologists for pesticides, agronomists for plant foods, and pharmaceutical companies for the drugs they manufacture.

Sadly, research results are often doctored to reflect the positions of these special interests.

The establishment news media has recently begun to realize some of this. Recently, Time magazine ran a cover story on the scandals surrounding university research. There is, indeed, more scandal than can be stated by the media because lack of substantiation can lead to libel suits and immersion in our money-sucking quicksand of a legal system.

This all makes the Harvard Report more impressive. It was not paid for by marijuana advocates, and the Harvard researchers had nothing to gain by presenting a favorable picture of a plant that is generally not smoked by the big-money interests.

A NOTABLE QUOTE

"Penalties against possession of a drug should not be more harmful to an individual than the drug itself." -- President Jimmy Carter, 1977

**DEA HEADLINE LUST TURNED ME
INTO A MARIJUANA ACTIVIST**

(Author's name withheld to avoid the certainty of persecution)

I had smoked marijuana for 20 years. Being health-conscious, a former tobacco smoker, I read everything I could find on the herb over the years.

I had learned that most of it was lies, that you could enjoy and benefit from smoking without getting what they called "stoned," just as you could have a couple of drinks without getting drunk.

On the other hand, I despised cocaine. I had seen firsthand how its heavy addiction had ruined lives. I knew hemp to be pleasurable, relaxing, and mind-expanding, as well as non-addictive.

But it's impossible to smoke for 20 years without a little hemp changing hands at some point.

A person I knew -- a former dealer -- persuaded me for some 8 months to get him a little. Finally, when I bought a supply for my freezer, I let him have a little.

I didn't know he had been arrested and coerced into becoming a DEA informant. It had kept him out of jail, and the fees he earned by busting brothers in his former fraternity -- and me -- was helping him get through college.

The DEA knew I wasn't a dealer. I was under surveillance for some 14 months after they tape-recorded this single transaction of less than ounce of marijuana.

They found nothing.

I weighed it out as an ounce but a small amount of it disappeared while in DEA hands.

My bust was an operation that targeted prominent "white collar" citizens to grab newspaper headlines. I was a high-ranking public relations official and community leader.

They announced their sleazy triumph at the state capitol. Five column headlines and a photograph thundered across the state. They didn't care if I was actually a dealer. It wasn't about fairness, truth and justice; it was about entrapment and publicity. It wasn't about prosecution; it was about persecution.

I was forced to resign my job, fight off financial ruin, and

finally got only five years of probation from an honorable judge who knew my reputation and learned the facts of the situation. He was obliged to postpone my case until after he was re-elected, however, so that he wouldn't appear to be "soft" on drugs to a largely uninformed rural electorate.

I would have fought the case based on entrapment, but the district attorney had inexplicably not indicted me for the taped evidence that there was more than one ounce in the house -- a far more serious charge. If I had taken the stand, they would have immediately slapped another indictment on me. I made the transaction anyway. I was guilty.

Being trapped in the convoluted posturings of our judicial system is like having a gag stuffed in your mouth and being dared to speak. When your fate can be five years in prison and is in the hands of a political judge who has to cater to prevailing public ignorance, you can pay a heavy price for stating unpopular opinions about legalizing hemp, or making derogatory statements about law enforcement. I was repeatedly advised to tuck my tail, act remorseful and run to some other part of the country.

To get this treatment, you only have to be tricked into a single transaction by an informant either coerced by threats or paid in cash. And while it cost the state a good deal of money to drag me through this caricature of justice, it did absolutely nothing to diminish the country's real drug problem.

The result to date: I am re-established, earning good money in another part of the country, and now a dedicated activist on behalf of legalizing marijuana.

National NORML told me that countless others suffer the same fate as I did.

When authorities concentrate on entrapping and persecuting casual users like myself to feed a scandal-loving media, it's no wonder that they're losing the real drug war against forces that are stronger and more resourceful than the corruption-ridden DEA.

I've had enough of marijuana prohibition. After smoking it for 20 years, I find that my senses and perceptions have been expanded, my mind remains sharp, and my memory intact. I have enjoyed many hours of relaxed and enhanced contemplation and pleasure. The idea that alcohol, tobacco and a number of addictive pharmaceutical tranquilizers are legal while marijuana is illegal, because of lies and also the fact that self-centered capitalists haven't figured out how to make money out of a bush that grows in the ground, is ludicrous.

If you are a casual smoker, I urge you not to take a fearful,

passive posture. Smokers have been cowed for too long. Sure, you should protect yourself from legal and economic persecution if necessary by keeping a low profile. Staying out of jail and keeping your job are important.

But please do what you can. Help us because we're dedicated to fighting the lies about marijuana that have been drummed into people's heads for years. Join NORML. Help stop the persecution.

NOTABLE QUOTES

From conservative economist Milton Friedman in an open letter to former drug czar William Bennett, in the Wall Street Journal:

"Every friend of freedom, and I know you are one, must be as revolted as am I 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. A country in which shooting down unidentified planes "on suspicion" can be seriously considered as a drug war tactic is not the kind of United States that either you or I want to hand on to future generations."

From Wesley A Pomeroy, lifelong police officer who served as assistant director to the White House's Office of Drug Abuse Policy under President Carter:

"We're in a war we shouldn't be in and can't win. The police are victims of this war just as soldiers were the victims in Vietnam."

From U.S. District Judge Robert W. Sweet in a speech to the Cosmopolitan Club in New York City, December 12 1989:

"What we ought to do is try to get at the source of this problem, which is poverty and disillusionment, and put our resources behind that and turn it around. I suggest it is time to abolish the prohibition -- to cease treating indulgence in mind alteration as a crime. The result would be the elimination of the profit motive, the gangs, the drug dealers. Obviously, the model is the repeal of Prohibition and the end of Al Capone and Dutch Schultz."

THE DUTCH TREAT THEMSELVES WITH RESPECT -- AND IT WORKS!

Reprinted from "Building Economic Alternatives" by David Morris, Spring, 1990

Holland is every conservative's nightmare come true. Coffee houses that sell marijuana to teenagers. Free abortions on request. Free needles for heroin addicts. Special rooms for prisoners to conduct liaisons with outside partners, even of the same sex. Euthanasia in hospitals.

To Americans such policies represent a moral breakdown. They are a prescription for social anarchy, promiscuity, drug addiction, family breakdown and AIDS. To Amsterdam Judge Fritz Ruter, such policies are "above all, pragmatic and undogmatic. You cannot solve social problems by making them taboo," he insists.

The Minister of Justice of Holland's conservative -- that's right, conservative -- government explains, the aim is to "prevent as much as possible a situation in which more harm is caused by criminal proceedings than by the activity itself."

Legalization allows the government much more flexibility than does criminalization. Prostitutes must undergo regular health examinations. One result is an astonishingly low rate of AIDS transmission among a group that now accounts for half the population of New York. Allowing prisoners sex with loved ones reduces prison tension and curbs in-prison aggressive homosexuality.

As for drugs, allowing the sale of marijuana gives the government much more credibility when it warns the young about the dangers of hard drugs. Indeed, says the Dutch secretary of drug policy, "Marijuana used to be the symbol of the youth culture. It was attractive because it was forbidden. Our aim was to turn it into an unsensational item" It worked. The proportion of Dutch teenagers using marijuana has dropped substantially. It is only a fraction of U.S. usage. Crack-cocaine is virtually non-existent.

All Dutch schools teach sex education. A year of birth control pills costs about \$10. Yet Dutch girls are no more sexually active than American girls. And 90% of those teenagers who are active use contraceptives. Holland's teenage pregnancy rate is 1/7 that of America. American teenagers have between 12 and 14 times more abortions than Dutch teens.

The Dutch treat prostitutes, drug addicts, teenage pot smokers and the terminally ill with respect. Not surprisingly, respect breeds responsibility, not license. The heroin addict uses a clean needle. The prostitute does not transmit disease. The teenager uses birth

control. Doctors assist a patient's death, only after a long, close relationship with that person.

Where does this sense of mutual respect and collective responsibility come from? Historian Simon Schama looks at Dutch history in "The Embarrassment of Riches." In the 1600's, tiny Holland was the most prosperous nation on earth. Riches bred a "collective consciousness" that demanded generosity for the needy and tolerance for those with different religions and habits. Obligations to community and society came first.

Today, the Dutch continue that 300-year tradition. They know the most fertile breeding ground for irresponsible behavior is the slum. They offer the world's most comprehensive social support programs. Medical care is free; child care is plentiful. Unemployment insurance is nearly forever. Amsterdam suffers a housing problem incomprehensible to American city planners. Sufficient housing exists for those with modest means, but there is not enough for the rich.

Such generosity of spirit and purse has not undermined Dutch prosperity. They live longer than Americans. The economy is robust; their businesses fiercely competitive. This prosperous country of 14 million has much to teach us, for tolerance has never been an American trait.

We have a long history of demanding moral purity of our neighbors and eagerly locking them up if they transgress. We rely on force to solve our social problems, not wisdom. Why we do so is up to the historians to ponder. That we do so seems not to be in question.

Today America imprisons a larger proportion of its citizens than any industrialized nation except South Africa, and President Bush now vows to double the number of federal prisoners, in an apparent move to dislodge South Africa from first place.

The Dutch tackle their social problems so well, and we so poorly, because we define the problems differently. For them, abortions, AIDS and prison violence are the problems, and they design approaches to minimize these problems. But America defines these as only symptoms of a more important social evil -- immorality.

We are willing to have almost 15 times as many teenage abortions per 1000 teenagers because, for us, abortion is not the real problem. Premarital sex is.

We are willing to allow massive prison violence because, for us, prison violence is not the problem. Homosexuality is.

We are willing to endure the AIDS epidemic among intravenous drug

users because AIDS, for us, is not the real problem. Drug use is.

We are on a holy war to stamp out sin, and the price tag for that war is mounting rapidly.

The Dutch watch our descent into social anarchy in amazement. They cannot understand why a nation would willfully destroy itself to control its citizens' social behavior. After seeing how well tolerance and self-respect work, neither can I.

A NOTABLE QUOTE.....

**from the Family Council on
Drug Awareness, Los Angeles**

**"The only crime that most
marijuana smokers commit is
using it. Although many who
abuse dangerous drugs also
smoke marijuana, the "stepping"
stone theory is discredited,
since most begin their habitual
behavior "using" legal drugs
like coffee, cigarettes, etc."**

MARIJUANA CHECKLIST

.....for considering whether to smoke.

ADVANTAGES:

- * Marijuana is a natural, non-addictive relaxant and euphoriant that effectively counteracts stress and anxiety.
- * A natural analgesic, useful for many kinds of headaches, as well as backaches, nervous stress, nausea, and other stomach disorders.
- * Useful for more serious disorders, including nausea caused by chemotherapy, spasticity, glaucoma, some forms of epilepsy, nervous disorders, drug addiction withdrawal.
- * Gives one a very pleasant "buzz," a feeling of peace and well-being.
- * Intensifies the pleasurable experiences of sensual pursuits, such as sex, food and music.
- * Expands the consciousness to consider alternative perspectives, stressing passivity and the ideals of truth, beauty, brotherhood, and peace while disdaining violence, aggression, and greed.
- * Reduces reliance on alcohol and other drugs to feel "high," thereby reducing addiction to these substances.
- * Rejuvenates energy when one is physically tired and brain-weary, without derogatory later effects.
- * Provides all this without the danger of any type of "hangover," such as with alcohol and pharmaceutical drugs.
- * Unlocks the relaxed, yet energetic, free-flowing mindset that enhances creativity in any kind of artistic pursuit.
- * Allows one to free the mind and look objectively and intelligently at one's situation, opportunities and problems -- and help make rational, although sometimes overly idealistic, decisions for dealing with them. You later wish fervently that your idealism was shared by the "straight" world, so that some real progress could be made in our alienated and troubled society. If only we could have a "joint" session of Congress, and see things in a more altruistic light.

DISADVANTAGES:

- * Contains some level of carcinogens, although new research has

noted that they may not be as harmful as tobacco smoke, since marijuana actually opens up capillaries instead of closing them down, as with tobacco. This function of opening up capillaries could make marijuana useful in treating heart disease if only authorities would allow research to be conducted.

* Requires some learning in order to enjoy the full effects of the "high." Initial users, having never experienced this altered consciousness, may let fear of the unknown drive them into a temporary state of disorientation and uncertainty. This ends with a little familiarity with the experience.

* It's illegal. Ignorant and overzealous cops will try to harass and abuse you. Any kind of transfer can brand you as a felon.

* Induces feelings of paranoia. But they're probably caused by the illegality of the substance. If you think people are out to get you, you're right.

* May induce feelings of inadequacy in uncertain situations with other people you may not know well. Again, this is caused by the newness of the experience. With a small degree of familiarity, this usually disappears.

* Can cause weirded-out or nauseous side effects when mixed with too much alcohol. Better limit or eliminate the alcohol intake and recognize that marijuana and alcohol are entirely different substances and best used for entirely different purposes.

* Can put some people in such a relaxed mood that they don't really want to do anything for awhile. This is not necessarily a disadvantage, but smokers should understand that activity enhances the "high" and often provides much greater enjoyment.

The above is a combination of proven facts and learned opinion. Millions of smokers believe the advantages far outweigh the disadvantages. Make your own decision. If you don't choose to smoke, at least be tolerant of those who do, and help end the oppression.

----Compiled by JIM HEMPHILL

SAMPLE ACTIVIST LETTER TO NEWS MEDIA

Editor:

It is regrettable that students brought home fliers advertising the Oct. 20 pro-marijuana rally at Fountain Square. The policy of NORML (the National Association for the Reform of Marijuana Laws) on adolescent drug use is as follows:

"NORML is strongly committed to the concept that growing up should be drug-free. NORML desires to help establish meaningful communication within the family based on honest and social consequences related to all drugs. NORML believes it is proper to restrict the distribution of marijuana to adults only."

With marijuana prohibition, however, there are no controls on usage as we have with alcohol. This innocuous medicinal herb remains a product of the streets, suffering guilt-by-association with legitimate, laboratory-produced drug threats like crack cocaine.

After smoking marijuana for 20 years, I am in good mental, physical and spiritual health, and know by experience that Americans have been lied to about this natural plant since the 1930s, when power brokers like the Hearsts, the DuPonts and the militaristic out-of-a-job alcohol prohibitionists set out to ban it.

Legalization today would allow the 35-60 million Americans who smoke marijuana to do so without the danger of legal persecution, and provide a framework by which its sale could be restricted to adults and taxed. It would free up half the jail space in this country and countless millions in law enforcement expenses, so that real problems like crack, murder, rape and robbery could be addressed. Marijuana smokers are neither criminals nor addicts. There is no victim of the "crime" of smoking it, and it is far less addictive than tobacco.

Varieties of marijuana (hemp) are also an excellent fiber crop that actually enhance the environment. Hemp was used for making rope, baskets, and sails until the DuPonts patented nylon. It was used for making paper until the Hearsts acquired vast timber holdings in the Pacific Northwest. The U.S. Constitution was printed on hemp paper. Legalization would be a major boon to agriculture and help the environment in various ways by substituting agricultural practice for the manufacture of synthetics. Alas, the industrialists have won out over the agriculturists in this country, and the synthetics interests are much stronger than the naturalists.

By its pharmacological name -- Cannabis -- the plant is rich in folk medicine lore, and in modern times has been found useful in treating stress, anxiety, nausea, headaches, backaches, and depression, as well as more serious disorders such as glaucoma, spasticity, epilepsy, and arthritis. Much more could be discovered if researchers were not restricted from getting the substance and were not patently refused funding for any proposed research that would consider benefits.

You'll hear much more at the Oct. 20, 3 p.m. rally at Fountain Square, if indeed there is one. Politicians striving to be vocally and "politically correct" may find some technicality to cancel the rally so that our free speech can't be exercised. They may even believe the lies about marijuana, which have been told for so long.

If they succeed, it'll be another win for a growing and insidious oppression that Americans are going to have to deal with in this decade. Forfeiture laws and forced labor camps are two examples. One of the greatest victims of the drug war has been our Bill of Rights, upon which our overzealous drug czars have carried on a frontal assault. Copies of the Bill of Rights will be available at the rally, as well as much more factual information.

Some 91,000 Ohioans were arrested on marijuana charges last year. Its prohibition is the cash cow of the legal business. But prohibition is costing the people millions, spurring corruption and oppression, and sidetracking our efforts against real problems. Millions really enjoy smoking it, just as millions like to drink. And so, like alcohol prohibition, marijuana prohibition is doomed to fail over the long haul. In the meantime, inflated prices spurred by eradication efforts are just encouraging more people to start growing it and simply pay off the local authorities.

And as much as I appreciate where the hearts of the "Just Say No" groups are, I urge them to consider extricating this medicinal herb from the stigma of the hard drug trade. If we were to ban all plants that affect our mental, physical and emotional state, we might as well ban tobacco, chamomile, sassafras, catnip, sugar and caffeine, as well as the base chemistry for many of our medicines. Lets have drug reform, not drug war. What we're doing isn't working.

Sincerely,

Jim Hemphill
Cincinnati NORML
Box 16158
Cincinnati OH 45217

SAMPLE LETTER TO POLITICIAN

(Use it as a guide to write your own.)

Dear Sir,

It is time to replace the lies and propaganda told about marijuana with the truth. This medicinal herb, falsely cast in the same mold as hard pharmaceutical drugs, is actually, in the words of DEA Administrative Judge Francis Young, "one of the safest and most effective therapeutic substances known to man." This statement came only after he had heard extensive testimony. It was followed by his call for decriminalization.

There is much evidence that completely refutes earlier medical warning flags, including the Harvard University Mental Health newsletter, vol. 4, no. 5, 1987. Modern scientific knowledge characterizes marijuana as being a non-addictive natural tranquilizer and euphoriant, an analgesic, and energy replenisher. It has a major role to play in relieving anxiety and stress, nausea induced by chemotherapy, spasticity, epilepsy, glaucoma and probably many other conditions as well. They will be discovered when the shroud of bias is lifted and researchers are allowed to have the substance and obtain funding for meaningful research. I urge you to learn the facts, after which you will realize that marijuana is part of the solution to the drug problem.

With legalization.....

* Marijuana would be subject to the same controls as liquor -- thereby giving society millions of dollars in tax revenues and providing a measure of usage control for minors.

* The approximate 30-60 million users of marijuana would not be subjected to harassment and prosecution, which costs billions of dollars in tax money while choking down our judicial and prison systems, alienating vast numbers of people, and encouraging disrespect for the law.

* With usage of this innocuous medicinal herb legalized, usage of dangerous drugs such as cocaine would greatly decrease, along with its many attendant problems. So too would alcohol usage and addiction, its related highway deaths and social problems.

* It would free law enforcement and the judiciary to deal with serious crimes that continue to get worse -- murder, rape, robbery, burglary -- and would unclog our severely pressured court system.

* It would save billions of dollars which are now going down a sinkhole in a drug war that can't be won. Alcohol prohibition proved to be one of the country's greatest mistakes. Marijuana prohibition will eventually be considered the same.

* With the pressure taken off the drug war, the cocaine and heroin problem could be addressed full-time, especially with funds freed up for drug education. And the thousands of young people who have discovered they were lied to about marijuana may begin to regain respect for the law.

* The reign of drug war terror, similar to the gangster battles of the 1930s, would subside. With greatly reduced interest in crack, more funds and resources for enforcement and drug education, the crack war could be won.

* A thriving hemp-based agriculture would develop, providing a much-needed economic boost to farmers, while producing a variety of fiber and biomass fuel products in a natural system that would be kinder to the environment than are the synthetic industries.

* The all-out assault on most provisions of our Bill of Rights by increasingly militant law enforcement agencies could hopefully be ended, leading to a return to Democratic principles of individual liberty and limited police state power.

You can make a heroic stand for drug reform in place of the ruinous drug war that squanders billions, promotes large-scale corruption, stimulates cocaine availability and usage as opposed to marijuana smoking, encourages violent crime while detracting from our effectiveness in dealing with it, and serves as an excuse for attacks on our personal freedoms.

And please help stop the omnibus crime bill now being considered, which is a devastating assault on individual liberties and even calls for establishment of Nazi-like concentration camps. As with the infamous property forfeiture law, these provisions would mostly be used against basically decent people who happen to smoke harmless marijuana or have foolishly used cocaine.

Decriminalize marijuana and watch the benefits accrue. My friends at the National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws in Washington and various other activist groups would be pleased to provide background information on many aspects of the marijuana question. Please also consider reviewing the testimony and final judgments by DEA Administrative Judge Francis Young, whose learned opinion has been disdained by the adamantly dogmatic DEA.

Sincerely,

SAMPLE LETTER ON AGRICULTURAL HEMP

Dear Representative,

Since our nation is growing very concerned over the condition of our environment, I felt it important to pass on some information to you. Everyone knows that most of our pollution comes from the manufacture and use of petrochemicals. What everyone doesn't know, however, is that there is a natural substitute that can replace petrochemicals. It is the fastest growing biomass on the planet and grows wild in all 50 states. It can be used to make fiber, paper, paints, varnishes, plastics, and fuel. This unique plant is called hemp, also known as cannabis sativa.

In 1916, the Department of Agriculture released a study on hemp paper (Bulletin No. 404). The report stated that one acre of hemp produces as much paper as four acres of trees. Since the report was published, we have deforested half our planet to make paper from trees.

Why? Because hemp was made illegal in 1937. The law was railroaded through Congress with little debate and supported primarily by the petrochemical industry. Later that year, nylon was introduced, a synthetic fiber that would have had difficulty finding a market if not for hemp prohibition. The anti-hemp laws were designed to help the petrochemical industry. However, they have denied our farmers a valuable crop with hundreds of industrial uses. Cloth made from hemp is as soft as cotton, but ten times stronger! The 1942 government film, "Hemp for Victory," explains the many uses of the plant, which was made legal for the duration of WWII.

I would like to see this valuable crop put back into the hands of American farmers to help revitalize our economy and rural America. Please let me know how you feel about this important issue.

Sincerely yours,

"TOUGH" QUESTIONS ANSWERED EASILY**FACTS AND TRUTH FAVOR MARIJUANA**

(Send your questions, comments, criticisms to Cinti NORML, Box 3557, Cinti, OH 45202. We will answer them sincerely, honestly and point you to additional sources, giving you a personal reply by return mail, and withholding your name on questions we deal with through this Drug Information Network.)

Q -- How can you possibly favor legalization of a drug that many people have said created in them paranoia, disorientation, mental confusion, and loss of memory?

A -- Easily. One can become intoxicated with heavy usage of marijuana just as with alcohol. Heavy doses of caffeine and most pharmaceutical drugs can also cause undesirable effects and should be avoided. None of these things are expressly illegal.

We advocate moderation and common sense in the use of any and all chemicals. Smoking marijuana does not cause these mental problems in most first-time, early or experienced users. For the persons who do suffer such ill effects as beginning smokers, the reason is usually that they are moving into a totally unfamiliar altered consciousness, with mental perceptions never before experienced. It is natural to have some anxieties and fear if the surrounding circumstances are not familiar and comfortable, and if an experienced smoker isn't providing a small amount of comforting reassurance that everything is okay.

So you might ask, why bother with something that provides these initial effects, or can cause intoxication in heavy doses. Because, simply, the benefits outweigh such generally minor problems. Enjoyable experiences are intensified, including sex, food, entertainment, music. New, broader, more enhanced perceptions come into the mind readily, giving remarkably fresh viewpoints and ideas relating to everyday situations that have grown ordinary and unremarkable. Insights achieved during moderate marijuana usage enhance creativity, expand sensitivities, promote good feelings toward others, stimulate passive, loving attitudes, and make even the most ordinary chores and activities of the day something special. Sure, it's worth learning how to use the herb profitably, and it's pretty easy to do. Undesirable side effects have been greatly exaggerated.

The idea that marijuana smoking impairs short term memory is neither proven or disproven. After 22 years of smoking, I find that I can remember most consequential events of my past, important ideas, and a vast amount of trivia. My mind not only continues to

work well, but increasingly better. So naturally, I have my doubts about memory impairment. But having heard this idea from users and former users is enough for me to advocate that research be undertaken to get some additional facts.

Remember too, the rap is possible "short term" memory loss. This could very well relate to specific things that happened while the person was "high." Maybe that's not desirable, but it's not such a bad thing that one should be overly concerned about it.

Q -- Don't we have enough addictive substances on the market without you advocating still another one? We don't need legal marijuana. That's just another problem for society to deal with, and another worry for parents that their children will foolishly get involved with.

A -- You already have to deal with it. With 30-60 million smokers and vast amounts of manpower, time and money going toward prohibition, marijuana is very much a part of our society. Like alcohol, it will never go away. Prohibition is doomed to fail, just as was alcohol prohibition. The overriding law of supply and demand will insure it.

Legalization would give society the means to control marijuana usage much like alcohol, derive tax revenues that could be used for worthwhile purposes such as drug education, that would warn kids about the truly dangerous drugs. Instead of spending great sums of money to eradicate it, society could make marijuana a revenue producer.

In its current illegal state, it is a sensational item to young people and most of them want to try it. Having it legal wouldn't prevent young people from wanting to try it, but it would be far less sensational and society would have far more control over who gets it and who doesn't. It's a fact that college campuses and high schools are both places where young people now obtain drugs. I, for one, had rather see it sold in liquor stores or drug stores.

The fact is that every bit of evidence available says marijuana is less harmful than alcohol. I had much rather see young people of drinking age smoking marijuana than drinking alcohol, no matter how socially acceptable that liquid drug has become. It leads to erratic mental behavior, distorted perceptions, loss of motor controls, nausea and vomiting, lingering hangover effects and the danger of addiction.

THE TRUTH ABOUT MARIJUANA
JIM HEMPHILL

Cinti NORML Rally -- 10-20-91

Thank you. I do have a bust story. But first I want to take you back in time.

To answer the question of why marijuana could possibly be illegal anyway.

It's a medicinal plant. An herb. It's included in every medicinal herb book ever written. What could be so awful about it that you could go to jail for having just the smallest amount of it?

How is it possible that you could become a convicted felon for letting a friend have a taste?

It's an amazing story.

Fivescore and seven years ago, our forefathers brought forth this incredible prohibition law to this country.

It was the 1930s. Depression era misery was everywhere.

There was a lot of greed, corruption, racism, the strong were abusing the weak, the working classes were really up against it.

Kind of like the 1990s.

The people who rammed through this prohibition law were rich and privileged people.

They believed they were better than the common people. They ought to use the ignorant masses for their own personal gain.

They had already done a helluva job of it. They put us in the depression and weren't doing a damned thing to help get us out of it.

They had a me-first, screw you attitude.

Kind of like the 1990s.

They outlawed hemp ... cannabis ... marijuana because of competitive greed.

The DuPont family, for example. Those wonderful people who give us pesticides and napalm, among other things. They had just patented nylon. And they wanted this new synthetic to take over

the hemp market for rope, twine, sails and other textile products.

The Hearst family, the people who brought you "yellow journalism." They owned a string of newspapers. And they wanted the newsprint for those papers -- and a lot of others -- to come, not from hemp paper, but from the millions of acres of trees they owned. Screw the environment. Chop 'em down. Run 'em through nasty, heavily-polluting paper mills. Turn 'em into trashy journalism.

Law enforcement was in on it too. An autocrat named Anslinger and his henchmen wanted to keep the big power base they had built up during alcohol prohibition.

Why? Because public money was rolling in to them. And so was graft. They had been raking it in from both sources. They didn't want a budget cut. They didn't want to lose any personnel.

But now, alcohol prohibition had ended -- one of the greatest failures in American history. It had been hopeless from the beginning. Prohibition had only increased corruption, violence, the power of organized crime and disrespect for the law, while wasting millions of dollars of taxpayer money.

Sounds kind of like marijuana prohibition, doesn't it? But apparently we didn't learn anything.

And since these 1930s power brokers were racists and elitists, even much more so than today -- they wanted control over the trouble-making blacks and Mexican laborers and other poor people who smoked marijuana. If they had no way to jail the people they wanted to jail, all they had to do was plant a joint on them. That would do it.

Those working class people were about the only ones smoking marijuana in those days. And since very few people were familiar with it, it was easy to prohibit it.

All they had to do was mention it in the same breath as narcotics morphineopium heroin cocaine. It began a long history of marijuana suffering from guilt by association. Mention terrible things and stick marijuana right in the middle of them.

If you don't believe things were that corrupt, people, just read your history books. You'll find that our history is riddled with corruption. And if you read the fraction of it that gets in the news media today, you'll realize it still is.

In the 1930s, some of the most outrageous lies ever heard were introduced as evidence to outlaw this medicinal herb. They said

smoking it would make you blind, rot your brain, induce you to commit rape and other violent crimes. The movie, "Reefer Madness" is so ludicrously ridiculous that it's still playing as a comedy.

So they outlawed marijuana as a natural, non-addictive relaxant and euphoriant. And the pharmacists woke up one day and said: "Hey, I didn't you were taking about cannabis. You mean we can't use it in medicines anymore?"

Nope. Not unless you want to go to jail.

And the agricultural hemp business was dead too. The synthetic products took all that. So today, instead of a cash crop that actually improves the environment, we have a collection of environmentally damaging synthetic, petroleum based industries that are harmful to the air, water and often the earth itself.

Well, folks, the lies have flourished ever since. When people quit believing the old ones, they just trotted out some new ones. The lies are just a little more sophisticated today. They talk about immune systems, chromosomes, brain deterioration, loss of motivation and sex drive, and memory loss.

But some of us who have smoked for more than 20 years know it's all bullshit. Lies. The same old wine in a different bottle.

And the lies are still fueled by the greed of major corporations who want to continue taking your money for the products they're producing.

They can't make a dime off a bush you could grow in your yard.

Who are they?

* The liquor companies. Their sales would drop if marijuana were legalized. And so would the costs of highway death and destruction, and addiction treatment for countless thousands of poor suckers who get hooked on alcohol and ruin their lives.

* The pharmaceutical companies don't want to see legalization. They want to sell you their drugs. And their lab concoctions, by the way, are the real drugs. Unlike marijuana, tranquilizers are addictive.

With marijuana legalized, they would sell less of these highly concentrated, laboratory-produced drugs.

* And from the hemp side, there are the synthetic companies. They are just one of the forces that have just about destroyed family farming in this country.

What's really disgusting is that vested interests like these put their lies on television as the Partnership for a Drug-Free America. And yet they themselves are liquor and drug companies, and petrochemical companies which have already seriously damaged the life-giving elements of our planet.

Their despicable tactics include putting the brain waves of a comatose patient on television and calling it the brainwaves of a teenager after smoking pot. You probably saw that one about the time they were running their silly so-nothing fried egg spot.

They were caught in that lie and took the announcement off the air. But not until the damage was done. It poisoned the minds of millions of people about marijuana. And very few people ever heard about them having to take it off.

Well, the Partnership had an explanation for it. The end justifies the means. It's all right to lie to millions of Americans if it serves your purpose.

Sounds kind of like Communism, doesn't it? But, hell, while the people in the Soviet are doing away with that kind of thinking, it's alive and well in the heads of too many arrogant, sanctimonious, self-serving, judgmental, and hypocritical Americans who want to tell you and me and all of us what to think and how to live.

Well, I don't need it. In the words of the song: They can't even run their own lives. I'll be damned if they'll run mine.

And what kind of leadership, what kind of moral example are we getting today? We've got Bush -- President Rambo -- former CIA spook, oil company money grubber and the man who is solely responsible for an aberration of reason called Dan Quayle.

He'll go to war for rich oil sheiks but he's got no sympathy for the poor people in this country. He figures it's their own fault.

He's the guy who killed 200,000 Arabs -- mostly just poor innocent guys with families who were forced into the military and who took the first opportunity to crawl out of their holes and kiss the hands of the allies who rescued them. But the one Arab who really needed killing hardly got inconvenienced at all. I bet he didn't even miss a meal.

But that's the way war is. The pawns die. The instigators live on.

And it didn't seem we'd ever quit congratulating ourselves for our half-ass job. Every time I turned on the TV, there was another parade and Whitney Houston screaming in my ear.

But Bush talks tough on the drugs -- I'm telling you. He wants to put every drug dealer in jail -- except for Oliver North.

His Justice Department and the DEA are attacking just about every provision in the Bill of Rights, which is supposed to protect people who have no power or influence.

So what's changed since the '30s?

The rich and the privileged are still trying to take this country away from the people. They've never stopped.

And marijuana and hemp prohibition rolls on. It sends billions of dollars down a rathole in a prohibition war that just escalates the price and attracts more production, which promotes massive corruption, and tears down our principles of individual freedoms from persecution.

So while the Russians reach courageously for freedom, our society is intent on restricting it while also building an entire society of homeless people ... turning the middle class into entertainment junkies in debt up to their ears, and making the rich even richer. And bullying people who just want to come home from an honest day's work and smoke a joint in the evening to relieve the tiredness and tension from a world that's becoming increasingly crazy.

I'll tell you a quick story about what they did to me. It made me so mad I opened my closet door and came out to join you brothers and sisters as an activist.

I had smoked marijuana for 20 years. I knew firsthand and from everything I had read that what they were saying was a pack of lies.

Forget the effects on immunity. On short-term memory. On reproductive chromosomes. On sex drive. On apathy and lack of ambition. Every single red-flag medical charge, which were often originated to extract big research grants from the government, have been refuted to my satisfaction by the Harvard Medical School and others. The facts are all on our side.

On the other hand, I knew marijuana provided an alert, euphoric relaxation. An expanded consciousness that provides useful perspectives and insights. It's useful for back pains, headache, any kind of stomach distress. It intensifies sensory experiences. It gives one concerns about peace, beauty, enlightenment, sharing, brotherhood. It makes one less tolerant of aggressive violence and greed.

After smoking marijuana for 20 years, I was a successful professional, a community leader, the father of two grown and successful daughters. I was liked and respected, except by the DEA.

They sent an undercover agent into my home -- a fellow my daughter had known since elementary school. From September until April, for eight months, he coaxed and begged me to get a little extra marijuana for him when I bought some. After these eight months, I decided to get an extra ounce for him. I could get a little more a little cheaper and do the guy a favor.

Well, as they say, the rest is history. A financial and legal nightmare. The transaction was taped.

I was under surveillance for another 15 months while the DEA tried to get at least one more transaction. They didn't. Because I was never a dealer in the first place.

They knew that. But they indicted me anyway. For one purpose -- to make five column headlines with a photograph in the state's largest newspaper.

The case wasn't about truth, fairness and justice. It was about arrest, conviction and newspaper headlines.

It wasn't about the spirit of the law. It was about the letter of the law. You only have to be tricked into one transaction to become a so-called "dealer."

My lawyer estimated that my case cost the taxpayers over \$75,000, including over a thousand dollars to the informant. His name is Jimmy Catalano, a former dealer turned undercover snitch who had even busted some of his college fraternity brothers.

So I was sucked down into a judicial system that works of the lawyers, by the lawyers and for the lawyers. And I watched the people posturing and playing their little head games, and hand-feeding the press what they wanted them to have. And, of course, they extracted a good deal of my money.

You know, marijuana is the cash cow of the judicial system. I used to think that everyone was concerned that the courts are so clogged up and choked down that you have to wait forever to get heard. And than can't afford it.

But, really, that's the way they want it. Marijuana generates revenue like hot cakes. Fines, lawyer fees, court costs. They even make you pay a monthly fee to be on probation.

You know, Americans tend to turn everything into a competition. They've even done it with the judicial system. But, believe me,

it's a game an ordinary person can't win. It costs a lot of money to get justice in this country, and you can spend a lot without getting it.

And in the end, you aren't going to get heard anyway in our court system. If I had fought them too hard, it was understood they would put me in prison for five years as opposed to probation. They dare you to fight them. They dare you to speak out. They tell you it'll be easier if you don't. And they mean it. They'll throw the book at you if you make them mad.

So the judge had my sentencing postponed until after he was re-elected so he wouldn't have to contend with the ignorant drug hysteria that afflicts so many rural people. Then he preached to me for the media's benefit and gave me probation. He knew that I had been set up. He knew my character was better than the DEA's.

The judicial system likes to run people through its meat grinder and take their money. And when they don't have any more money, they throw them in jail. For marijuana charges alone, the State of Ohio arrested 91,000 people last year. And they spent a ton of money doing it that could be used for something useful, like education, or drug education as a matter of fact.

This country now jails a higher percentage of its citizens than any country on the face of the earth. We've just taken over first place from South Africa.

And now Bush and his "Just Say More" administrators are pushing through an omnibus crime bill that would spend millions more of your tax dollars to build even more prisons, and jail even more Americans.

And at the same time, that proposed law rips into your individual freedoms in a way that should scare every one of us.

Well, let's look at this horrible thing they call marijuana.

There is absolutely no victim of the so-called crime of smoking it. It isn't addictive. It is no more unhealthy than tobacco. No one has ever overdosed on it. In the words of the DEA's own administrative judge, Francis Young, it is "one of the safest, most effective therapeutic substances known to man."

That judge heard expert testimony for several weeks. He got the facts. And his decision jolted the DEA so hard, they've been trying to overturn it since 1987.

But there is a victim of the drug war. Your rights and freedoms. The Bill of Rights is undergoing a major assault. For possessing marijuana or especially for letting someone you think you know have

just a little of it, they want to take your personal property -- your car and home -- take away any professional license that you have, force your landlord to evict you, just about ruin your life if they can. And one wonders, what can they possibly gain by taking away your job, your possessions, your home? We have enough homeless people already.

Then I found out. It's right there in the newspaper. The new property forfeiture law, which they rammed through Congress with the lie that it would be applied against organized crime -- the Mafia. It allows them to take the personal property of anyone caught growing plants. The newspaper said they spent 3.8 million dollars on marijuana enforcement last year, and collected \$38 million in assets.

Just like in the courts, marijuana has become a lucrative money-maker for law enforcement. And, believe me, it's going to be tough getting it legalized when they're making that kind of money off it.

The only historical analogy to this forfeiture nightmare that I can think of is Nazism. When Hitler's legions rounded up the Jews, then the intellectuals, the homosexuals, anybody else they didn't like, they took all of their possessions. Their seized assets funded the Third Reich and World War II. The property forfeitures today are funding the DEA and the Drug War, which they are using as an excuse to erode and wear away just about every provision of the Bill of Rights.

Of course, most people don't know what their rights are. They don't read about them in school, which is a shame and disgrace for our educational system. And I guarantee you one thing. If we don't wake up and defend them, they will be taken away. Too many prosecutors and law enforcement people have a police state mentality, an us versus them mind-bent.

I think one of the great heroes of the year was the fellow who shot the videotape of the police muggings in Los Angeles. Police racism and brutality has been a fact of life for a long time. Finally, finally, someone made a videotape so that our nation of sheepish entertainment junkies could see for themselves.

Well, only 35-60 million people smoke marijuana. What about those who don't?

They're not making any money from the drug war. In fact, they are paying millions in an ill-advised prohibition war that is riddled with corruption and ineffectiveness.

Even with their well-orchestrated campaign to link marijuana to the real drugs. Guilt by association.

Comparing marijuana to cocaine is like comparing ice water to 100 proof whiskey.

Not only does it not belong in the same category with hard pharmaceutical drugs. It belongs in a category even less harmful than alcohol and tobacco.

And speaking of guilt by association -- their ultimate lie. The mayor of our unfair city was quoted here in the Cincinnati Post a few days ago saying it was unfortunate that freedom of speech forced them to allow radical groups to use Fountain Square. Groups like the neo-Nazis, the white supremacists, the Ku Klux Klan, and -- the Marijuana Harvest Festival.

Well, I'm no Nazi and I'm no Kluxer and I resent the hell out of being linked together with that kind of trash.

And I'm not voting for this jerk in November. I'm voting for someone who isn't so stupid. And I urge you to do so.

I also resent people trying to tell me that smoking marijuana is a moral issue. My morals are as high as anybody's, and I smoked marijuana for 22 years. That's past tense, unfortunately, because as an activist I don't want to be targeted for more persecution.

I also read in the newspaper recently that police morale was low.

It would be higher if they would quit wasting money and pay our officers what they're worth. And quite turning them into nursemaids of morality and let them go after criminals. Who cares that you're busting marijuana smokers if the figures for murder, assault, rape, robbery and burglary are going through the roof.

Where are our priorities? They can bust Pee Wee for masturbating. But they are completely powerless to do anything about the Mafia. Never have. Never will.

And they harass and abuse school children right here in Cincinnati because the kids found something that looked like it might be crack. Why?

Listen. It's just my opinion. But I think those kids need guidance, compassion and love. They don't need to be thrown out of school and dragged through a justice system that produces more criminals than it ever rehabilitates. They need to be back in school.

And later, they found out it wasn't even crack.

It's bad enough that they can't do anything about crack. I thought at least they knew what it was.

This case prompts me to say three things.

One is -- If you lie to young people about an innocuous herb like marijuana, they're probably going to try it at some point, no matter what you do to prevent it. And when they find they've been lied to about it, they'll think you're lying to them about the stuff that can really hurt them.

And believe me, when you warn kids about cocaine, I hope to God they believe it. I've seen it ruin too many people's lives.

Now, let me say that I do not -- and NORML does not -- advocate marijuana smoking by school children. Legalization would help control that. We should have the same controls -- and same tax revenues -- that we have with alcohol.

Secondly -- this ordeal will encourage those three elementary school kids to grow up like a lot of others -- distrusting and despising the law for putting them through this wringer. That's too bad. I wish we could return to a respect for the law -- a belief that they do "protect and serve" rather than "harass and abuse."

Thirdly -- this case has done absolutely nothing to solve the drug problem in this city. I know the authorities want to shock people by saying it's in the schools. But the truth is, in this case, the kids just happened to find it on the street.

And do they want you to be shocked because kids know what it is. Hell, crack is all over television, movies, newspapers and a lot of neighborhoods. Who could possibly miss it? The more sensational you make an item, the more people are interested in it.

And I guess they wanted to make what they call an "example" out of these children with hard punishment. Like they did me. But you can't control people with fear, abuse and harassment -- even children. You will only build hatred and resentment.

They tried it for years in Russia. And they never did succeed.

Let's give the police a break. If we legalized marijuana, the crack cocaine problem would be much smaller. The stuff probably wouldn't have been invented in the first place had marijuana not been so scarce. They needed a cheap and dirty form of cocaine for the masses because they couldn't hardly get marijuana part of the year and it was too high the rest of the time.

The big difference is that marijuana is harmless. Cocaine is dangerous because too many people just can't handle it.

Marijuana is not part of the drug problem. It's part of the solution. When the system begins to realize that, we'll make some real progress. And we can put the millions spent on fighting marijuana into drug education and toward meeting some of the country's real needs. Like education reform, judicial reform, welfare reform, health care reform, environmental reform, electoral reform, the rehabilitation of this country with money we've squandered on military arms and foreign aid.

The cold war is over. And the Japanese won. Unlike the Russians and Americans, they didn't waste countless millions on missiles, planes, submarines, ships, and bombs, things that kill people, things that people can't use.

But in the meantime, we're saddled with President Bush-shit and his crowd of bullies. He doesn't care what's right and fair, only what's politically correct based on public opinion, whether it's informed or not -- and what's politically profitable based on which major banks and corporations are financing his party.

They don't want you to be open-minded, thinking individuals.

They want you to swallow their pre-fab, shrink-wrapped homilies that they themselves don't even live up to.

They don't want you to think for yourself and express yourself.

They want you to vegetate in front of their ball games and sitcoms and not think about their corruption. For heroes, they give you inhuman killing machines like the Terminator and Rambo and Chucky and Freddy Kreuger and Jason. Or corporate produced mind candy like the New Kids on the Block and the Ninja Turtles.

They don't want you to be human beings.

They want you to be consumers.

Up to your ass in debt to the big corporations that own the government that wants to own you.

Well, I, for one, say: SCREW THIS!

It's time for the people to get on their feet. If the 60 million marijuana smokers and their supporters would shuck their fear of persecution and get out of the closet and stand up -- we would be too damned many to deal with.

The black people have done it. Women have done it. The gay people are doing it now. Both sides of the abortion issue are doing it. The animal rights people are in line. When the hell are the hemp smokers going to get on the agenda?

If we wait, they're already setting up barbed wire and quonset hut concentration camps for drug users. They call them boot camps. You know what they are. You better believe this. You better keep your eyes open.

I'm asking you to stand up for your rights before it's too late. We're not criminals and we're not immoral. I'm asking you to commit yourself to doing just a few things:

1-- Join Cincinnati NORML. Just a few dollars each year. We'll keep your name and address top secret and you'll get a number of mailings to tell you what the movement is doing everywhere. We'll use your dues to send our drug information newsletter to every politician and news media in the city -- we're doing it now but we need more postage money --and to organize more rallies and protests.

2 -- Sign these petitions that you see. A lot of politicians now see that marijuana prohibition is a hopeless fiasco. They really do. They're getting more interested in drug reform instead of drug war. But they're not going to do anything until they hear from the people. And that's you. I hope you're signed up to vote.

3 -- Write letters to your city council, your legislators, your congressional representatives and the governor. Invest in some paper, envelopes and stamps. Write them. Write them all. And after a while, write them again. Set a goal of X number of letters per week or month. Believe me, there are people paid to read these letters, keep a tally on what's coming in, and report to their politician bosses. Be sure to tell them you're a voter.

4 -- And while you're writing, take every opportunity to write the newspapers when you read about any issue involving marijuana, drugs or civil liberties. Flood them with paper. Some of these letters will get published and reach a lot of people. All of them will be read by media people who very much influence public opinion.

5 -- Learn the facts about marijuana. They're all on your side. The more you know the more you will be absolutely convinced that marijuana is not a problem but a solution. Then have the courage to speak your conviction.

You know, at certain times in their lives, people have the opportunity to stand up for what's right. It happened in the sixties when people got out in the streets. They made noise. And they undermined the Vietnam war and saved some lives, they ended the draft, they struck a major blow for civil rights and women's rights, they liberalized marijuana laws, they raised environmental consciousness. They stopped this country -- at least temporarily - - from turning into a police state. And many of the values they

espoused for the first time are still with us. Today, there is a counterculture. Before the sixties, there was not.

It's time to get out there again. Don't let fear suck you down. You're not doing anything illegal. You're fighting for common sense and freedom, and you're fighting to take your country back from the rich politicians, the rich corporate executives, the rich bankers, the rich lawyers, and the rich cocaine dealers.

And you're fighting to turn this American nightmare back into the American dream.

You are the patriots. You are the champions for individual liberty and the Bill of Rights. You are the real conservatives, because you want to go back to the individual freedom principles of Thomas Jefferson and the framers of the Constitution. Which was -- incidentally -- printed on hemp paper.

You can help return this nation to a country of the people, by the people, and for the people by replacing the corrupt Bush bozos who run this country arrogantly with honorable men and women who really care about people.

The winds are changing. I can feel it. I've seen it happen more than once in my 50 years. Sometime this decade, before the year 2000 rolls in, millions of Americans are going to stand up like the Russians did.

They're going to say: We're not spoiled, jaded and lazy. We're involved and we're mad. And we're not going to sit back and let you sap our money and sap our spirits and destroy our individual freedoms.

We have the right to smoke the leaves of this plant. We have a right to grow this plant. We have the right to share it with our friends. And we have the right to throw your ass out of office if you try to persecute us for it.

So I'm not telling you to lay back and be cool and drop out.

I'm telling you to get involved. Get involved in this system that's being run for the well-connected by the politicians they own, and help take it back for the people.

Fight for freedom. Fight for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Fight for medicinal herbs. If they were to outlaw every herb or natural substance that affects your brain, body and nervous system. they'd have to outlaw caffeine, tea, chamomile, ginseng, sugar, alcohol, catnip, tobacco.

It may sound ridiculous to go to jail for a piece of ginseng root.
But banning marijuana is about the same thing.

Fight for the truth. And if they ask you if you're ever going to
get out of their face.

Just say NO.

In fact Hell no!

Thank you.

TOWARDS A SENSIBLE DRUG POLICY

Reprinted from The Progressive Review, Washington, DC

The real turning point in the Vietnam war may well have occurred when Paul Harvey's son reached draft age. About that time, Harvey, the arch-conservative broadcaster who was perhaps the most listened-to person in America, decided we couldn't win and should get out. It finally became acceptable for even proponents of that grisly adventure to admit it was time to come home.

Something similar seems to be happening today with our domestic Vietnam: the misbegotten war on drugs, complete in metaphor with its high-tech weaponry producing death without victory, its poisoning of the land, its pacification programs, and a hubris on the part of the politicians that seems to mount with each failure.

Our leaders have offered the same response to each defeat: doing more of the same, only harder and at greater cost. And they promise the same light at the end of the tunnel.

The almost hallucinogenic unreality of this, however, may be nearing an end. Those columnar curators of the conventional, William Buckley and Richard Cohen, have sent out trial balloons on behalf of drug legalization and have not been pilloried for it. But most astoundingly, Kurt Schmoke, a former prosecutor now the mayor of Baltimore, has called for a national discussion of narcotics legislation.

We have paid an enormous price for our futile war on drugs beyond the cost of crime and of incarcerating its participants. We have hamstrung public health officials who can not effectively reach the addicted population as long as the justice system writes all the rules. People have died because police and prosecutors won't even accept the US surgeon general's word that exchanging clean needles for dirty ones would help in reducing AIDS. We have accepted unprecedented intrusions on our privacy and individual rights as a necessary cost of winning the war. And we have diverted funds from housing, health care and education, where the money could be spent usefully, to creating pointless, ineffective symbols of our concern that, in reality, make matters worse. We have in the end chosen to fund our moral indignation rather than produce moral results.

There are things we could do right now to extricate ourselves from the problems the war on drugs have created. We could decriminalize the personal use of drugs, we could establish badly needed sterile needle exchange programs, we could spend at least as much on

treatment and rehabilitation as we do on enforcement. We could begin treating drugs as the public health problem they are.

In the Vietnam era, the argument changed from the moral question of why were there to the pragmatic question of whether, right or wrong, the American presence could accomplish anything. In the end, Henry Kissinger and Abbie Hoffman arrived at the same place and we got out. We are on the cusp of such a change in our war on drugs, like Vietnam, many futile deaths too late. So, as Kurt Schmoke says, we might as well start talking about how end what we can't win. Will the last cop out of Mayfair please turn off the lights?

DRUGS AND OUR COMMUNITIES: A PLAN OF ACTION

Excerpts relating to marijuana from the comprehensive drug policy program recommended by the Greater Washington Americans for Democratic Action, published in its entirety in the June, 1989, issue of The Progressive Review.

It is time to end the war on drugs and begin a drug peace movement.

Peace is not surrender. Peace is not apathy. Peace is not indifference. Peace is the natural state in which problems can be solved rationally, unimpeded by violence and vengeance.

We can not hope to wean our children from the drug culture if we simultaneously declare war on them. It's time to stop worrying about whether we are being tough enough on drugs and start worrying about whether we're smart enough on drugs.

The so-called war on drugs has failed and will continue to fail unless we take a dramatically different approach to the drug problems in Washington, DC, an approach that treats the problem as a public health issue rather than overwhelmingly as a matter of law enforcement.

We have tried the latter approach. It has not worked and spending more money on it will not make it work better. The cure has proved worse than the disease. We are probably losing more of our citizens through murder in the drug wars than through overdose deaths. There are other grim unintended results of our well-meaning but misdirected efforts.

* Aggressive law enforcement policies have increased the stakes in the drug game, thereby contributing to greater violence and danger to law-abiding citizens.

* There has been a serious assault on the democratic and constitutional rights of our citizens. The war on drugs has turned out, in reality, to be a war on democracy.

* Badly needed government services are being shortchanged in the panicky effort to find funds to fight drugs.

* A public and political hysteria has been created, in which rational discussion of the problem has become nearly impossible.

* Unsafe sex practices common in prison have turned our correctional institutions into breeding grounds for the deadly AIDS virus. The extraordinary incarceration rates of the war on drugs has magnified the danger.

* Our minimal level of self-government has been directly threatened by the failure of our drug policies.

In an effort to propose new approaches and to move discussion to a more rational and unhysterical level, Greater Washington Americans for Democratic Action offers this comprehensive plan for the restoration of community order in Washington, DC.

We realize that some of the proposals are controversial. This is nothing to be afraid of. We are facing a difficult problem and if we are unable to even discuss controversial ideas we will never find realistic solutions. In fact, some of the controversial ideas contained in this report are discussed behind closed doors, some actually come from high officials, some have proved successful in other countries, some might be endorsed by politicians if they didn't have to run for re-election. Some of the ideas that follow may prove impractical, some require further study, but we will never find solutions if we do not even permit them to come to the discussion table. **We can not continue to limit our alternatives to those we know have failed.**

It is time to discuss these proposals and others like them seriously, rationally and calmly. A whole generation of Washingtonians is depending on us to do so and thus far, sadly, we have failed them.

(An outline of the policies by title, with elaboration regarding marijuana information. Get the full report from The Progressive Review)

THE GOAL: Reducing Harm

To act effectively, we must understand what we are trying to achieve. Oversimplistic and utopian visions of total elimination of drug use in no way helps us toward reaching what should be our goal: the reduction of harm caused by drugs -- and the war on drugs -- to our nation, our communities, our individual citizens and our Constitution. We are dealing not with one form of abuse -- that of drugs -- but with a whole system of abuse, intricately tied to the drug phenomenon. There is the abuse of the individual who uses drugs, the abuse to the community by the drug trafficker, the abuse to the addict denied proper health care, the abuse of race and class that permits some communities and individuals to be neglected and mistreated, the abuse of our laws and Constitution by overzealous politicians and law enforcement officials, and the abuse of our good sense by those who have used the drug situation for personal political gain.

Policy #1: Treat Drugs as a Public Health Matter

- Have public health commissioner coordinate all drug policy

- Institute a clean needle exchange.
- Greatly increase funds for treatment and education

Policy #2: End Political and Public Hysteria

- End wasteful spending on flashy but ineffective initiatives
- Immediately cease unconstitutional practices
- Take a holistic approach to the drug problem

Policy #3: Change Our Drug Law

Walt Kelly once said that we must defend the right of Americans to make damn fools of themselves. Freedom does not mean merely the right to behave correctly according to majority values, but to be wrong by those values. The use of even personally harmful substances is not a matter over which the state should impose criminal sanctions unless that use presents a clear threat to other persons. The prevention of such abuse should be a public health matter.

Further, efforts to restrict such personal use by criminal sanctions has proven a woeful failure. DC Police Chief Maurice Turner has estimated, for example, that only ten to fifteen percent of those arrested on drug charges actually are convicted and sent to jail. American society has been able to reduce significantly the consumption of only one drug, cigarettes, and has done so with a minimum of legal sanctions and maximum use of its educational and public health resources. In attempting to reduce drug consumption, we should follow the successful model of the war on cigarettes rather than the ill-conceived futile model of the war on drugs.

If we take this wiser course, we will inevitably move towards a different legal status for drug activity. While this is a complex and controversial issue, it is not one that we should be afraid to discuss. And while, obviously, significant change in this area is dependent on national action, there are steps this city could take, among them:

-- Deescalate the drug war. With one-quarter of the city's young adults and teens refusing to obey the law concerning marijuana, this part of the war on drugs has already been lost. We should recognize this by eliminating the sanctions we have on the use and sale of small quantities of marijuana, a position GWADA has held for over ten years. Marijuana, according to the best medical evidence, is a drug less harmful to the human body than either cigarettes or alcohol. Further, it should be noted that until the Reagan administration's crackdown on marijuana, pot was the cheap drug of choice on the streets. With the suppression of marijuana, we did not eliminate the availability of cheap drugs, we simply changed the type: pot was replaced by the far more dangerous crack

The immediate police responsibility should be to deescalate the drug turf war and to contain (rather than aggressively suppress) the drug problem, recognizing that any significant reduction in drug availability will drive up drug prices and, concurrently, drug violence. Police should concentrate on removing drug transactions from residential neighborhoods.

In coordination with health officials, the police should begin adjusting enforcement of laws regarding possession and use of drugs other than marijuana as treatment facilities and techniques become available.

The city should adopt a multi-tiered approach to drug possession, use and sale. Depending on the drug and transaction involved, this approach should include legalization, civil penalties (as with a traffic ticket), limited enforcement (laws remain on the books but are only enforced in aggravated circumstances), zoned enforcement or vigorous enforcement.

Operation Clean Sweep methods should be abandoned as ineffective and counter-productive. Among the latter results have been the moving of the drug trade to previously unaffected neighborhoods and increase in drug murders as drug dealers forced out of one area move into the turf of other dealers.

Increase the tax on legal drugs such as cigarettes and alcohol. Not only is the current disparity in our policies toward various classes of drugs hypocritical and medically unsound, such a policy would provide additional funds for drug prevention programs.

Policy #4: Rebuild Our Neighborhoods

- Provide drug-impact aid to affected communities
- Give neighborhoods budgetary authority
- Greatly increased funding for recreational and school extracurricular activities
- Establish a neighborhood constabulary
- Establish neighborhood judicial councils
- Increase the powers of the advisory neighborhood commissions

A SIDEBAR

Ralph Salerno worked for twenty years on the crime beat for the New York City police department and is one of the nation's leading experts on the mob and a consultant to police departments around the country.

A few years ago, Salerno told Pacific News Service he was training a grand jury looking into crime in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida. He told the group that police estimate that they seize, at most, ten percent of the drugs being sold.

"I said to them, 'suppose Ralph Salerno at 8 o'clock tomorrow morning could wave a magic wand and stop 20% of the drugs coming into Broward County from coming in. How many of you would be in favor of that?' All 22 or 23 of them raised their hands.

"I then asked, "What happens to the price of the 80 percent that is getting through?" And one gentleman -- a businessman -- said it would probably go up. And I said, 'You're probably right.' So what would happen to the statistics of breaks and entries and tape decks ripped out of cars and CB radios stolen and little old ladies knocked down on the ground while someone grabs their pocketbook and runs away?' And they said, 'My God, they would go up.'

"One and half minutes into that educational exercise I asked the same people, 'How many of you would now like to see me wave my magic wand and cut off 20% of the drugs?' And they all voted against it."

Another sidebar from The Progressive Review:

DUTCH TREATMENT

Dutch officials estimate that there are 15,000 to 20,000 drug addicts in the Netherlands, a country with a population of almost 15 million. This is the equivalent of Washington having an addict population of around 800. (It is many times larger.)

Holland uses a multi-tiered approach to its drug problem: decriminalization of marijuana, tolerance of other drugs, and enforcement against major dealers. It works.

Dr. Henk Jan Van Vliet, director of the Dutch Drug Research Agency, told the Koppel Report in Sept 1988: "This drug policy that we have developed during the last 20 years in the Netherlands has created a low level of not only marijuana use because of a formal decriminalization, but also a very, very low level of cocaine use, and also a decreasing level of heroin use.

"A policy that leads to an availability of drugs or paraphernalia will not always increase drug use, but can help to manage, to contain the problems for the addicts, for the society, and for the immediate circles in which the addict has to live."

HEMP (AND KUDZU) FOR VICTORY

by John Dunlap

Excerpts from an article in "Southern Reader," December, 1991

On September 19, 1861 in Lexington, Missouri, Federal troops awoke to do battle with Confederate soldiers and saw a most unusual sight. The Confederates were making their way toward the Union lines using a surprising cover -- hemp bales. The bales, soaked wet by Rebel soldiers, served as an effective barrier to Union bullets, and soon the Federals were routed. One can only imagine what the atmosphere on the battlefield would have been had the bales caught fire

Think what you might about hemp and kudzu, they represent two agricultural items greatly misunderstood by our society. And both, without question, could prove invaluable to the South in years to come.

In the case of hemp, once Southern farms and the American government pay a bit more attention to current use of the plant in other countries, laws could be changed to allow its widespread growth as a crop for making paper, oil, medicine, clothing, twine, rope, protein-rich salad and cooking oils, paint, varnish, soap, birdseed and cattle food.

The problem in converting hemp and kudzu into useful, widely-used crops is basically simple -- one must show farmers and politicians in the South that the plants can be easily grown, regularly harvested, and are in demand to make the products just listed. And, in the case of hemp, one must also consider the law.

The hemp plant is illegal because the leaves of the plant are known as marijuana -- none of which matters much to hemp growers in other countries like France and China, where the leaves are so weak that they are idly tossed away. Even now, a well-known U.S. company, Kimberly-Clark, owns rights to a paper-making operation in France that makes use of hemp. In fact, bibles are being printed in France on hemp-stock paper.

Hemp is hardly a new crop to the United States. Ask your grandparents. They probably know hemp by its nickname "rope," which is based on the fact that most of the rope and twine generated in this country through the 1700 and 1800's was made from hemp, as was the fabric for settlers' covered wagons and a great deal of the clothing our ancestors wore.

Speaking of ancestors, both George Washington and Thomas Jefferson are well-documented in their enthusiasm for hemp as a major

agricultural staple and the plant was farmed at both Mount Vernon and Monticello. The original Declaration of Independence was written on rag paper, which was composed of paper made from hemp. The leaves of hemp were originally used for medicinal purposes to calm nerve disorders.

Even after it was made illegal in 1937, the U.S. Government did an about-face in its attitude toward hemp during World War II and encouraged its growth, even coming out with a film, "Hemp For Victory," in which an announcer bellows: "American hemp will go on duty again: hemp for mooring ships; hemp for tow lines; hemp for tackle and gear; hemp for countless naval uses both on ship and shore, just as in the old days when Old Ironsides sailed the seas victorious with hemp shrouds and hempen sails. Hemp for Victory!"

With no more need to fit a ship like Old Ironsides, and Jefferson and Washington well out of the modern-day picture, how does hemp fit into the South's agricultural future? For one, hemp makes a terrific grade of paper that requires less toxic chemicals to break down and far less space to grow than trees. Here are the words of Jim Young, technical editor of Pulp and Paper in an editorial from its June 1990 issue:

"Hemp is the world's primary biomass producer, growing ten tons/acre in approximately four months. It can produce four times the amount of paper/acre than 20-year old trees can and will grow in all climactic zones of the contiguous 48 states.

"U.S. hemp-growing restrictions were set aside to meet material shortages during World War II. They should now at least be modified to meet pending shortages of fiber, energy and environmental quality."

In short, save the trees, grow hemp, make paper.

Kentucky has always been one of the hotbeds of hemp growth. In 1775 as Daniel Boone was blazing a trail through the wilderness, Kentuckians were sowing hemp seeds. In 1991 Lexington lawyer Gatewood Galbraith ran for governor with a platform that included the legalization of hemp. Galbraith even drove in a car powered by hemp fuel, and country singer Willie Nelson, an avid believer in the legalization of hemp, did a benefit concert for him.

Speaking on the value of hemp, Nelson said, "They (the government) doesn't want you to know that hemp is petroleum. They don't want you to know that hemp is food, hemp is paper, that it can save the trees. The environmentalists of this world should be the first to stand up, should be the most interested in seeing hemp returned and seeing the farmers growing hemp for the soil itself, and say 'We have to return to the agricultural way of doing things.'

"I believe in the war on drugs," adds Nelson. "I just don't think hemp is a drug. I think hemp is a flower and an herb and I don't believe in a war on flowers."

The hemp leaf does have powerful medicinal qualities that are recognized by doctors across the United States. It has been found helpful in relieving nausea, and improving appetites in cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy and AIDS patients undergoing AZT treatment, as well as helping individuals with glaucoma, asthma, multiple sclerosis and epilepsy.

Hemp seed is high in protein and, when made into a cake, is excellent as a livestock feed. And experts like Jack Herer (whose book The Emperor Wears No Clothes is a hemp cult classic) are convinced that a methanol-type fuel can be made from hemp that would burn far more cleanly than gasoline and thus be desirable from the ecological point of view

With the earth facing problems of overheating, ozone layer depletion, air pollution due to fossil fuels, of too many mouths to feed and not enough food for our animals, of too few trees in our forests and medical bills going sky high, the time has come for the South to take a good, hard look at hemp and kudzu. Gifts from nature, they could also be gifts to society as a whole.

MARIJUANA -- PROGRESS OR PROHIBITION?
(Sample speech to civic organization)

Thank you.

I'm thankful for the opportunity to talk with you today and offer a plan for a real step forward in the so-called War on Drugs.

The plan is to legalize a natural plant that has been used safely as a medicinal herb for thousands of years. That plant is known by many names.

If a person smokes the flowertops or leaves to get a relaxing and energy-replenishing high. Or for relief of stress, anxiety or stomach disorders. Or for filling the mind with fascinating new perceptions, enhancing creativity, increasing sensory enjoyments such as music, food and sex ...

Then that drug is Marijuana.

If you're a pharmacist or herbalist, you know this plant by another name. It was prescribed in a variety of medicines into the 1930s. But the pharmacists were surprised to look up one day and see that federal prohibitionists had made it illegal and vowed to stamp it out.

One pharmacist exclaimed: "Cannabis? I didn't know you were talking about Cannabis."

But they were. In the mid-30's, the rising pharmaceutical companies took that medicine market with their laboratory-derived synthetic drugs. After all, they couldn't make any money off a plant that people could grow in their yards. From that point on, the synthetic business interests in this country have been beating down those who produce natural products which are derived from agricultural sources. More about that later.

If you were a farmer in the '30's you would've known this plant by yet another name -- Hemp. Agricultural hemp.

Hemp is an outstanding biomass fiber crop. Throughout civilized history, this natural plant has been used to make twine, rope, baskets, ship sails, fuel, denim-like fabrics that are much stronger and durable than cotton, and high-grade paper.

The Constitution of the United States is printed on hemp paper. If that paper had come from trees, it would have rotted long ago. George Washington grew hemp. Thomas Jefferson smuggled in seeds from Italy.

But when the prohibitionists struck in the mid-30's, hemp could no longer be grown legally in the United States. The farmer lost a valuable crop that is very kind to the environment and does not require pesticides. A farm crop which today could greatly retard the continued ravaging of our forests and the continued destruction of our family farm system.

Who got that market? Again, it was influential business interests with newly patented synthetic products like nylon and rayon. And in the nick of time too. A patented new harvesting machine for hemp was just about to hit the market. That would've turned hemp into a major competitor.

Not any more. That crop has become illegal. It had what law enforcement authorities called a "narcotic" top. So they placed it at the top of the hit chart -- right up there with heroin.

Marijuana can hardly be called a narcotic. On today's list of addictive substances, it ranks 9th -- far below alcohol and tobacco, even lower than coffee.

There has never been a case of overdose death from marijuana. Not in recorded history.

And modern science today, in 1992, has found it useful in the treatment of chemotherapy-induced nausea, glaucoma, multiple sclerosis, spasticity associated with disorders such as epilepsy and cerebral palsy, arthritis, anorexia, and certain kinds of headache.

Not to mention the number one killer in America. The root cause of virtually all illnesses -- stress and anxiety.

There is certainly a compelling reason for at least legalizing Cannabis for medical use. Thirty-nine states have already done so. A national bill will be introduced soon by the Businessman's Alliance for Commerce in Hemp.

And if we have to be satisfied with a small step at a time, that's fine. But there is an equally compelling reason to legalize marijuana for sale under generally the same restrictions as we now have with alcohol. The system is already in place.

This would certainly bring the commerce in marijuana under some control, and there would be plenty of tax revenues considering there are now, by conservative estimates, about 25 million regular marijuana smokers. Instead of being an enforcement money drain, it would be a contributing industry.

Believe me, people, this crop is everywhere. Hemp activist organizations consider it to be America's number one cash crop --

valued at \$42.9 billion annually. Not a penny of which is taxed.

Ohioans spend \$1 billion each year for marijuana. This isn't taxed either.

A \$25 tax per ounce on legal marijuana would generate \$300 million for Ohio -- to spend on jobs programs, to build schools or to build roads.

Tobacco companies would be anxious to get into the business. They would get a superior product which doesn't have the addictive characteristics of tobacco, one that scientists believe may actually open up capillaries instead of shutting them down like tobacco does.

Farmers could begin growing fibrous hemp for industrial commerce, as well as the other Cannabis varieties that are far more suited to recreational and medical use. Hemp also has some promise -- no one knows how much -- in the production of fuel. You may have heard of Kentucky Gubernatorial Candidate Gatewood Galbraith and Willie Nelson tooling around the state in a "hempmobile," fueled entirely by the hemp plant.

All this would really help revitalize the economy of rural America, which has been in a long economic slump from such factors as the farmer's loss of market power and the domination of synthetic competitors. Needless to say, farmer bankruptcies, farmer migration to the already-suffering cities, and rural poverty hurts all of us in this society. Our economic fates are all interlocked with one another in this country.

Legalization would do a number of positive things toward winning the so-called War on Drugs.

First, it would stop the continuing drain of millions of dollars in law enforcement and incarceration costs -- the vast majority of it coming out of the pockets of taxpayers. We have to face the facts. Marijuana is not a dangerous drug. Alcohol is a dangerous drug. And we've been proving it in the addiction wards and the hospitals, out on the highways and in broken homes for years.

Second, legalizing marijuana would force law enforcement to concentrate on the real drug problem -- cocaine. With that much more attention, maybe they could get somewhere. It's clear from everything I read that they're making little progress right now.

Let me digress for just a few moments. Maybe that's because prohibition has never worked for anything. The government tried to prohibit alcohol, but that was a total bust. It did all the things that prohibition of drugs does today -- stimulates demand and criminal commerce, enhances criminal profitability, promotes

corruption and street violence, wastes a lot of public money in a hopeless cause, chokes down the legal system with litigation and the jails with offenders, persecutes and criminalizes a lot of people who are essentially law-abiding citizens except for the fact that they enjoy a recreational drug like beer, wine or marijuana sometimes.

We've tried to ban gambling, prostitution and drugs in this country. But none of these things has ever gone away either. In fact, gambling today is legal in a number of states, prostitution in at least one, and in some places marijuana smoking is hardly more serious than a traffic ticket.

We may be learning, finally, that prohibition doesn't work. We might should just face that reality and move on from there.

Society has never successfully prohibited either vices or pleasurable habits. But there are many examples to show that we can control them through regulation and segregation, and get some tax revenue besides. Money that can be used for such things as schools, social programs, drug education, rehabilitation, and health care. Anti-tobacco smoking programs have had some measurable success in this country, all the while tobacco is legal.

And what right does anyone have to ban by law an herbal plant that is smoked regularly by 25 million people by conservative estimate. That's more than the combined populations of Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, South and North Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri and Arkansas -- and more besides. Are all these people criminals? No. Why do we persist in persecuting them?

This country already jails a higher percentage of its population than any other country in the civilized world, having just passed South Africa to become number one. Shamefully, a great many of these are on marijuana charges. Experience shows that most imprisoned people come out angrier, more alienated, vengeful and disgusted with society than ever before ... plus -- they've learned how to be better criminals.

And how does all this anti-prohibition rhetoric jibe with my idea that marijuana should be legal and cocaine illegal. Maybe it doesn't. I only know that marijuana is relatively harmless and cocaine is dangerously addictive. I'm not ready to advocate legalization of cocaine because I've seen it literally ruin some people's lives. But a lot of learned people do -- like the very conservative writer, William F. Buckley Jr., and Dr. Milton Friedman, a Nobel Prize winner and a senior research fellow at Stanford University.

I'm not personally ready to buy legalization for cocaine, though.

Or for heroin.

Are there other reasons for legalizing marijuana? Yes. Besides saving millions of dollars and turning law enforcement toward legitimately addictive drugs -- highly concentrated laboratory pharmaceuticals.

Thirdly, it would lead a lot of potential users away from cocaine to something that provides a level of euphoria that would be legal, non-addictive and less expensive. I'm sure we would still have drug addicts. I'm not saying this would totally eliminate the drug problem. For a lot of people, marijuana is not the drug of choice. Cocaine is. Or alcohol. Certainly nicotine.

But I am saying that it would be a big help. And I'm also saying that there might not have appeared such a cheap and dangerous street drug as crack if marijuana had been easily available.

Prohibition helped invent crack and speeded its development from nowhere to become this country's number one drug problem. The thriving drug trade needed a cheap substitute for marijuana because prohibition had cut supply and run up costs. A cheap substitute for crystal cocaine because the poor masses couldn't afford it. Marijuana is too bulky and smelly to deal with easily anyway.

Fourth, the legalization of Cannabis would get the Rambos off our backs and open up this beneficial substance for research. It is ludicrous today that there is a complete black-out of any meaningful research that even hints at looking for beneficial aspects of Cannabis. Not as long as it's a class one narcotic.

Research funds just aren't available unless the research is disguised as a red flag waver. And it's very hard to get Cannabis for experiments. All of the partially proven medical benefits go unexplored while the synthetic pharmaceutical people hustle their legal uppers and downers and hook a large share of the population on Valium, Thorcin, Corzac and other stress-reducing pharmaceuticals. They are all more addictive and more expensive than marijuana.

Marijuana has never killed anybody. But some of those drugs have, from bad reactions and from mixing with alcohol.

We can thank the increasingly oppressive Bush Administration bureaucracy for much of the current oppression. I'm sure they really don't care that Cannabis is a useful medicine or that Hemp is a strong fiber crop. It's not politically correct to go against the public perception about marijuana -- even if that perception is built from four decades of lies, enforced ignorance and corruption.

The spoils of that corruption were divided. The synthetic pharmaceutical companies took the Cannabis medicine market. The petrochemical industries took the fuel business. And William Randolph Hearst and his string of yellow sensationalist newspapers benefitted because he owned thousands of acres of Northwest forests that he wanted to strip to make newsprint. Hearst had nothing to gain and everything to lose from a hemp papermaking industry.

And what about the federal narcotics bureau? Who can say for sure what was in the minds of its autocratic head, a racist cretin named Harry Anslinger.

We do know that during this period hardly any of white society smoked marijuana and didn't much care if it was banned -- so it was easy to do.

And we know that Cannabis was primarily being smoked by dark-skinned peoples -- Mexican and Spanish field laborers, immigrants from the Caribbean, blacks in New Orleans. Unlike alcohol, they could smoke it without having a hangover in the morning, which would hamper them in their field labor.

And we also know that Anslinger was a racist and despised these people. He once said jazz music was an instrument of the devil.

The Federal Bureacracy should always to be watched closely. And that brings us to the fifth drug war benefit we will get by legalizing marijuana.

Some relief from an all-out assault on our personal freedoms and choices. Just about every provision of the Bill of Rights has been trampled on in this so-called drug war. Look around at what's happening to us.

They've got unwarranted search and seizure powers and have sometimes used them to terrorize people at the wrong address.

They're moving hard toward more intensive roadblock searches, more and more urine testing, forced landlord evictions. They're even trying to set up boot camps for drug offenders. Boot camps? They would really be concentration camps. And if you don't think Nazi thinking can take over in this country, I think you should take a closer look at the continued erosion of our freedoms.

Property forfeiture laws for example. This RICO law was supposedly designed to strike at organized crime. The Mafia. Racketeering. But I'm sure no one seriously expects anything will ever be done about the Mafia in this country. They either offer influential politicians and bureacrats attractive sums of money or threaten to kill their families. For most, the choice is easy. And once made, the mob owns them.

They really use the RICO racketeering law to seize the farms of marijuana growers. The family home, the land, the pickup, the cash in the tin box, the bank accounts. All for growing a little marijuana for themselves and their friends.

Recently, a huge special report in USA Today recounted the horrors of property forfeiture a few days before the U.S. Senate opened hearings to investigate abuses of the law. I submit to you that this is one of the worst laws in the history of this country because law enforcement is arbitrarily seizing all assets of even the poorest people -- on suspicion only -- and these people, even if proven innocent have to sue to get the property back.

Needless to say, they can't afford lawyers after the feds have seized everything they own. Law enforcement can do this because property -- unlike people -- has no rights. I offer to you the common sense idea that property cannot commit a crime either -- only people do. This law is stupid, discriminatory, unconstitutional, cruel and evil -- and another prime example of how our legal system has become an utter failure and needs drastic reform.

The law is, however, a hot money-maker for law enforcement. While Ohio spent nearly \$4 million in expenses to eradicate hemp last year, they seized over \$35 million in assets. And a lot of rural families were destroyed and driven from the land -- probably into poverty and the unemployment rolls.

Nationally, federal forfeitures have soared from \$27 million in 1985 to \$644 million in 1991. State forfeitures equal perhaps another 25% of this amount. In addition, the government holds another \$1.4 billion in assets seized but not yet forfeited and sold.

For every drug kingpin brought down by the law, there are hundreds of poor people and rural hemp growers who are literally ruined.

Such as the woman who shoplifted a \$25 sweater and forfeited her automobile because it was the "getaway vehicle."

Or the college student who lost his \$18,000 automobile because police found a small amount of marijuana in the trunk.

Or the poor couple who were growing four marijuana plants behind their 22-year old house trailer. The government took it, the wife's old automobile, a fishing boat, a riding lawnmower, two concrete shacks and a vacant lot. Needless to say, this couple, who slept on the floor while their three young children took the only bedroom, couldn't afford a lawyer to try to get it all back.

If society isn't smart enough to legalize marijuana and turn it into a cash cow, leave it to law enforcement to turn it into a prohibition money-maker. They auction off a family's property even if most of it was paid for by soybeans and corn -- not illegal Cannabis. Then they plow that money back into their budgets to continue the repression.

That kind of money, my friends, can build a pretty big police state.

You may say, well and good, they shouldn't be growing it. But when all your personal choices and freedoms under the Bill of Rights are gone, you should be aware that the police state may decide it doesn't like something you're doing and come after you some night.

In Nazi Germany, when they began knocking for the Jews, a lot of people pulled their shades and turned away. But then they came for the handicapped, the mentally incompetent, the homosexuals, then the professors, the intellectuals, then anybody that opposed them, then anybody they wanted.

In a country like ours, where only half the people bother to vote, I think we should be more concerned with such things.

And in a country which says on every piece of money, "In God We Trust," I think we should have more compassion for our fellow man.

The Bill of Rights is becoming the first major casualty of the drug war. Whether you have any interest in marijuana or not, you should have an interest in that.

Let's put up a sixth drug war benefit from legalizing marijuana.

It would take the sword of criminality from over the heads of those 25 million Americans who smoke marijuana regularly. They don't hurt anyone; not even themselves. It is a victimless crime, but the enforcement of this stupid prohibition law makes victims of us all. Those who need marijuana to treat all of those various ailments we discussed get persecuted and prosecuted right along with the rest.

Meanwhile, they want millions to build more jails. Much like our debacle in Viet Nam, we seem not to have the capacity to see a mistake and take action to rectify it before it leads us into economic and moral chaos.

We don't need jails for marijuana smokers -- or dealers. Their so-called "crime" has no victim and appears only to be a crime because law enforcement and politicians rush to enforce the moral platitudes of the church and perpetuate a judgmental arrogance that does not serve us well in a so-called free society.

I smoked marijuana for 23 years. I resent the implication that it is somehow a moral issue. I am an intelligent person with high morals, ethics and a spiritual faith. Millions more like me smoke marijuana but they have to hide because of legal and economic persecution. To me, this is a national disgrace.

So, in short, quit wasting millions to ruin decent people's lives.

By now some of you may be saying: I guess you want my kids out there smoking pot because it'll be on every street corner if it's legal.

The answer is no. I wouldn't want your kids drinking whiskey either. Or even smoking tobacco. I say legalize to control the market, take the criminal element out of it, bring in revenue, open up many medical benefits, and stimulate the economy. It wouldn't be anything like the problem we have with alcohol right now, and nobody has seriously suggested we make alcohol illegal again.

Twenty-five million smokers prove to me that marijuana prohibition doesn't work any better than it did for alcohol. I personally believe that alcohol is a far more addictive and dangerous substance than marijuana. But I shudder to think what would be happening in our country today if we were still trying to enforce the prohibition of it.

In summary, we don't need drug war. We need drug reform. We need to take the cap off the pressure cooker by legalizing marijuana. Because it's more or less harmless. Smoking it for 23 years has been nothing but beneficial for me. We can make the production of high-grade sensimilia for smoking, hemp for industrial products, and cannabis for medicine into a mainstay agriculturally-based industry in this country.

You know, they made a propaganda film back in the 30's to push the prohibition idea. It's called "Reefer Madness" and you can get it at the Cincinnati library.

In this cheap, exploitative film, people smoke marijuana and immediately turn into wild-eyed, lust-crazed fiends. Needless to say, it has become a perverse comic classic. The Partnership for a Drug Free America carries on this tradition of lies and deceit by showing us in a public disservice spot what they describe as the brain waves of a teenager who has smoked pot.

They were later exposed as having actually used the brain waves of a comatose person.

In the 30's and today with the Partnership, their response to criticism was and is the same. The lie was for a good cause. The

end justifies the means.

It may be helpful for you to know that the major contributors to the partnership are liquor companies, pharmaceutical companies, and petrochemical companies. And they coordinate it through advertising agencies who are anxious to kiss the feet of such big advertisers.

I ask you not to believe either government or business propaganda. And I ask you to understand one thing if nothing else from what I've talked about.

Comparing marijuana to cocaine is like comparing ice water to 100 proof whiskey. Making it illegal makes no more sense than outlawing such plants as ginseng, coffee, or tobacco. But I, personally, don't go so far as to advocate legalization of cocaine. I've seen it literally ruin the lives of supposedly intelligent people who should have known better. They get a tremendous high, they get hooked, and they spend a long hard dissipating time trying to reach that high again -- and never do.

Yes. I know. Cocaine is a plant too. But the problem seems not to be from chewing the leaves of the Coca plant as the Colombian peasants and Peruvian Indians do. It's in the highly concentrated, laboratory produced powder that comes from extensive processing - - which makes it highly addictive to susceptible people. The same kind of laboratory processing which produces our highly-concentrated synthetic tranquilizers

So finally, what is marijuana -- the smoking kind?

Marijuana is an herb that can expand your consciousness and make you feel euphoric. It's only mildly addictive. It makes you passive, not violent. And it has a variety of medical uses, including everyday relief from stress, aches and pains.

Let's quit sending people to jail on marijuana charges. Let's save that space for murderers, rapists, burglars and bandits, where there are actually victims involved. Thank you.

POLITICIANS KNOW LITTLE ABOUT LIFE ON THE STREET

by Mike Royko, Tribune Media Services

John is a Chicago cop. He doesn't want his full name used because what he has to say might not please his superiors, although many probably agree with him.

"I'm a sergeant and I've worked on the west side by choice most of my career. So I know something about the problem of drugs. I think I know more about it than some of the people who do a lot of talking about winning the drug war and make the laws and set our national policies, but have never been on the street where everything is happening.

"For years, I've been advocating, mostly to my friends, the legalization of drugs and using the billions we'd save from trying to fight the import and sales to cure those who want to be cured.

"The way things go now, the courts will sentence drug offenders and people who steal to get drug money to rehabilitation as a condition of probation.

"But what happens when they want to go straight and can't get into a program for six months, which is very common. I'll tell you what. They go right back to their friends and habits. So instead of spending all those billions pretending you're doing something, some of the money could be used for rehab, some of it for ad campaigns not to use it, the way it's done with cigarettes and liquor.

"We'd still have laws against the sale to minors. You know it pains me to see how rich drugs laws have made punks and white collar opportunists. But once the profits aren't there, the punks and the others are out of business.

"On the west side, kids used to complain that we stopped them because they were black and driving a new Cadillac. That was true. Most often the car was stolen and we had to chase them.

"But now that's changed. Now the cars belong to them, and they've paid cash. And some of them aren't even old enough to drive.

"Those of us in law enforcement look like fools trying to fight a battle we can't win. And that just breeds contempt for law and order.

"You know, even if we were able to stop the coke from Colombia and Peru, it wouldn't change things. It would come in from somewhere else. And if we stopped that, it still wouldn't change because now they can make this synthetic stuff right here. They're doing it already.

"The problem is the demand. And the only thing for sure is that where there is a demand it will be satisfied. That's a basic market principle and that's why all the arguments against legalizing and controlling drugs are nonsense.

"I'll tell you what the biggest change the last four or five years has been. It's the drug dealers themselves.

"Now we have 13-year old dealers who make more than me. They go out and sell, then they give some of the money to mom, who maybe lives in the Chicago Housing Authority or some dump. She needs it to make ends meet.

"How can President Bush fault someone who lives in a drafty apartment and is wanting for food and has no chance for a decent education or a job for selling drugs?

"How are you going to convince the kids to go back to school so they can become a factory worker, or get a low-paying job in a fast food place, or to be unemployed when they can sell drugs for big money?

"Then they are going to have kids, and they aren't going to be able to steer them away from drugs or get them to go to school because they can't lead by example. If you're going to have values and morals, they have to come by example. And that's why we have all the casual violence out there, the disregard for life and death.

"The way they're going at this thing reminds me of Vietnam. A quagmire. Lives lost, then we pack up and leave.

"One of the reasons we study history is to learn from our own mistakes. Well, it looks like we didn't learn anything from Prohibition.

"I keep reading that every poll shows that most people are against any kind of legalizing of drugs.

"You know what that tells me? It tells me that most people who get polled don't know what the hell is going on out there.

That's one cop's opinion. But I suspect it is also the opinion of thousands of other cops in Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and in most cities where the problems are the same.

Since they're the ones who are actually fighting this no-win war, I respect their opinions more than the word-warriors in Washington who have never been any closer to Chicago's west side, or New York's Bronx, or Los Angeles' Watts than their TV sets can get them.

THE CASE FOR LEGALIZATION OF DRUGS

by David Elderkin

Past President, Iowa Bar Association

I read with some incredulity William J. Bennett's response (Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9-25-89) to the plea of Milton Friedman for legalization of drugs. It read curiously like articles written a few years ago justifying the escalation of the Vietnam War. Escalation is exactly what Mr. Bennett is proposing in the "drug war," a war we have been pursuing over the past 15 or 20 years at the cost of some \$30 billion.

During this time, drug trafficking has increased a hundred-fold. Streets of our inner cities are occupied by such drug gangs as the Asian Triads, Jamaican Mafia, Drug Lords and Black Gangster Disciples. The pernicious trade has spread even to cities in Iowa, with gang affiliations so sophisticated that junior high and high school youth carry electronic pagers to keep up with customers' demands.

During this time countless numbers of fine law enforcement officers have lost their lives. Others have been corrupted by the enormous rewards offered. The war Mr. Bennett advocates has made children into gangsters, corrupted law enforcement officials, overwhelmed our courts and overtaxed our prisons. This war has succeeded in giving the Mafia nearly unbelievable wealth and power.

State banking regulators nationwide report thousands of small intercity businesses are used to launder drug money, involving billions of dollars. In Miami travelers have been smuggling drugs in their stomachs, coming in "packed from top to bottom with pellets."

San Diego newspapers report a great part of the smuggling has been diverted to Southern California, where illegals pour across the border every night like water through a sieve. In Colombia, presidential candidate Galon, along with a councilman and police chief, were killed. Since 1981, cocaine barons have killed 220 judges, magistrates and judicial aides. Fourteen mayors in Peru have been assassinated, and in Brazil, a relatively minor player, drug gang warfare killed 11 people the last week in September.

All of Colombia's 4,600 judges have threatened to strike if not given better protection. Which Mr. Bennett promptly did -- he sent them bulletproof vests.

Now Mr. Bennett's proposal is to escalate this war. We are going to throw more money at it, hire more police, more prosecutors and build more prisons. A dandy idea, but it is difficult to prosecute 14- and 15-year old kids. As for the adult drug pushers, they are

all -- including anyone extradited from South America -- entitled to their constitutional rights, which, given or exclusionary rules, particularly Fourth Amendment search and seizure prohibitions, make large drug prosecution a revolving door. And if we ever did get all the drug pushers convicted, where would we house them?

Mr. Bennett's escalation now includes involving the military, particularly in Colombia. But what will the military do there? This is an economic, not political, problem. The growing of coca plants by the peasants is a way of life; it is woven into the entire economy. The military itself is controlled by the drug barons clear to the top. And there have already been cries of "American imperialism" and "Yankee go home!" Mr. Bennett has not yet said what we do militarily about occupying Peru or Bolivia. Both countries are cocaine producers.

The "drug czar" uses several arguments in attacking those who would legalize drugs. He claims legalization would cause a dramatic increase in drug use, saying that after Prohibition's repeal, consumption of alcohol soared by 350 percent. Since there are no statistics showing how many people consumed alcohol prior to the repeal of Prohibition, the accuracy of this statement is suspect.

Mr. Bennett apparently has forgotten Al Capone, the Valentine Day Massacre, official corruption and gang wars that took place during Prohibition, a situation that was relieved 1000 percent by repeal. What Mr. Bennett also doesn't reveal is that both alcohol consumption and cigarette smoking have been reduced sharply -- not by Prohibition and not by force -- but through health education.

Mr. Bennett says public housing tenants enthusiastically support plans to enhance security in their buildings and applaud police when a local crack house is razed.

Of course they do. But they also want something a little more permanent than a system which arrests the drug dealers, who promptly get out on bond and return the next day, or who merely go to another neighborhood. It shouldn't be hard to understand that if there were no profit in it, drug dealers wouldn't show up in the first place.

Mr. Bennett says it is fanciful to suggest legalization of drugs would make crime vanish. Of course it is. And no one has suggested it. Legalizing drugs won't make all crime vanish and it won't halt the use of drugs. Since the dawn of civilization, drugs have been used by people everywhere. And until the Second Coming, people will continue to use them. The only thing we can do is reduce drug use to a minimum and we can do that only by education, not prohibition.

Mr. Bennett suggests that those who would legalize drugs do so

because they would like to save money. To the end that it would prevent the staggering amount of dollars now siphoned off into the hands of the Mafia and other drug barons, this is true. But there is no reluctance to spend money where justified. If the drug supply could actually be choked off, no cost would be too high in terms of dollars. But if the cost included a police state, it might well be debatable.

The fact is, however, that the war Mr. Bennett advocates escalating won't choke off the supply. He doesn't even claim it will. His projection is that after two years, it will be 10 percent effective. He doesn't mention that drug use has fallen 37 percent in the last three years, without a reduction in supply, simply through educational efforts. Think what educational efforts could do if given some of the funds Mr. Bennett proposes to spend on more prisons and military intervention into Central America. Just the amount needed to furnish the X-ray machines and stomach pumps at the Miami airport would help.

The fact, we don't have to wait two years. We can stop transferring huge amounts of wealth and power into the hands of organized crime; we can prevent civil war in Colombia; we can clean up our law enforcement departments, reduce congestion in our courts and the overcrowding of our prisons, and bring to heel every drug dealer in America by the simple expedient of taking the profit out of drugs. And we can do it now.

Again, will it prevent drug addiction? Again, no. But it will prevent children from joining drug gangs, save little old ladies, and the rest of us, from being knocked on the head by someone desperate to get money for drugs, reduce street crime, remove the necessity of girls turning to prostitution, or parents turning over their daughter to a drug dealer to be raped, in exchange for a fix. And it might make life safer to convenience store clerks who, with only \$50 in the till, aren't being held up and killed by professional thieves.

Lastly, Mr. Bennett states that those who believe in legalization recommend surrender, which he says is irresponsible and reckless public policy.

This is not exactly Mr. Bennett's best statement, if indeed he makes any. Legalizing drugs is not a surrender. There are different ways to fight a war. Force is one of them. Intelligence is another. The legalization of drugs is a weapon, the only weapon which will defeat the mammoth, drug dealing enemy. And it will permit us to finance and use to the fullest our only weapon to control the use of drugs -- education and rehabilitation.

GIVE UP THE DRUG WAR; LEGALIZE DRUGS INSTEAD

by Lynn Scarlett, USA Today

After a decade of intensified enforcement of drug prohibition, the USA faces a crisis. No, we are not becoming a nation of zombies. The real drug crisis is one of failed policy.

Federal drug war expenditures tripled from 1981 to 1988, reaching over \$3 billion. And drug war activity consumes nearly 20 percent of state and local law enforcement budgets. Billions more go to house or prison population, up 90 percent since 1981 due largely to stepped-up incarceration of drug-law offenders.

The drug war has had no appreciable impact on drug supplies. Moreover, during 75 years of drug prohibition, illegal drug use has climbed, and drug potencies have increased. Meanwhile, violence has skyrocketed.

Yet President Bush, amid a cacophony of drug demagoguery and political grandstanding, has announced he will escalate this pernicious war. The predictable result? More suffering, especially by our inner city families. And the real problem -- the health needs of drug abusers -- remain unattended.

Drug-war architects claim to battle our nation's drug problem. But that "problem" embraces and blurs together three distinct concerns. First is the violence committed by drug traffickers and drug users seeking to pay for their habit. Second is the suffering associated with drug abuse. Third is the perceived problem of occasional drug consumption among some 30 million Americans.

The drug war addresses none of these concerns. Indeed, drug prohibition directly causes the violence now associated with the drug trade. As an illicit business, drug trading falls into the hands of criminals lured by high black market profits. In 1919, alcohol prohibition led to increases in homicides. Its repeal in 1933 brought dramatic reductions in homicides for 11 straight years. Legalization of drugs would have similar results.

Equally important, legalization would allow us to turn our full attention toward treatment of drug abusers. Those with debilitating drug habits, now longer designated as enemies of the state, could be encouraged to seek assistance to overcome their problem. Unlike the zero tolerance drug war, drug treatment is a manageable task, since the numbers of drug abusers are relatively small.

Anti-drug crusaders allege that legalization implies a moral acceptance of drugs. The argument is spurious. Because tobacco

is legal doesn't mean we applaud its use.

The real moral horrors Americans face are the abuses of civil liberties increasingly incorporated into the drug war; the parlaying of a health problem into a criminal one; and the condemnation of our inner cities to a world of violence that drug legalization could greatly reduce.

President Bush would do well to heed Hippocrates' warning -- first, do no harm -- as he proposes revisions to the nation's drug policy.

THE HIDDEN COSTS OF THE WAR ON DRUGS

A report by Hemp Environmental Activists (HEA) in honor of the 200th Anniversary of the Bill of Rights. For more information, contact HEA at Box 4935, East Lansing, Michigan 48826, or phone 517-371-HEMP.

The "War on Drugs" directly costs American taxpayers billions of dollars yearly, but it has other usually unrecognized costs as well. To understand the true expense of this "war," these hidden costs must be examined fully.

MONETARY COSTS

The governments spends over \$10 billion per year on a state and federal level for drug enforcement and interdiction. If the full costs of the drug war are considered, including crime, untaxed drug money, AIDS treatment for I.V. drug users, and lost salaries of drug prisoners, the costs rise to about \$147 billion per year.

But the money is not spent equally against illegal drugs. In fact, about a third of federal funding is spent on enforcing marijuana laws. Meanwhile, crack cocaine has become more available and less expensive than marijuana in many cities, and violent crack gangs terrorize many neighborhoods.

In addition, African Americans are the primary target of drug arrests. FBI statistics show that African Americans accounted for 41% of drug arrests in 1989, up from 38% in 1988, even though most drug users are white!

OTHER COSTS

The first casualty of this war is the Bill of Rights. Drug use has provided an ideal scapegoat to push for erosion of American citizens' constitutional rights.

The First Amendment: Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or the press ...

The right to freely practice religion has been affected by the drug war. Currently, the Rastafarians and Coptics, who use marijuana as a sacrament, have been denied the right to practice their religion freely. In addition, the Supreme Court recently ruled that states can bar the Native American Church from using its sacrament, peyote cactus, denying members the right to religious expression.

This ruling actually hinders the fight against drug abuse, for Native Americans in the Church have a vastly lower rate for alcohol

and drug use than non-members and alcoholism is rampant in Native American society.

The Second Amendment: A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms shall not be infringed.

Interpretation of this amendment is controversial. There is debate as to whether it entitles Americans to own guns freely, or only as part of a state militia. If interpreted as freely giving the right to gun ownership, then the drug war infringes upon this right. Currently, possession of firearms is a felony for unlawful drug users. (This includes people who use prescription drugs not given to them by a doctor.)

The Third Amendment: No soldier shall, in time of peace, be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner; nor in time of war but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

It could be argued that the government's call for random drug testing is roughly equivalent to keeping police ("troops") in citizens' homes, for it gives them the ability to monitor home behavior. In addition, the high-tech surveillance technology used to search for indoor marijuana gardens could be interpreted as an infringement of the third amendment in the same manner.

The Fourth Amendment: The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath of affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Criminal lawyers recognize that fourth amendment protections have been lost due to the war on drugs. For instance, civil forfeiture is used to seize assets for minor drug offenses, including possession and small scale marijuana cultivation. Random drug testing also attacks this amendment's protection from unreasonable search. Finally, the courts have approved the use of warrantless searches for drugs, searches on the basis of anonymous tips, and check lanes which stop motorists without probable cause to check them for intoxication.

The Fifth Amendment: No person shall ... be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without the due process of law

The fifth amendment's guarantees of due process have been greatly diminished. Mandatory sentencing for first offenses often lead defendants to plead guilty to lesser crimes, instead of facing the chance for long jail sentences. Random drug testing also violates

this amendment, forcing people's bodies to give evidence of their possible drug use, and assumes that those tested are "guilty until proven innocent."

The Sixth Amendment: In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial ... and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

The massive backlog of drug cases in the courts is slowing the legal process and hindering the right to a speedy trial. The right to have legal counsel has also been attacked by the drug war. The Supreme Court has allowed DEA agents to question defendants, without lawyers present, to threaten conviction. In addition, Congress has allowed prosecutors to seize attorney fees for lawyers working on drug cases. Furthermore, attorneys themselves can be called to testify against their own clients in drug cases!

The Seventh Amendment: In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved ...

The war on drugs has increasingly turned to civil forfeiture to raise funds and attempt to discourage drug use. Currently, civil forfeiture efforts are used to take defendants' property before trial, and the seized items can be kept even if the defendant is found innocent of all charges!

The Eighth Amendment: Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishment inflicted.

Drug offenders are generally considered in federal court to be "dangerous to the community" so they can be held without bail. As for cruel and unusual punishment, the Supreme Court has repeatedly struck down the death penalty for crimes which do not involve the intent to kill, but Congress has created law allowing the death penalty for "drug kingpins." In addition, the Omnibus drug act sets fines of \$10,000 for any drug offense, including the possession of tiny quantities of drugs.

The Ninth Amendment: The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

The current prohibition of drugs takes away the right of individuals to control their bodies and lives. "Casual" drug users are a primary target in current anti-drug efforts, but these users are by definition not doing harm to others or abusing large amounts of drugs. In addition, recent DEA operations have attacked small-scale domestic marijuana cultivation. Where in the Constitution is the right to grow certain plants outlawed?

The Tenth Amendment: The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

According to this amendment, Congress has no legal right to impose prohibition laws without amending the Constitution. Remember that Prohibition of alcohol in the 20s and 30s was done with a Constitutional amendment, the 18th. Congress has justified prohibition efforts by declaring that drug use affects interstate commerce. But it remains unclear how "casual" use of drugs in the home, or cultivation of marijuana for personal use could be regulated by Congress's power over interstate commerce.

IN SUMMARY ...

It cannot be denied that drug abuse has serious costs to American society. However, it must be recognized that the current war on drugs is not successfully minimizing the problems of drug abuse, and it is vastly limiting Americans' Constitutional freedoms in the process.

Currently, the U.S. has over 1 million people (primarily African Americans) in jail, more than any other country, largely due to the war on drugs. Increased efforts at jailing drug users cannot solve the problem of drug abuse, it can only turn the U.S. into a police state. To truly solve the problem requires long-term effort and treating drug abusers as people instead of criminals. Truthful education about the dangers of all drugs (including legal ones) and increased funding for treatment facilities are the only ways to effectively combat this problem.

SOURCES:

Estrada-Palma, Thomas R. "Restoring the Bill of Rights." Sinsemilia Tips, Spring 1990.

Kleinman, Mark. Marijuana: Costs of Abuse, Costs of Control, NY: Greenwood Press, 1989.

Meddis, Sam Vincent "FBI Statistics Show Drug Arrests Focus on Blacks," Lansing State Journal 12/23/90.

Prince, Richard "Let's Raise Alarm About the Fourth," Lansing State Journal 1/5/91.

"Report: U.S. Jails Most People," Lansing State Journal 1/5/91.

Sterling, Eric "Is the Bill of Rights A Casualty in the War on Drugs?" Speech to the Colorado Bar Association, 9/14/90.

Szalavitz, Maia "The Costs of the War on Drugs," High Times, September, 1990.

NOTABLE QUOTES FROM ELSEWHERE

from Kurt Schmoke, Mayor of Baltimore --

"I recommend we eliminate criminal penalties for marijuana possession and redirect funding from law enforcement efforts to prevention and education programs. The war on drugs should be led by the surgeon general, not the attorney general.

from Doug Bandow, nationally syndicated columnist --

"What sort of society are we becoming? Are we really willing to destroy the nation, or at least the values that make it worth living in, to halt drug use? Drug abuse ruins lives, but the drug laws and enforcement efforts have become even more destructive. It's time we admitted, as did the nation 56 years ago when it abandoned alcohol prohibition, that the cost of trying to protect people from themselves is simply too high."

by Professor David Rasmussen, commenting on his Florida State University research study that strongly refutes the notion that drug use leads to crime. Professors interviewed 45,096 people arrested for drug possession in 1987, and found that 76 percent had never been arrested for violent crimes and 88 percent had never been arrested for any property crimes, such as burglary --

"This study suggests we are incarcerating people for the use of drugs when they do not commit other crimes .. What you get is a connection in the public mind that drugs cause crime, because many people who commit crimes are associated with alcohol and drug abuse. It's a classic logic fallacy that because things are related, they're causal. Our study and other studies suggest that this is simply not true."

by George Schultz, former Secretary of State --

"We need to at least consider and examine forms of controlled legalization of drugs. I find it difficult to say that. Sometimes at a reception or cocktail party, I advance these views and people head for somebody else. They don't even want to talk to you. I know I'm shouting into the breeze here as far as what we are doing now. But I feel that if somebody doesn't get up and start talking about this now, the next time around, when we have the next iteration of these programs, it will still be true that everyone is scared to talk about it. No politician wants to say what I just said. Not for a minute."

KENTUCKY LAWYER CONTINUES MARIJUANA BATTLE

by Lisa Popyk
Cincinnati Post

Even his critics confess that Gatewood Galbraith has all the makings of a promising political contender. He's distinctive, fast on his feet, solid on the issues and witty enough to make the most skeptical listener smile. And he has style.

The problem? He's pro-pot. And most voters seems to frown on that -- at least they did this year.

Galbraith, a Lexington attorney bent on someday serving as Governor of Kentucky, stands on a political platform built on the ardent belief that marijuana should be legalized.

It's organic, good for you and has multiple uses, he says, and therefore, it should be made available to those over 18.

This year, in his first bid for the gubernatorial seat, Galbraith finished fourth in a four-man race for the Democratic nomination. He got 5.3 percent of the vote.

Adults, he said, should be able to use marijuana if they want or need to, but he emphasizes that it should not be distributed to youngsters.

Galbraith says he believes that "marijuana should be licensed and regulated and sold to adults 18 years and older." He believes children should be informed about marijuana, but should not be permitted to smoke it until they are 18.

He knows his platform is controversial. That most don't take him seriously. And that he may have snared more votes had he been a little less fiery in his stance. He's the first to admit it.

But the 44-year-old isn't one to compromise or soft sell. Nor is he one for giving up on something in which he believes.

To him, marijuana is a life jacket, waiting to be grasped by a country drowning in its own bureaucratic selfish short-sightedness.

If sold as a taxable good, marijuana can pull Kentucky out of poverty, he says. If widely-grown and converted into fuel, it could make the United States energy-independent. And if made available to chronic pain sufferers, it could offer relief to countless thousands.

If only more people would listen.

But Galbraith, a self-admitted marijuana user of 23 years, believes he's right.

And he's convinced his following will increase if he can just continue his soap-box speeches and statistic-packed presentations.

"I'm no martyr and I'm no fool," he says in a slow Kentucky drawl.

"People know I sincerely believe what I say. I'm honest, I'm forthright. And if I can just match these other folks dollar-for-dollar, I can win. There's no doubt in my mind."

A University of Kentucky law school graduate who handles criminal and personal-injury cases, Galbraith describes himself as a highly successful attorney and a straight thinker.

Should he make it to the Governor's office -- he's running again in 1995 -- Galbraith says legalizing marijuana would not be his sole mission.

He also wants to strengthen the schools, improve the roads, and help the elderly pay costly medical bills.

But people rarely hear those ideas. "By the time they get through questioning me about marijuana, the show is over."

Galbraith could put pot on the back burner for a bit, at least remove it from the front page of his political agenda. Maybe talk about other issues for awhile. He could. But that wouldn't be honest.

"I'm not going to be a hypocrite," he says. "I'm not going to back off."

Besides, the United States can't afford for him to back off, he believes. The country is in a downward spiral, and hemp can help, Galbraith says. Someone has to spread the word, educate the masses.

He says hemp can be:

* A lucrative cash crop. If taxed like cigarettes and alcohol, Galbraith said hemp sales could bring in \$35.7 billion in new tax dollars each year. "The Drug Enforcement Agency said in 1988 the American public smokes 35.7 million pounds of marijuana a year ... I plan a \$1,000-a-pound tax on each and every one of those pounds."

* Used as fuel if the plant's seeds are broken down. "If we plant 6 percent of U.S. agricultural land with hemp, we will not have to

import another drop of oil."

* Used as medicine for stress, wide-angle glaucoma, anorexia, bulimia, emphysema, chronic pain and a host of other ailments and ills. "It's the very best medicine in the world. People who smoke marijuana live a year to a year and half longer than do people who do not."

* Used as a paper source, thus nearly eliminating deforestation. "Hemp makes the best paper in the world. You get the same amount of paper pulp from 1 acre of hemp that you would get from 4.1 acres of trees." Plus, he said, hemp paper has a life span of 300 to 500 years while wood-based paper lasts 35 to 50 years.

* Used as food, providing a protein supply only slightly below soybeans with eight essential amino acids needed for growth and development. Galbraith said hemp may not be a culinary delight, but "it can grow on marginal land and does not need insecticides and herbicides."

* Used to rejuvenate the farming industry, which he says once was one of the country's greatest strengths and the foundation for family and morality. Today, it's on a pitiful decline.

"And all this ignores the drug aspect of it," Galbraith says, explaining that hemp can be grown without THC, the ingredient that turns hemp into marijuana, or cannabis, and gives users a high.

Gatewood said hemp might be main-stream by now if it weren't for the U.S. government's blind restrictions and independent companies' monopoly "on the basic commodities of life."

He said companies manufacturing items which hemp could naturally and readily replace use their influence and power to keep marijuana off the market.

"I am outraged," he said, "that the government has been able to take control of my fundamental behavior, especially something so fundamental as my right to plant a seed in the earth and consume the free natural plant that comes out of it."

DRUG DEATHS RISE AS THE WAR CONTINUES**by Mike Males****IN THESE TIMES May 20-26, 1992**

While President Bush announces that "Americans are turning away from illegal drugs" and "we are winning the war," the sobering fact is that Americans are in greater danger from drugs today than ever before in our history. In fact, despite the "war on drugs," drug deaths in the U.S. are skyrocketing.

Before the drug war was launched, deaths from drug abuse and drug-related murders had declined from a peak of 8,500 per year in the early '70s to 7,700 in 1982. Since 1982, drug-abuse deaths have risen by 50 percent and drug-related murders have tripled -- to more than 13,000 in 1990. This is the steepest increase and highest level in history.

President Ronald Reagan formally declared the "war on drugs" in 1983. Reagan escalated the war in 1986 with \$1.76 billion funding for greatly expanded law enforcement, education and treatment. Drug arrests doubled from 700,000 in 1982 to a record 1.4 million by 1989. To date, the drug war's cost is estimated to have reached \$13 billion.

The intensity of the anti-drug campaign shows up in one '80s statistic after another. A 100 percent increase in drug-possession arrests; a 250 percent increase in drug-sale arrests; a tripling in the amount of heroin seized by federal authorities; a 20-fold increase in cocaine seized (reaching 160 tons in 1990); a quadrupling in patients committed to drug and alcohol abuse treatment; multibillion dollar anti-drug programs among schools, communities and law enforcement agencies; a leap in drug offenders incarcerated -- now a majority of all federal and 40 percent of all state prison inmates.

Commensurate with initiation and growth of the anti-drug war, all types of drug deaths tabulated by the U.S. Public Health Service and Federal Bureau of Investigation began to climb. Most are now at record levels. A single week of the "drug war" today finds 15,000 more arrests, 5,000 more pounds of cocaine seized and 10,000 more people sent to drug treatment -- **and 100 more drug-related deaths** -- than in an average week before the national "war on drugs" began.

Five thousand more Americans die annually from drugs today than just 10 years ago. But instead of focusing on the alarming rise in drug fatality, official publicity points to surveys showing fewer Americans are using drugs. From 1982 to 1988, self-reported

monthly marijuana use by high school seniors fell from 28 to 18 percent, and among adults from 11 to 16 percent. Cocaine, heroin, and LSD use showed similar decreases.

This decline in drug use (even though the decrease began years before the "war on drugs" gained impetus underlies official claims to see light at the end of the narcotic tunnel. Yet falling drug use, and rapidly increasing drug education, arrest, imprisonment, interdiction and treatment, have been accompanied by rapidly increasing drug deaths -- just the opposite of the result predicted.

Drug misinformation. Teenagers are typically portrayed as the most at risk for drug abuse. In fact, they are the least vulnerable. Of 13,300 drug-abuse deaths in 1990, teenagers numbered less than 500 and the elderly numbered 1,500; adults age 20 to 59 accounted for 11,000. Drug-abuse death rates peak around age 35 at a level five times higher than that of high school teens.

Similarly, while street drugs (marijuana, LSD, cocaine, heroin) are portrayed as the major threat, medical prescription drugs (barbiturates, stimulants, sedatives) remain the most lethal. Cocaine (including deadly "crack") and heroin together account for fewer than 3,000 deaths annually; medical drugs, in excess of 8,000 (Also overlooked, of course, is the legal drug death toll: 400,000 annually from tobacco, 100,000 from alcohol.)

Who dies, who gets busted? The distortions of "drug war" publicity featuring youths, blacks, street drugs and ghetto scenes are reflected in arrest patterns.

* Teenagers account for only 4 percent of all drug deaths but 20 percent of all drug arrests.

* Minority groups account for 25 percent of drug deaths but 40 percent of drug arrests.

* Marijuana, LSD and other hallucinogens account for fewer than five annual deaths but more than half the arrests.

In contrast:

* White adults over age 25 account for two-thirds of all drug deaths but only one-third of all drug arrests.

* Prescription drugs cause well over half of all drug deaths but account for just 10 percent of drug arrests.

Thus a black youth is only one-third as likely to die from drug abuse but is five times more likely to be arrested for drugs than a white adult.

Low times. Political implications aside, the factual misinformation and misdirection of drug war strategy have been followed by alarming trends: The original rationale for the "war on drugs" was to reduce death and crime associated with drug abuse. Yet today the U.S. has the highest levels of drug-abuse death and drug-related murder in our history. The rationale for the barrage of education, publicity and arrest aimed at youth was to deter them from drug abuse. Yet drug-abuse deaths among teenagers climbed to a record 80 percent from 1982 to 1990.

The fight against street drugs has been featured as the drug war's centerpiece. Yet the major street drugs, cocaine (including "crack") and heroin, killed an all-time high of 1,500 more people in 1990 than they did eight years earlier.

Roger Guevara, spokesman for the Drug Enforcement Administration in Washington, said the sharp increases in drug deaths is baffling to explain. "I don't know what the answer is," Guevara said. But he expects that the combination of "a more violent society" and more powerful drugs (especially illegally-marketed pharmaceutical drugs) in circulation may lead to increased fatalities.

Referring to the touted decrease in drug usage vs. the unpublicized increase in drug deaths, Guevara said, "It's almost like we're talking out of both sides of our mouths ... Unless you're blind to this (deaths), you can't help but be concerned about it." The death increase has occurred not just among glamorized drugs such as heroin and "crack" cocaine but in across-the-board fashion for nearly all types of drugs, age groups, racial groups, among both men and women and in private homes and public locations alike.

It may be argued that the "war on drugs" is a traditional attack on the young and minorities, including punishment of the "casual user" whose practices least resemble the images of addiction, violence and death used to justify the anti-drug war in the first place. At some point amid media splashes and bipartisan demands to pour more resources into more of the same, one question must loom large: If the "war on drugs" isn't saving lives and deterring murder, what are its ultimate goals and what price is worth paying?

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE URGES MEDICINAL USE OF MARIJUANA

DEA expected to reject call for limited legalization

(from the Washington Post, September 7, 1988)

by Michael Isikoff
Washington Post Staff Writer

A Drug Enforcement Administration administrative law judge, calling marijuana "one of the safest therapeutically active substances known to man," recommended yesterday that the drug be made legally available for some medical purposes, including treatment of cancer patients.

If adopted, the opinion of Judge Francis L. Young would mean that doctors could prescribe marijuana -- a fundamental change in the drug's legal status that some specialists say could aid tens of thousands of patients suffering from nausea-inducing chemotherapy and muscle spasms of multiple sclerosis.

The opinion is not likely to have any immediate effect because DEA Administrator John C. Lawn is considered almost certain to reject Young's conclusions. Nevertheless, coming after a 16-year legal battle, the 69-page ruling has accepted a medical role for the country's most widely used illicit drug.

"The evidence in this record clearly shows that marijuana has been accepted as capable of relieving the distress of great numbers of ill people, and doing so with safety under medical supervision," Young wrote. "It would be unreasonable, arbitrary and capricious for DEA to continue to stand between those sufferers and the benefits of this substance in light of the evidence in this record."

The long-awaited ruling was immediately criticized by DEA lawyers and anti-drug groups who said it would send a confusing message at a time the federal government is attempting to wage a war on drugs. DEA officials also said the ruling ran counter to the body of accepted medical opinion.

"This totally ignores the bulk of the medical evidence," said Stephen E. Stone, associate counsel of DEA, which had fought changing marijuana's classification. "The judge seems to hang his hat on what he calls a 'respectable minority of physicians.' What percent are you talking about? One half of one percent? One quarter of one percent?"

"From our point of view, marijuana has not been established as a safe and effective drug," Stone added.

Young's ruling, which cites medical researchers from Harvard, New York University, and other leading medical schools, comes in the form of a recommendation to Lawn to change the status of marijuana under the 1970 Controlled Substance Act. Ever since the act was passed, marijuana has been classified with heroin and LSD as a Schedule I controlled substance, which means it is an illegal drug with no known medical use.

Young recommends that Lawn use discretionary authority to make marijuana a Schedule II substance. This means it would become a drug -- like morphine and cocaine -- that, while still unavailable to the general public, can be prescribed by doctors for limited purposes.

A DEA spokesman said yesterday that Lawn would not comment on the ruling until he has a chance to review it. Even if he rejects the recommendation, however, lawyers for the National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws (NORML) and other pro-marijuana groups said Young's ruling would provide a powerful evidence to overturn a rejection in federal court.

"This is the most significant victory that one can imagine," said Robert C. Randall, president of the Alliance for Cannabis Therapeutics, a group that joined with NORML and the Drug Policy Foundation in petitioning DEA for the ruling. "For the first time in over half a century, the federal government is viewing marijuana in a rational context ... not just saying it's something evil."

In his opinion, Young cited a number of medical experts and patients as a basis for his conclusion that marijuana's medical use was "clear beyond any question." Their testimony showed that marijuana helped suppress nausea and vomiting experienced by chemotherapy patients, was a "highly successful appetite stimulant" and was widely -- if illicitly -- used in some hospitals.

"This successful use of marijuana has given many cancer chemotherapy patients a much more positive outlook on their overall treatment," Young wrote, adding that smoking marijuana was far more effective than taking pills with synthetic THC, the active ingredient in the drug.

Young found similar benefits for using marijuana to control muscle spasms suffered by patients with multiple sclerosis, spasticity and hyperparathyroidism, a painful hormonal disorder that causes bone spurs. But Young rejected permitting marijuana for treatment of glaucoma, saying there is insufficient evidence that many physicians support such a move.

At the core of Young's ruling, however, was the conclusion that the dangers of marijuana do not outweigh its medical benefits. While agreeing that marijuana "can be harmful" and "abused," he noted there is still not a documented death caused by the drug. "In strict medical terms, marijuana is far safer than many foods we commonly consume," he wrote.

DEA JUDGE'S 'FRESH' VIEW OF LEGAL MARIJUANA USE

Opinion draws attacks inside, outside agency

(from the Washington Post, September 19, 1988)

by Michael Isikoff
Washington Post Staff Writer

Francis L. Young would like to make one point right off the bat: he does not now, nor has he ever, smoked marijuana.

In fact, he is not precisely sure what a marijuana cigarette looks like: "I gather it looks like a mini sort of cigar that comes to a point at both ends," said Young, the chief administrative judge for the Drug Enforcement Administration. "But I wouldn't know ... as you can see, I'm not of the hippie generation."

Yet Young, a courtly 60 years old, brashly cuts against the prevailing winds when he recently issued a ruling that advanced, at least in part, one of the lost causes of the 1960s -- reform of the nation's marijuana laws.

In a 68-page opinion contrary to Reagan administration policy, Young recommended a modified legalization of the country's most popular illicit drug for some medical purposes.

Concluding that the evidence of marijuana's medical benefits was "clear beyond any question," Young formally urged DEA Administrator John C. Lawn to reclassify marijuana under the Controlled Substances Act, thereby permitting doctors to prescribe it for cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy, as well as for victims of multiple sclerosis and spasticity.

It was, some of his defenders say, a typical opinion for Young: solidly researched, lucidly written, and in almost complete defiance of the medical establishment and the official position of his agency. Indeed, two years ago, Young stirred up a similar controversy when he recommended that the psychoactive drug "Ecstasy" -- then undergoing a fad among Yuppie drug users -- be

made legally available to psychiatrists for use in treating their patients.

Such opinions have made Young a hero to a small band of medical dissenters who have been arguing for years that the nation's punitive drug laws are misguided. "Judge Young is a remarkable man," said Dr. Lester Grinspoon, a professor of psychiatry at the Harvard Medical School and a longtime adviser to the National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws (NORML). "When you read his opinion, you say, 'Boy, there is at least somebody in the government who's willing to speak the truth and not just go along with the established unwisdom.'"

At the same time, Young has come under sharp attack from antidrug activists and is treated as something of a pariah within his agency. DEA officials, who privately say they were appalled by Young's marijuana decision, advised reporters that Lawn is virtually certain to reject the recommendation, thereby assuring the battle will spill over into the courts and carry on for years.

But in an interview in his K Street office, Young made clear that getting overturned by his administrator -- or being sharply criticized by other agency officials -- is not a prospect that bothers him.

"I don't write to please him (Lawn)," said a cheerful Young, an avid sailing enthusiast who began presiding over DEA administrative proceedings 13 years ago. "I do not have a bureaucratic mindset ... I think I bring a fresh approach to these questions, which I think is what I'm supposed to do."

Perhaps nothing illustrates Young's "fresh" approach more than a controversial passage of his opinion in which he analyzes the relative dangers of marijuana, noting that -- unlike virtually every other drug, including household aspirin -- there is no known dosage that is considered lethal.

Young calls this "remarkable," noting that in the 5,000 years that human beings are believed to have been smoking the drug, "there are simply no credible medical reports to suggest that consuming marijuana has caused a single death."

Medical researchers have failed in their efforts to kill laboratory animals by feeding them enormous amounts of marijuana, Young said.

"In strict medical terms, marijuana is far safer than many foods we commonly consume," Young concluded. "For example, eating 10 raw potatoes can result in a toxic response. By comparison, it is physically impossible to eat enough marijuana to induce death. Marijuana in its natural form is one of the safest therapeutically active substances known to man."

Those comments in particular drew strong protests, although some researchers acknowledged that within the narrowly defined terms he was using, Young was probably on target. The literature on marijuana, however, remains perpetually in dispute, and marijuana defenders acknowledge that some recent studies have found disturbing links between heavy marijuana smoking and pulmonary and lung damage, similar to that caused by prolonged tobacco smoking.

But in terms of a direct physical threat to the body, "it's probably true that its greatest danger is if a bale of it falls on you," said David Friedman, deputy director of the National Institute on Drug Abuse's preclinical research division and the official in charge of overseeing that agency's marijuana research. "There is, however, a danger when people abuse it and become obsessively involved with its use," he said.

In any case, Young emphasized that he noted this in his opinion. "I affirmatively said it (marijuana) is dangerous and it is abused," he said. "But so are a number of other drugs whose legitimate therapeutic uses are accepted."

Striking that balance -- between the potential dangers and the potential medical benefits -- was at the core of the marijuana proceeding, which Young described as a "monster" and the biggest in his career at DEA. Started in 1972 in the form of a petition by NORML, the case was kicked back and forth between the courts and the agency for years. In the end, it generated 18 bound notebooks of testimony and 13 days of public hearings around the country last fall and earlier this year, all presided over by Young.

During those hearings, Young relied heavily on anecdotal accounts from individual doctors and patients who testified that smoking marijuana was sometimes the only relief they could find to cope with the nausea, vomiting and loss of appetite caused by chemotherapy.

"A lot of people have not had the opportunity that I've had to see the evidence produced in this case and to sit down and analyze it," said Young. "They (critics) were not looking at the issue I was looking at. They were looking at this in terms of the issues that were troubling them."

MARIJUANA IN MEDICINE? IT'S TIME IS HERE

by Mary Lynn Mathre
Director, NORML
(Reprinted from The Leaflet)

Evidence of marijuana's medicinal use can be found throughout world history, with the earliest documentation found in Chinese writings during the first century. Looking at American history, you will find that up until the mid-1900s, marijuana was prescribed for a wide variety of ailments including insomnia, loss of appetite, nausea, depression, migraine headaches, menstrual pains and spasticity.

In 1970 two historical events took place regarding medicinal marijuana: 1) NORML was formed and 2) Congress enacted the Controlled Substances Act (CSA), which was an attempt to control the use of various drugs by putting them in categories ranging from Schedule V (the least restrictive) to Schedule I (the most restrictive). Marijuana was placed in the Schedule I category. A drug must meet three criteria to be placed in Schedule I: 1) have no medicinal value, 2) not be safe under medical supervision, and 3) be highly addictive.

It was obvious to NORML that marijuana did not meet any of the criteria. In May of 1972 NORML filed a petition with the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, now the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA), to reschedule marijuana to a less restrictive category so that physicians would be able to prescribe marijuana for their patients. It has been a long series of legal battles since then, with the U.S. government putting up roadblocks at every turn. Along the way, the Alliance for Cannabis Therapeutics (ACT) joined forces with NORML, followed more recently by the strong support of the Drug Policy Foundation (DPF).

To remove marijuana from Schedule I, NORML has argued that marijuana is safe under medical supervision and that it does have medicinal value. The case has been heard by the DEA's own Administrative Judge, Francis Young, who ruled in September of 1989 that marijuana should be rescheduled and made available for physicians to prescribe; however, the DEA has decided to ignore its own judge's decision and the case is now being appealed.

Is marijuana safe under medical supervision? Compared to most prescription drugs and many over-the-counter drugs, marijuana is one of the most benign drugs known. There have been no known deaths caused by marijuana overdose, and it is relatively impossible to overdose on it -- a person would have to consume 20,000-40,000 the therapeutic dose.

Along with toxicity of a drug, the side effects should be considered when looking at safety. When used in therapeutic doses, marijuana has not been shown to cause any significant body organ damage or disrupt any body functions. Side effects that have been noted are an increase in drowsiness, minor respiratory tract irritation, and a minor increase in heart rate. Problems with many of the negative reports on marijuana's health risks are based on studies of very high doses of inhaled marijuana smoke. It doesn't take much sense to determine that large amounts of any smoke is not healthy for the respiratory tract.

The "new danger" of marijuana has been the claim of increased potency in the marijuana grown today. Careful research by Dr. John Morgan has shown there has not been any significant increase in marijuana potency. It is true, however, that a healthier plant will produce more THC and the female buds (sinsemilla) will have a higher content of THC than the leaves of a male plant. In terms of health risks, it would make sense to inhale less marijuana with a high THC content because of the fact that less smoke would be inhaled. The effects of inhaled marijuana begin quite quickly, thus it is easy for a user to titrate the dose and use only what is necessary to produce the desired effect.

Does marijuana have therapeutic value? There is most certainly overwhelming evidence that it does. It is important to understand, however, that like most drugs, marijuana will not produce the same effects for everyone. While it may be beneficial to one person with a particular ailment, it may not be of equal value to another person with the same ailment. No drug reacts the same for all persons.

Some of marijuana's confirmed therapeutic uses are as follows:

Glaucoma is a condition that can result in blindness caused by an increase in the pressure inside the eye (intra-ocular pressure). All of the drugs currently recommended for the treatment of glaucoma have a risk of producing serious side effects, including kidney stones, depression, retinal detachment (results in blindness), paralysis and even death. Marijuana has been shown to reduce the intra-ocular pressure for persons with glaucoma and thus prevents blindness.

Most of the chemotherapy used in cancer treatment include highly toxic drugs and a frequent side effect from these drugs is severe nausea and vomiting. Many persons become so ill from the chemotherapy that they are not physically able, or choose not to continue their chemotherapy. Marijuana has been very effective in controlling the nausea and vomiting for thousands of persons receiving chemotherapy, and thus allowed those people to continue on with their treatment.

Another common problem with cancer patients is a loss of appetite which subsequently results in loss of weight and loss of basic nourishment needed to maintain health. Marijuana has been found to be effective as an appetite stimulant, and thus persons have been able to improve their nutritional status with its use.

Marijuana has also been found to be effective in treating various forms of painful and/or debilitating muscle spasms as seen in persons with spinal cord injuries (i.e. para- or quadriplegia) and neurologic diseases such as multiple sclerosis. Individuals suffering from epilepsy have found that marijuana use reduces and sometimes eliminates petit and grand mal seizures.

There are few drugs available for treatment of spasticity and of those available there are serious side effects, and even in therapeutic doses they have caused death. Because of the potential danger of drugs for muscle spasm control, physicians may prescribe drugs which reduce muscle tone and thus make the spasms less noticeable. Marijuana, however, reduces spasms for many persons and does not interfere with their normal activities.

NORML will continue in its efforts to inform the public of marijuana's potential therapeutic benefits and relative safety, and, most notably, to change our antiquated and misinformed laws regarding the use of marijuana.

BUREAUCRATIC TERRORISM

by Robert Randall
Reprinted from High Times, June 1992

The terror of our times can be reduced to a single line: "I'm just following orders."

Under this slogan organized mobs of bureaucrats have dutifully chucked bodies into ovens and shipped the living dead to Siberia. Such vile practices are instigated by political men induced by the narcosis of power to perfect mankind.

But the implementation of organized terror relies on the compliant participation of many seemingly decent people who, for the price of a pension, will do whatever they are told. The face of institutionalized evil is frightening because it is so familiar and bland.

Viewed in this context the federal prohibition against medical marijuana is in crisis. The people who enforce the prohibition know marijuana has medical value. By extension, they also know they are participating in an organized conspiracy to deprive sick people of legal access to urgently needed care.

For years people at FDA, in the White House, at DEA and elsewhere have intentionally inflicted the cruelest injury on desperately ill people who sought their help. DEA agents gave paralyzed men the red tape runaround. FDA employees cynically promise people with AIDS supplies of medical marijuana which do not exist.

The brutality cannot be exaggerated. In May, 1991, FDA employees disrupted shipments of medical marijuana to a Nebraska grandmother who suffers from glaucoma. She had been legally smoking marijuana with positive results for nearly two years. The supply disruption came without warning or explanation.

After six weeks the grandmother, terrified of losing her remaining vision, publicly pleaded for help. The FDA, embarrassed by the public exposure, resumed her shipments the next day. Tests, however, indicate she lost additional vision because of the FDA-engineered supply disruption. "I did not think people could treat other people like this," she says.

The FDA employees who perpetrated this act of medical terrorism consider themselves ethical physicians. They dismiss the irreparable harm they inflicted by saying, "We're just following orders."

Are well-educated FDA officers no better than street thugs? Go ask Sheila Dinella. In December 1990, FDA promised to provide medical marijuana to Sheila, a middle-aged, middle-of-the-road Wisconsin school teacher fighting to survive ovarian cancer. After a year of debilitating chemotherapy treatments, Sheila is still waiting for her first legal marijuana cigarette. Call FDA to ask why and you get bureaucratic double-talk. Press the point and the bluster fades, replaced by a sudden, gut-wrenching confession: "Look, I'm just following orders."

Those words roll down the halls of the drug bureaucracy like thunder in a canyon. It is the quiet shriek of tormented souls. When you know you are doing wrong, the echoes are endless.

An official at the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) begins sobbing while giving a man with AIDS the most recent regulatory rag. She knows marijuana stops his intense nausea and vomiting. She knows the government-promoted synthetic marijuana substitute, Marinol, doesn't work. She knows the nice man with AIDS needs to eat if he is to survive. To the unintentionally anorexic, "the munchies" can be a lifesaver. Struggling to regain composure she tells him, "I understand but I can't help you." In bitter irony the dying man comforts the grief-stricken bureaucrat who, by following orders, is condemning him to unnecessary suffering and premature death.

A highly inflated PHS official gives a Texas man with glaucoma the latest bureaucratic bull for blocking his promised shipment of marijuana. The bureaucratic bully thinks he's on a roll until the churchgoing Texan tells him to can the commentary. "Look, I'm no hippie. I just want to be able to see my two sons grow up. Can't you understand that?" The simple reality of the Texan's plight hammers the PHS big-shot. After a long pause the bureaucrat quietly says, "Look, I'm opposed to what's going on around here. I'm sorry. It's not my fault."

Multiply these conversations a thousandfold and you begin to comprehend the reality which is rattling the foundation of the entire drug-control complex. Even cynical DEA agents have trouble finding nobility in a holy war against the blind, lame and dying. Many decent people in the drug bureaucracies are questioning the morality of the medical prohibition they enforce. As a consequence, federal drug agencies are littered with shell-shocked human beings who, after decades of ideological denial, are suddenly confronted by the calamity of the collective cruelty they are inflicting on innocent people.

Something profound is happening. People in the bureaucracies are learning firsthand the real-life carnage caused by the medical prohibition. "Just say no" is a hollow anthem to an AIDS patient

named Tim who is starving to death because FDA-promised supplies of medical marijuana do not exist.

The drug company bureaucrats have not only deprived Tim of legal access to urgently needed medical care. By promising the drug and then not delivering it, they have also shattered his faith in basic human decency. War on Drugs' hard-liners have transformed the government's promise of compassion into a cheap con. In such stark quarters the depravity of the prohibition is suddenly self-evident, even to anti-drug zealots.

Despite this dawning realization, the fact remains that the seemingly decent people at FDA and in the White House, at DEA and NIDA continue to inflict injury on seriously ill Americans. It is quite likely that Tim will die of starvation before FDA produces his promised supplies.

In public the bureaucracies ease their guilt with rhetoric about "sending the wrong message to our youth." But what they are doing to fellow human beings is savage and immoral. It is inexcusable that none of the people who animate the mean machinery of medical prohibition has had the moral courage it takes to "just say no."

On January 31, in a letter leaked to the Los Angeles Times, the Bush administration blasted bureaucratic efforts to block marijuana's medical use. In so doing, the White House placed itself squarely on the side of compassion and sick people.

The letter was written by Ingrid Kolb, acting assistant director in the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy, the Drug Czar's office. In blunt language, Kolb denounced the FDA's failure to deliver medical marijuana to scores of desperately ill people as "unconscionable." The White House went on to emphasize that desperately ill people "are suffering great pain ... many are dying" because of irrational prohibitory policies.

In many ways the White House letter is the most honest and honorable bureaucratic statement on medical marijuana in 60 years. The true test of White House intentions will, of course, be the rapidity of federal efforts to make medical marijuana legally available to FDA-approved patients. In some instances, AIDS and cancer patients have been waiting for more than a year for FDA-promised supplies.

In a practical sense we are about to learn if the President who flung half a million troops into the battle for Desert Storm can get medical marijuana to a score of desperately ill Americans.

NOTE: Following the publication of this article, the HHS announced that no new candidates -- including those already approved -- will receive medical marijuana. No word yet on Kolb's reaction.

DRUGS IN AMERICA: THE CASE FOR VICTORY
Knightsbridge Publishing Company, 1991

by Vincent T. Bugliosi, for eight years prosecutor for the Los Angeles District Attorney's office, including the prosecution of Charles Manson.

ON PROHIBITION AS 'PROTECTION':

"The prefatory observation should be made that the only rationale for making the use of drugs illegal is that we want to protect people from themselves. There is no other defensible justification.

"The corollary argument that by protecting people from themselves, we are also protecting those around them, such as their families and society as a whole, necessarily falls of its own weight since this argument could equally be applied to the lawful drug of alcohol, which has not only destroyed an incalculable number of families but is also responsible for the carnage on the nation's highways (approximately 25,000 deaths per year) that drugs such as marijuana and cocaine have never even approached. Likewise, the argument that drug users are immoral because by their use of drugs they support the drug industry with all its horrible consequences, is a hollow one, unless we are willing to say that all cigarette smokers are also immoral because they keep the tobacco industry going, an industry whose product is responsible for over 300,000 deaths from cancer per year." pp. 183-184

ON MARIJUANA AS THE NATION'S LARGEST CASH CROP:

"The U.S. Forest Service reports that although eradication of marijuana plants on U.S. public lands has intensified, domestic marijuana production has tripled in the past five years, now supplying 35% of the American demand for the drug. Marijuana has now supplanted corn as the nation's biggest cash crop. John P. Sutton, chief of the DEA's cannabis investigation branch, says, "At a minimum, this business is worth \$20 to \$30 billion a year." The most concentrated domestic marijuana production is in Appalachian Eastern Kentucky, the same area once the cradle of moonshining. It's an impoverished region, and like their campesino counterparts in the Andes, farmers have turned to marijuana for a decent living. Richard Taylor, Kentucky Governor Wallace Wilkinson's anti-drug chief, says that "marijuana has become a way of survival" for many, and if we don't address the poor standard of living in the area, "we're not going to be successful" in solving the problem." p. 222

ON THE ALCOHOL DOUBLE STANDARD:

"A favorite argument of the prohibitionist for treating alcohol differently than drugs like marijuana and cocaine is that alcohol has a long tradition of being the main drug of choice in America, and it would literally be antithetical to our culture to prohibit its consumption. But this notion seems intrinsically un-American

and in contravention of the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution in that it discriminates against Americans whose "drug of choice" is not as common as alcohol. In other words, if your drug of choice is not the same as that of the majority of Americans, you should be treated as a criminal." pp. 264-265

ON LEGALIZATION IN HOLLAND:

"By electing not to enforce drug laws against users, in effect Holland has legalized drugs. Yet the use of marijuana has actually gone down, and the use of cocaine has increased only marginally, as opposed to dramatic increases in the U.S. the past decade. Moreover, Holland has the lowest percentage (of total population) of hard drug addicts in all of Western Europe.

"In Holland, where addicts register with the government and are placed under medical supervision, receiving, among other things, clean syringes for free in exchange for their used ones (the 1989 'return rate' of used syringes in Amsterdam was 86%), the percentage of addicts who have contracted AIDS is markedly lower than anywhere else in Western Europe. For example, the percentage is 5 times higher in West Germany, 7 times higher in Italy, 16 times higher in Spain. Approximately 70% of Holland's drug addicts are enrolled in federal treatment programs." pp. 265-266

ON DRUG DEALERS' APPRECIATION OF PROHIBITION:

"The prohibitionists, above all, hate the big drug dealers and drug lords, yet they unwittingly pursue policies that can only serve to perpetuate these very people. In fact, were one to ask members of the Medellin cartel who their very favorite people were next to their families, it would have to be those who fight so tenaciously to keep drugs illegal." p. 266

11 REASONS FOR DRUG LEGALIZATION (all direct quote, without the complete discussions):

1. Prohibition creates a black market, increasing the value of drugs far beyond their natural price First, just as Prohibition gave rise to bootlegging and organized crime (which in turn led to a succession of gang wars and murders) in the 1920s, when profits from the illegal sale of alcohol were so high, the prohibition of drugs has not only given rise to the international drug cartels but has also spawned a dramatic increase and proliferation of violent gangs like the Bloods, Crips and Jamaican posses warring over drug turf and terrorizing urban areas. Second, with the elevated cost of drugs caused by prohibition, the addict feels compelled to commit other far more serious crimes, e.g., theft, burglary, robbery to support his habit, a second area of drug-related crime and violence.

2. Enforcement of drug prohibition laws by local, state and federal

law enforcement agencies, our courts and prisons, etc., costs the nation an estimated \$16 billion to \$18 billion a year, a significant drain on this nation's economy. Legalization would eliminate that drain, and hence by economically beneficial.

3. Some of the billions now spent on enforcing the drug laws could be utilized for expanded and improved drug education among the nation's youth, and for treatment of all indigent addicts who request it.

4. Even a small tax on legalized drugs would bring in much-needed revenue to state and federal coffers.

5. Law enforcement and our courts, set free of the obligation to enforce drug laws, could devote all of the millions of man hours now tied up in the drug war to apprehending and prosecuting rapists, arsonists and murderers.

6. Deaths from sometimes impure, toxic drugs sold on the street would be eliminated if the production of drugs were federally regulated. Moreover, the criminal element that otherwise law-abiding citizens frequently have to deal with to secure their drugs on the street (which exposure can beget other, more serious antisocial behavior) would be eliminated.

7. Legalization would permit, for example, the compassionate prescription of heroin to relieve the needless agony and suffering of thousands of Americans dying from cancer.

8. Though in the minority percentage-wise, numerically the drug wars are widely ignored by great numbers of American citizens in every socioeconomic segment of our society. This widespread disapproval and violation of the nation's drug laws can only breed cynicism and disrespect for the rule of law in general, a negative consequence.

9. Legalization would spare millions of Americans the anxiety, grief and public embarrassment and shame of being branded criminals. Many believe that drug abuse should be treated as a public health problem, not a criminal justice problem, that those who are hooked on drugs need help from our society, not law enforcement adding immeasurably to their problems by arresting them, forcing them to go through the judicial process, and punishing them by fines or incarceration.

10. Legalization would give protection to the most basic and cherished right in a free society, the right of privacy.... "The government seems to be doing a better job waging war against the Fourth Amendment than winning the war against drugs," says University of Michigan law professor Yale Kamisar.

11. Although not extensive in this country, the prohibition of drug use has nevertheless created significant corruption among the very elements in our society charged with enforcing the laws. Though not of Miami Police Department or New York City Police Department dimensions, nor even numerically prevalent, virtually every major police department in the nation has been infected with drug corruption." pp. 187-195.

ON LEGALIZATION AS THE 'WRONG MESSAGE' TO YOUNG PEOPLE:

"One of the leading prohibitionists is Rep. Charles B. Rangel (D-NY), Chairman of the House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, who makes the argument that "legalization would only send a message to our young people that we encourage drug use." But surely our legalizing alcohol and tobacco is not a statement by our nation that we encourage young people to drink and smoke. And young people could hardly form this opinion when they would not only be informed time and time again by expanded educational programs about the dangers of drug use, but would know that any adult selling drugs to them would be committing a serious crime.
p. 199