

# The Social and Economic Feasibility of Sustaining the War on Drugs

Patrick Lee Hampshire

## Abstract

*This presentation goes against the current conservative political norms by proposing that the war against illegal drugs is "unwinnable." Future economic conditions will mandate that money now spent on enforcement activity be redirected toward more pressing social and economic needs. Historical facts are explored, especially the American prohibition and marijuana enforcement experience. There is exceptional evidence presented that the law enforcement "war" has actually increased the amount of drug abuse, violent crime, and organized criminal gangs.*

*A very unique, controlled experiment using conservative police personnel is detailed, showing that given the right arguments, there will be a change in future public attitudes that could lead to, and end the "unwinnable" war on illegal drugs.*

## Introduction

*When the solutions to our vices become as unacceptable to us as the vices themselves, then society will fall.*

This paraphrased quote from Livy's The History of Early Rome, written sometime between 59 B.C. and 17 A.D., is as applicable today as it was over 2,000 years ago. Just like Prohibition in the early part of this century, created by the 18th amendment to the Constitution, and subsequently repealed by the 21st amendment, we as a people must address the solution to our war on drugs. Like the Korean War and the Vietnam War, the war on drugs is an unwinnable conflict between a large segment of society, the law, and the economic ability to sustain such a war for an extended period of time.

Through the use of historical research, current survey polling, and economic statistics, this research brings together the various components of this war on drugs and attempts to display "the big picture." This big picture will compare very closely with the Prohibition experience early in this century. It is hypothesized that history repeating itself - government and society making the same mistakes over a moral issue, has resulted in unnecessary carnage, violence, and crime to the detriment of our overall welfare. Laws do not always provide the best solutions to our problems, sometimes the law is the problem. Szasz summarized:

*It is time -- if it is indeed not too late -- that we look more closely not only at what harmful drugs and profit hungry pushers do to us, but also at what harmful laws and power hungry politicians do to us. In the history of mankind, many more people have been injured and killed by laws than by drugs, by politicians than by pushers. We ignore this lesson at our own peril. (Rublowsky, 1974, p. 11)*

## The History of Alcohol in America

During the Colonial period, alcohol played a central role in the economic development of our nation. Rum and whiskey were the principal items of trade with the

Indians, and as such, were central to the lucrative fur trade.

Farmers in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia depended on distilling as the most practical and profitable method of transporting a rye crop to market. Many small farmers depended on cash from whiskey sales to purchase the necessities of life. The Whiskey Rebellion that occurred soon after the American Revolution revealed the importance these farmers attached to this commodity.

1913	\$89M
1922	\$190M
1927	\$270M
1932	\$318M
1934	\$219M

Source: Historical statistics of the United States, Bicentennial Edition. U.S. Department of Commerce, 1976.

1913	\$3M
1922	\$14M
1927	\$20M
1932	\$31M
1934	\$15M

Source: Historical statistics of the United States, Bicentennial Edition. U.S. Department of Commerce, 1976.

By the late 18th century, widespread drunkenness was cause for concern. In the decades prior to the Civil War, the temperance movement emerged in the form of organizations such as the American Temperance Society, the Sons of Temperance, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, and the Anti-Saloon League. Temperance leaders sought to persuade people to abstain from alcohol voluntarily. The victories and defeats of the movement took on the symbolic meaning of victory or defeat for the values of the middle-class: American-born Protestants vs. the European, Roman Catholic, Irish, German, Mediterranean, and Slavic immigrants of the late 19th century.

In 1906, only three states had prohibition. By 1912, there were ten. In December 1917, the U.S. Congress passed the 18th Amendment to the Constitution, outlawing manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors into or out of the United

States of America.

By the time the 18th Amendment had been ratified in January of 1919, 19 more states had passed prohibition legislation. More than 50% of the American population lived in dry areas of the country.

In January 1920, Prohibition became law. The Volstead Act, the enforcing arm of the 18th Amendment, was passed by Congress, overriding a veto by President Woodrow Wilson. The law remained in effect for almost 14 years until it was repealed on December 5, 1933, when Congress ratified the 21st Amendment.

Unlike the drug legislation of today, The Volstead Act did not criminalize the consumption or purchase of alcohol. It prohibited the sale, manufacture, and transportation of alcohol. The 18th Amendment directly caused the creation of a major industry: bootlegging and smuggling. Prohibition was the single most important element in the development of organized crime in America.

Bootlegging and smuggling required venture capital to get started and to maintain a cash flow to pay expenses. It also required business organization skills to meet the supply and demand of this thriving industry. Political protection, as well as protection from hijacking, were essential. In such a market, political corruption is necessary to operate and curtail competition. Competition is as unwelcome in illegal activities as it is in legal activities. Considering the violence that erupted during this time in our history, it is ironic, but true, that a number of bootleggers died - in essence, defending the tenets of free enterprise.

The Volstead Act failed because people did not stop drinking under Prohibition. Drinking simply became a crime by virtue of an act of law. This resulted in a whole new criminal class in America, a class that numbered in the tens of millions. This posed an unwieldy legal situation. It became almost impossible to prosecute, much less jail, the estimated one-third of the population that openly ignored the law.

The cost of enforcing this prohibition legislation was astronomical. State and local law enforcement expenditures, before and after prohibition, increased 257% (see Table 1).

From 1932 to 1934 there was a decrease in law enforcement expenditures of 31%. The only significant variable between these two years was the repeal of Prohibition.

Federal law enforcement expenditures, before and after prohibition, increased a whopping 933%! As Table 2 clearly shows, Federal law enforcement costs dropped by over 50% between 1932 and 1934 when Prohibition was repealed.

What this experiment demonstrated was that our national drug of choice was not something to be trifled with, even by the most well-meaning people of the day.

### Tobacco as a Drug

When Columbus returned from the new world he brought with him a new substance from the Indians he encountered: tobacco. The habit of smoking and chewing tobacco spread rapidly throughout the world. At this time, the rapid dissemination of tobacco appeared to be a bewildering phenomenon. Many saw it as the hand of the devil!

So rapid was the spread of the tobacco habit, and so compelling was the need for the leaf, that authorities in practically every country sought to ban the habit. In 1642,

1963	523.9
1964	511.2
1965	528.7
1966	541.2
1967	549.2

Pope Urban VIII declared a formal condemnation on tobacco, and sanctioned it as a new sin. The Russian Czar, Michael Fedorovich Romanov, punished smokers by cutting off their noses or beating the soles of their feet until they were bloody.

In 1633, the Sultan Murad from Turkey proclaimed a royal decree against smoking. His sanctions included such acts as hanging, beheading, and quartering the condemned subject between four horses. The Japanese confiscated the smoker's property. Those without property were jailed.

The English, a more mercantile people, recognized the financial possibilities of tobacco. Here was a substance whose use was almost impossible to stop once a user became accustomed to its effects. Instead of prohibiting the use of tobacco, the English taxed it. Almost immediately the treasury grew and tobacco became a significant new source of revenue. The new tax was paid by the tobacco users with a minimum of complaint.

In the Colonies, tobacco was a cash crop for the South and contributed, along with alcohol, to the economic supremacy of the United States of America. We can safely say that without the economic impetus provided by these two drugs, American history would have been vastly different.

People did not stop smoking, even though the dangers were known to them. Surveys revealed that smokers were aware of the dangers, but refused to abandon their drug of choice. Even after the Surgeon General's Report on smoking and mortality in 1964, society did not respond and cigarette sales soared (Table 3).

Although this trend is in sharp decline today, the demand for cigarettes will not subside. Ottawa, Canada reports 95% of all cigarettes exported from Canada are smuggled back into the country for distribution on the black market.

#### A Brief History of Drugs in America

Rublowsky (1974) described the hysteria caused by the perceived drug problem:

*There is a panic in the streets that radiates out from our cities in widening circles that threatens to engulf the entire country. It is as though a new plague has been turned loose on the land. It strikes the rich and the poor; black and white; the city and the state. The fifth horseman of the Apocalypse casts a shadow that darkens the lives of all Americans, everywhere. (p. 15)*

However, it is often contended that the desire to alter one's state of consciousness

is inborn. The Indians of North and South America discovered and developed the most extensive list of hallucinogenic drugs in the world. These included mescaline, peyote, psilocybin, jimsonweed, and various other mushrooms and plants; these were used by nearly all the tribes in the New World long before Columbus set sail in 1492, with little or no disruption of the social fabric. These organic substances still play a central role in the religious life of the American Indian today.

Pilgrims brought spirits to the new world in the form of rum, laudanum, and tincture of opium. In the 1850's, America even had a hashish club for writers and artists. The Civil war brought morphine addiction, also known as the soldier's disease. Sigmund Freud prescribed cocaine to his patients and is responsible for popularizing its use. Harvard psychologist William James discovered the effects of nitrous oxide (laughing gas), and Timothy Leary introduced LSD as a hallucinogenic.

When alcohol prohibition was repealed, there was no longer an official menace or crime. In 1930, the Federal Narcotics Bureau was instituted as part of the Treasury Department. Its first director was Harry J. Anslinger. Repeal of prohibition left a huge gap that had to be filled. The establishment of the Narcotics Bureau created an organization that had to find justification for its existence. This need could be filled by directing the public's attention to the use of cannabis (marijuana). There was one problem: very few people in America had heard about cannabis. Use of the drug was restricted to a tiny portion of the population, and it was difficult to get people excited about marijuana when they knew so little about it. Therefore, Director Anslinger took steps to remedy the situation.

Anslinger described his efforts to arouse an apathetic public:

*As the marijuana situation grew worse, I knew action had to be taken to get proper legislation passed...Much of the irrational juvenile violence and killing that has written a new chapter of shame and tragedy is traceable directly to hemp intoxication...On radio and at major forums...I told the story of this evil weed of the fields and rivers and roadsides. I wrote articles for magazines; our agents gave hundreds of lectures to parents, educators, social and civic leaders. In network broadcasts I reported on the growing list of crimes including murder and rape. I described the nature of marijuana...I continued to hammer at the facts...I believe we did a thorough job, for the public was alerted and the laws to protect them were passed, both nationally and at the state level. (Rublowsky, 1974, p. 106)*

By the spring of 1937, when the Marijuana Tax Bill was enacted by Congress, most people in America had heard about the drug. Anslinger was right - the Narcotics Bureau had done a thorough job. The nation was alerted. However, Congress, Anslinger, and the public ignored previous studies and research on the subject. The British East India Hemp Commission Report, prepared in 1893-1894, consisted of seven volumes and more than 3,000 pages.

The English Commission studied all phases of cannabis use in a country where the drug had been in common use for centuries. It was reported that cannabis was not an addictive drug and no significant physical effects or evidence of mental deterioration were found in moderate users. Also, no connection with crime, of any kind, was

revealed. The Commission recommended that the colonial government not interfere with the traffic of the drug in India.

A 1925 U.S. Army study on the growing use of cannabis among soldiers stationed in Panama revealed similar findings:

*After an investigation...the committee found no evidence that marijuana as grown here is a habit-forming drug...or that it has any appreciable deleterious influence upon the individual using it. (Rublowky, 1974, p. 104)*

The Narcotics Bureau published an annual report in 1932 for the preceding year that stated in part:

*A great deal of public interest has been aroused by the newspaper articles appearing from time to time on the evils of the abuse of marijuana. This publicity tends to magnify the extent of the evil and .... infers that there is an alarming spread of the improper use of the drug, whereas the actual increase in such use may not have been inordinately large. (Rublowky, 1974, p. 112)*

Five years later, in a hearing before the Ways and Means Committee of Congress, that was considering passage of antimarijuana legislation, Anslinger's testimony had changed dramatically. He presented marijuana as a menace of crisis proportion that was spreading like a cancer throughout the nation.

This testimony resulted in a law being passed once again that arbitrarily made criminals out of the users of a drug that Colonel J.M. Phalen, editor of Military Surgeon, described after an official inquiry as, "no more harmful than the smoking of tobacco or mullein or sumac leaves...The legislation was ill-advised...it branded as a menace and a crime a matter of trivial importance."

After World War II, people believed in the power of technology and the huge productivity of U.S. corporations. The war also created a pervasive analogy for the postwar era itself. Having triumphed, Americans were tempted to see all societal problems as small wars. Problems could be surmounted with the proper strategy and tactics. The analogy was sometimes explicit (as with the "war on poverty" in the 1960's or the 1980's "war on drugs"). As problems arose, we would solve them, privately if possible, publicly, if necessary.

### The War on Drugs

President Bush made a campaign promise and stated, "This scourge will end." But the cost of fighting this war is astronomical. According to the National Drug Control Strategy (Budget Summary), published by the White House in January 1992, the projected drug control budget for 1993 will be \$12,728.7 billion (see Table 4).

In the 1991 edition of the U.S. Statistical Abstract, the United States Department of Commerce reported that total law enforcement expenditures for local, state, and federal governments exceeded \$22 billion in 1985. The Office of National Drug Control Policy estimates the amount spent by Americans for illegal drugs in 1990 was \$40.4 billion ("Justice by the," 1992). This figure contrasts with \$46 billion in state, local, and federal law enforcement expenditures to fight the war on drugs in that year.

**Table 4**  
**National Drug Control Budget, 1982-1993**  
(in billions of dollars)

1982	\$1,651.9
1983	\$1,934.7
1984	\$2,298.0
1985	\$2,679.6
1986	\$2,826.1
1987	\$4,786.7
1988	\$4,702.4
1989	\$6,592.3
1990	\$9,693.1
1991	\$10,841.4
1992	\$11,953.1
1993	\$12,728.7

Prison bed space has more than doubled from 31,272 in 1982 to 69,152 in 1991; and drug use continues. Also, prison budgets increased 93% between 1988 and 1992 (\$1,069 billion to \$2.06 billion). The Andean strategy aimed at attacking drugs at their source has shown little success. In fact, the American advisor in the Andes said, "We've lost the war."

Brian Bruh heads a new arm of the U.S. Treasury Department created to sniff out international drug lords. Bruh told Parade's Washington bureau that as much as \$85 billion in American and European drug proceeds are being laundered each year. Bruh stated that, "As many ways as there are to move narcotics, there are many more ways to move money. That's why it's so hard to stop" (America's top sleuth, 1991).

The most poignant statistic of all comes from the Pentagon. A direct military role in drug interdiction had been debated for years in Washington. Congress appropriated \$300 million in late 1988 to pay for increased military surveillance of drug smugglers in the Caribbean, but military resources were still limited and the armed forces could not make arrests. The Pentagon resisted an increased role. However, Congress passed bills in the summer of 1988 calling for the armed forces to seal U.S. borders to drug trafficking. The Pentagon said it couldn't be done. Simply attempting it, the Defense Department said, would cost \$22 billion and require: 110 AWACS, 96 infantry battalions, 53 helicopter companies, 165 cruisers and destroyers and 17 fighter squadrons (Gugliotta & Leen, 1989).

Patrick Murphy, chairman of the Police Policy Board for the U.S. Conference of Mayors states, "Hiring more police officers is no answer...drug treatment, social programs, and education are the solution."

The war on drugs is taking its toll at the local level as well as at the national level. The Lake Worth Police Department 1992/1993 budget had to be cut by over \$600,000

to \$6,634,050, to balance the total city budget. With approximately 85% of the budget being personnel costs, the projected result was 11 officer layoffs. Lake Worth has a total budgetary complement of 98 sworn personnel, thus 11 officer layoffs reduces the force by 11% at a time when violent crime is on the increase and drugs are in abundance.

Over the past 5 years, Lake Worth has shown significant increases in the budgetary expenditures to fight the War on Drugs. The figures in Table 5 only reflect the cost to respond to the numerous citizen calls for service by uniform zone officers. These figures are based on an average hourly salary for patrol officers and an average time spent on each call. However, the Lake Worth Police Department has 18 of its 98 sworn personnel assigned to drug investigations and drug task forces. This includes the vice unit and the tactical patrol unit. These 18 people make up 18% of the total sworn complement at Lake Worth, and in 1991 accounted for approximately \$524,137 in salaries alone. This figure does not include overtime or equipment costs. Therefore, Lake Worth's costs to fight the war on drugs would more than cover the 1992/1993 budget deficit.

If the layoffs occur, the war on drugs would tie up 21% of the sworn personnel specifically, with the remaining sworn personnel handling routine drug calls for service 3-5% of their time.

#### Changing Social Attitudes About Drugs

Federal Judge James C. Paine stated, "The criminal caseload has expanded rapidly in the past decade, and...the most significant fact apparent from a review of the data on the federal courts' criminal docket is a meteoric increase in drug cases in the 1980's" ("Repeal today," 1991, p. 1). This increase of drug cases will likely continue as a result of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988.

Between 1980 and 1991, federal drug cases increased 292%. Before the Anti-Drug Abuse Act (1980-1988), drug cases only increased from 11% to 24%. Based on Judge Paine's experience over the past 20 years, he concluded that the government has lost the war on drugs.

Year	CFS	Total Budget	Drug CFS Costs
1987	1,195	\$4,064,582	\$89,664
1988	977	\$4,863,740	\$91,703
1989	1,124	\$5,774,808	\$116,650
1990	1,111	\$6,221,439	\$121,618
1991	1,080	\$6,585,394	\$128,589

Judge Paine has joined that group of people who believe that the use and sale of controlled substances should be legalized. Judge Paine believes that alcohol did not cause the high crime rates of the 20's and 30's, Prohibition did. And drugs do not cause



today's alarming crime rates, but drug prohibition does.

Prohibition of alcohol by the Volstead Act was supposed to be an economic and moral bonanza. Prisons were to be emptied, taxes cut, and social problems eliminated. Productivity was to skyrocket and absenteeism disappear. But these things did not happen, and they have not happened since the advent of the drug war. Instead, the major beneficiaries have been smugglers and the forces of big government.

For a paper presented to the 1982 Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association in San Francisco, a telephone questionnaire survey was conducted with a random sample of 250 persons in the San Diego area. Over 98% of the respondents believed that the seven FBI "index" crimes -- murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny and motor vehicle theft -- were legitimate crimes. However, only 50% thought that victimless and marginal crimes such as vagrancy, public drunkenness, gambling, and smoking marijuana, should be considered crimes.

In an open letter to Drug Czar Bill Bennett, Nobel Prize winning economist Milton Friedman (1989) of the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, wrote:

*In Oliver Cromwell's eloquent words, 'I beseech you in the bowels of Christ, think it possible you may 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 abusers and a whole...of repressive measures can only make a bad situation worse. The drug war can not be won by those tactics without undermining the human liberty and individual freedom that you and I cherish.'* (p. 1)

Friedman goes on to make his case by informing Bennett:

*...that the very measures you favor are a major source of the evils you deplore. The problem is demand, but not only demand but 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 and monopolizes the efforts of honest law forces so that they are starved for resources to fight the simpler crimes of robbery, theft, and assault.* (p. 1)

If drugs had been decriminalized 17 years ago, "crack" might have never been invented. It was invented because the high cost of illegal drugs made it profitable. Legalization would have saved the lives of thousands of innocent victims; the ghettos of our major cities would not be drug and crime infested no-man's lands.

In her book, Desperados, Elaine Shannon (1989) asked, "Is there a solution?" Can a law that is violated regularly by 23 million Americans be enforced? The Soviet Union was a police state and could not contain its growing heroin abuse problem that was imported by Soviet soldiers stationed in Afghanistan. But if the solution is tougher law enforcement, what does that really mean? Execution of drug dealers? Wholesale arrests of drug users? Who will make the arrests? Most big-city police departments have their hands full rounding up dealers. If users could be arrested, where would they be kept? The jails are overloaded with violent felons. And what if the answer is more

involvement of the military?

How can any military force secure the 88,000 mile perimeter of the United States? If the U.S. military and the American intelligence agencies could not interdict the Ho Chi Minh trail, the supply line to the Viet Cong during the Vietnam War, why does anyone think a military solution can be devised to smash trafficking rings that operate in the jungles and mountains of several dozen nations?

#### Lake Worth Police Department Survey Poll

Prompted by the opinions of individuals such as Judge Paine, economist Milton Friedman, and Baltimore Mayor Kurt Schmoke who advocate the legalization of drugs, a survey poll of the Lake Worth Police Department was performed. Based on the premise that people in law enforcement are basically conservative, it was hypothesized that if this group sanctioned legalization of drugs, society is also likely ready for a new approach.

A questionnaire was constructed with only one question:

#### Should all drugs that are currently illegal be legalized and controlled like alcohol and tobacco?

Each participant was chosen at random regardless of sex, race, age or work assignment. They were asked to read the questionnaire and answer the question. There were five answers to the question:

- 1 NO
- 2 NOT SURE
- 3 MAYBE
- 4 CERTAIN DRUGS, BUT NOT ALL
- 5 YES

After answering the question, each participant read two articles from the Palm Beach Post; both articles advocated legalizing drugs. The first was a December 9, 1991 article, "High crime: It's the drugs," by George McEnvoy, a columnist for the Post. McEnvoy was heavily influenced by the second author, Federal Judge James C. Paine. Judge Paine's article, "Repeal today's prohibition: legalize drugs," appeared in the Post on December 8, 1991. There was also a November 15, 1991, USA Today graphic from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration that showed drunk driving deaths had declined over the last ten years.

Once the participant had read the material, they were asked to answer the same question again. The results of this survey/poll are contained in Table 6.

There are 141 full time employees at the Lake Worth Police Department. Table 6 shows there were 47 participants in the study. This constitutes 33% of the Department. There were 11 females in the study that constituted 23% of the 47 participants and 33 males that constituted 70% of the 47 participants. Three people (7%) chose not to indicate their sex.

The survey results indicated that education and information can have an impact

<b>Table 6 Lake Worth Police Department Drug Legalization Survey</b>		
<b>Response</b>	<b>Before</b>	<b>After</b>
1 No	29	15
2 Not Sure	2	3
3 Maybe	1	9
4 Some Drugs	12	15
5 Yes	3	5
Total	47	47

on how people view the issue of legalization of drugs. By taking the before and after quantitative results from this experiment and arranging them in ascending order, the median response had increased from 1 to 3. This indicates that the reading material had some impact on the views held by these people in a conservative profession. In other words, the median response prior to the reference material being presented was "NO" legalization. After reading the informational material the median response was a "MAYBE."

Of the 11 females who responded, the median response to the before question was "MAYBE." After the reading material was administered to the females, the median score increased to a 4, or "CERTAIN DRUGS, BUT NOT ALL" should be legalized. Of the 33 males who responded, the median score for the before question was "NO." After the reading material was administered, the median score rose to a 3, or "MAYBE."

Taken at face value, it would appear that females are more receptive to legalization of drugs than males, and they would respond more positively to an informational campaign to proceed with such legislation. However, because of the small female sample in this survey, this claim can not be substantiated.

On January 13, 1993, this same survey was given to 17 participants and 3 staff members of the Florida Criminal Justice Executive Institute's Senior Leadership Program. Almost all respondents were high ranking, male criminal justice administrators with ten or more years of experience. Thirteen of the surveys were returned following a one hour lecture on drug legalization. The median response to the question, both before and after the lecture, was a 4 -- higher than the Lake Worth poll.

#### Conclusion: What Would Legalization Accomplish?

The first result of a prohibition is crime. This is a simple matter of economics. Drug laws reduce the number of suppliers and thereby the supply of drugs, driving up the price. The higher price means that users often commit crimes to pay for a habit that would be easily affordable if drugs were legal. At least half the crimes in major U.S. cities are committed as a result of drug prohibition.

The second effect of prohibition is corruption. Prohibition raises prices, that leads to extraordinary profits, which are an irresistible temptation to officials at all levels of government. We should not be shocked that some police officials are "on the take"

during this war on drugs; we should be shocked that so many more are not.

The third result is that buyers are brought into contact with the criminal element. The very illegality of the drug business attracts people who are already criminals. The decent people, who could sell drugs as they might sell alcohol and tobacco, are squeezed out of an increasingly lucrative business enterprise. The corruption and violence that results should not be surprising.

The fourth result is the creation of stronger drugs. If a dealer can smuggle only one suitcase full of drugs into the U.S., that same dealer can get more money by smuggling, in bulk, a more potent drug. This occurred during Prohibition when the production of beer declined, while spirits accounted for a larger part of total alcohol consumption.

Massive savings in law enforcement expenditures, along with increased revenue from taxes, would produce the necessary funds to educate our youth against drugs and treat the current population affected by drugs.

There are numerous forces propelling us into the future and an infinite number of possible futures waiting for us. This paper suggests one of those possible futures and the forces behind it.

"When the solutions to our vices become as unacceptable to us as the vices themselves, then society will fall"; this is as true today as it was in the time of Rome. Morality laws have failed throughout history; they will continue to fail in the future. Soaring budget deficits, increasing health care demands, and growing violence need a higher priority than attempting to police 23 million Americans who are obviously very committed to certain recreational activities. The aging baby boomers are about to explode the system as we near the year 2000, and resources will be necessary to accommodate them. Most will be on pensions and/or social security, thereby reducing the tax base, and creating an even greater financial disaster looming in our future. These children of the 60's and 70's are not as susceptible to the scare tactics associated with drugs as their parents were. They will not be willing to support the increasing expenditures necessary to continue the war on drugs. Our society has had significant experience with legal dangerous drugs, particularly alcohol and tobacco, and we can draw on that experience when we legalize our other recreational drugs.

As a sign of the times, Hallmark greeting cards has a new series of "Just for Today" cards for those people who are going through drug recovery. Hallmark conducted a survey and 78% of the respondents said they are, have been, or know someone in a recovery program. Hallmark estimates that 15 million people attend support groups for alcohol, drug, and other dependencies and an additional 100 million family members and friends encourage their efforts. These numbers would seem to indicate that help and treatment, rather than prison, is more acceptable to a vast majority of the population.

Another sign of the times is the 1992 presidential campaign, in that both democratic candidates, Bill Clinton and Al Gore, publicly acknowledged using marijuana in their youth. A similar admission a few years earlier by a Supreme Court nominee contributed to his defeat.

This research in no way advocates, condones, or is meant to persuade people to use drugs. However, it is meant to present an alternative perspective on a national and international problem that has, and will continue to have, a significant impact on social

and economic issues well into the 21st Century.

Patrick Hampshire was born December 1, 1947 in Garrett, Indiana. He served in the 1st Infantry Division (Recon) in the Republic of Vietnam in 1968 and was decorated for valor in combat. Captain Hampshire has 17 years of law enforcement experience, starting as a patrol officer and working his way through the ranks to his present position. Captain Hampshire has worked in all phases of law enforcement from patrol to detective to personnel management and technical services. He is married and has two children.

## References

- 1991 a bloody year. (1992, February). Law and Order.
- A bad report card. (1992, January 27). Newsweek.
- Aging baby boomers could explode system. (1992, January). Palm Beach Post.
- America's top sleuth in the drug wars. (1991, December 29). Parade.
- Author urges war on drugs. (1992, January 25). Palm Beach Post.
- Cigarette smuggling up. (1992, January 25). Palm Beach Post.
- Criminal justice agency profile. (1991, July). Fraternal Order of Police Magazine.
- D.C., Maryland inmates and arrestees. (1992, January 3). USA Today.
- Drug laws keep criminals in business. (1992, February 10). Palm Beach Post.
- Drug war: Senator Bob Kerrey to use military. (1992, January 24). USA Today.
- Drunk driving dwindles. (1992, January 29). USA Today.
- Drunk driving declines. (1991, November 15). USA Today.
- Drunken driving dwindles. (1992, January 29). USA Today.
- Few back legalizing hard drugs. (1992, February 21). Palm Beach Post.
- Florida Department of Law Enforcement. (1991, December). Criminal Activity Bulletin. Tallahassee, Florida: author.
- Friedman, M. (1989, September 6). Open letter to Bill Bennett. Wall Street Journal.
- Garrett, P. M. (1989, September 6). Cocaine crusader. Wall Street Journal.

Goode, E. (1975). Drugs in American society. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

Gugliotta, G., & Leen, J. (1989). Kings of Cocaine. New York: Harper and Row.

Henderson, J., & Sherman, J. The public's perception of crime and police activity. High crime: It's the drugs. (1991, December 9). Palm Beach Post.

How to fight a drug war. (1992, February 7). Newsweek.

Justice by the numbers. (1992, January 31). Law enforcement news.

Legalize drugs to cut crime rate. (1991, December 14). Palm Beach Post.

Minneapolis court: Crack law discriminates. (1991, December 14). Palm Beach Post.

Most women in jail held for drug crimes. (1992, March 23). USA Today.

Netherlands soft approach to drugs. (1992, February). Law and Order.

Office of National Drug Control Policy. (1992). National drug control strategy. Washington, D.C.: Office of the President.

Office of National Drug Control Policy.(1992). A nation responds to drug use. Washington, D.C.: Office of the President.

Officers killed total down. (1992, February). Law and Order.

Palm Beach County deputy arrested for crack. (1992, March 2). Palm Beach Post.

Pawning and drunk driving death graphs. (1991, November 11). USA Today.

Reduced spy threat lets FBI shift focus. (1992, January 10). USA Today.

Repeal today's prohibition: Legalize drugs. (1991, December 8). Palm Beach Post.

Rublowsky, J. (1974). The stoned age: A history of drugs in America. New York: G.P. Putnam & Sons.

Shannon, E. (1989). Desperados. New York: Signet.

Sheriff, crack addict officially open Glades drug farm. (1992, January 18). Palm Beach Post.

Taxes, education, war on drugs comes up short. (1992, January 11). Palm Beach Post.

The prohibition experiment. (1983). Encyclopedia of Criminal Justice, 1.

The newest war: The pentagon's battle against Latin America's drug lords. (1992, January 6). Newsweek.

College without chemicals. (1992, December 16). Newsweek.

The new age of aquarius. (1992, February 3). Newsweek.

U.S. Department of Commerce. (1976). Historical statistics of the United States, Bicentennial edition. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Walrus slaughtered in drugs for ivory ring. (1992, February 15). Palm Beach Post.

War on drugs runs up against 4th amendment. (1991, December 13). USA Today.

West Palm Beach federal judge says drugs should be legal. (1992, November 28). Palm Beach Post.