

## **B. THE LEGISLATIVE FACTS**

The following is a summary of the materials, information and evidence presented to the Minister of Justice pursuant to the *Extradition Act*.

### **I The U.S. War on Drugs – The Broad Picture**

#### **i) Early History – From the Opium Wars through the fight against Communism**

75. Anyone who has made a serious effort to investigate the history of drug prohibition knows that its true purpose is neither the protection of health nor the deterring of crime. As Professor Chambliss has written, to understand the phenomenon one must go beyond an analysis that simply looks at why some people use drugs and others do not, what effect use has on other types of crime and how addicts can be rehabilitated. One must look at history and how a drug is linked to the political economy.

**“Markets, Profits, Labour and Smack” by William J. Chambliss (1977) 1, Contemporary Crisis – Crime, Law, Social Policy, Number 1, pp. 53 – 76 at pp. 53 – 55.**

76. To take opium as an example, it was discovered long ago that the juice from the opium poppy, when taken internally, had the effect among other things of relieving pain. The plant grew in warm climates at high altitudes in places like Turkey. In the Eighth and Ninth Centuries, the Turks carried opium into India, China and Southeast Asia to trade for other commodities. As Capitalism emerged from Feudalism in Europe, the search for new markets and products began with Italy, Spain and Portugal in the forefront. In the 1500's the Portuguese arrived in Asia searching for goods to take back to Europe and to sell goods from Europe into the Asian economies. Most of these economies were self-contained at the time. Europe had little to offer Asia while Asia had spices, tea, silk and pottery that were much in demand in the European market. Europe had silver and gold but their prices were rising while silk and tea, once purchased or consumed, left little or no value. The Portuguese discovered this small trade in opium, a drug that was used primarily for medical purposes at the time. Its use was rare and relatively inconsequential. The Portuguese took over the Asian trade and began purchasing opium from Turkey and India for spices and tea. Over the next 300 years, the European powers

fought over Asian colonies. The Dutch gained the upper hand in Indonesia and much of Southeast Asia. European colonial powers expanded into the interior of Asian nations and increasingly turned to the opium trade as a source of income to pay for military excursions and the products that they sought to return to their mother country.

**“Markets, Profits, Labour and Smack” by William J. Chambliss (1977) 1, Contemporary Crisis – Crime, Law, Social Policy, Number 1, at pp. 53 – 55;**

**Affidavit of Randall G. Shelden, sworn June 12, 2000, paragraph 3 and Exhibit “B”.**

77. It was at this time that opium dens began appearing in the major cities of Asia. Opium was produced mainly in India and shipped by the British East India Company which enjoyed almost total political and economic control over the Indian colony. This private company encouraged and expanded opium addiction throughout Asia and especially amongst the Chinese. Initially, the Chinese Government paid little attention. By the middle of the Nineteenth Century, however, it realized that it was trading away its precious metals, silks and tea for opium. China made efforts to stop this development by the introduction of a stringent anti-opium policy in 1839. The Manchu rulers appointed Commissioner Lin to stop opium importation into Canton. He demanded the right to inspect all incoming vessels and to confiscate any opium found. The American traders complied but the British refused. A lobbying campaign ensued in the English Parliament to support the right of the British East Indian Company to trade in opium in China. Prime Minister Palmerston authorized the British fleet to seize Canton and other major ports. This was the beginning of the first Opium War between China and Great Britain which lasted from 1839 to 1842. The British, who enjoyed superior naval power, brought the Manchu Dynasty to defeat and Great Britain was given possession of Hong Kong, open access to the five Chinese Ports including Canton, reparation for opium seizures and compensation in the amount of \$21,000,000.00. They also obtained a declaration that British traders would only be subject to British and not Chinese laws in the event of conflict. While smuggling was outlawed, enforcement of the laws was placed in the hands of British smugglers and not the Chinese.

**“Markets, Profits, Labour and Smack” by William J. Chambliss (1977) 1, Contemporary Crisis – Crime, Law, Social Policy, Number 1, pp. 55 – 56;**

**Affidavit of Randall G. Shelden, sworn June 12, 2000, paragraph 3 and Exhibit “B”.**

78. While opium remained illegal by Chinese law after the first Opium War, in effect the British East Indian Company had a free hand to import and distribute opium into the five Chinese ports and Hong Kong. American and Indian groups also became re-involved. The trade flourished for the next 14 years. However, the seizure of a British registered but Chinese owned vessel in 1856 led to the second Opium War which ended in much the same way. However, this time Britain was able to obtain the legalization of opium smoking and trading and the Chinese received the right to impose a tax on all opium imported. This led to a vast increase in the potential and actual market for opium. It also, however, planted the seed that would destroy the British monopoly and its profits. Taxation and the right of the Chinese to grow their own introduced competition that would eventually destroy the market for the Europeans. However, the market flourished along with British capitalism in China until the end of the Nineteenth Century. The Industrial Revolution in Europe increased Europe's demand for markets and raw materials. Southeast Asia became a major factor in the political economy of Europe's capitalist movement. Burma, Malaysia and Thailand fell under British influence whereas as Laos, Vietnam and Cambodia became "French Indo-China". The Netherlands colonized Indonesia and Britain also had possession of Hong Kong and, in many respects, China, itself.

**"Markets, Profits, Labour and Smack" by William J. Chambliss (1977)  
1, Contemporary Crisis – Crime, Law, Social Policy, Number 1, pp. 56  
– 57;**

**Affidavit of Randall G. Shelden, sworn June 12, 2000, paragraph 3  
and Exhibit "B".**

79. A major problem for the colonizers of Asia was the obtaining of labour. The demand for cheap labour was great but local inhabitants were not inclined to move to the various foreign owned plantations. A famine in South China provided a solution and people began emigrating by the thousands. Some went to the United States and Canada where they provided hordes of cheap labour for the building of the railroads. Most, however, emigrated to the cities of Southeast Asia where they were employed as labourers on the docks, particularly in Saigon and Bangkok. They brought with them their opium smoking habits. The colonial governments soon recognized the value of encouraging the worker to smoke opium. Their profits were substantial and the opium-addicted labourer was very compliant. The governments sponsored opium dens. The trade became carefully organized through an alliance between colonial officials, local governments and businesses who were given franchises to import and sell opium. Apparently, the profits provided 40%

to 50% of the income of the colonial governments at the time. They helped to finance the railways, canals, roads and government buildings and to keep the colonial bureaucrats in a comfortable lifestyle. While local governments, particularly Thailand, resisted the opium trade from time to time by banning opium trading and instituting in 1839 the death penalty for traffickers, the British ships and British colonial power contained the trade and ultimately an opium monopoly under government control run by a wealthy Chinese merchant was established in Thailand. Opium became the main government revenue and the main means of encouraging the working class to provide labour for the European traders. By the 1940's, there were over 2,500 opium dens in Indo-China providing 45% of all tax revenues and many of the salaries for government officials.

**“Markets, Profits, Labour and Smack” by William J. Chambliss (1977) 1, Contemporary Crisis – Crime, Law, Social Policy, Number 1, pp. 57 – 58;**

**Affidavit of Randall G. Shelden, sworn June 12, 2000, paragraph 3 and Exhibit “B”.**

- 80 While Turkey and India had been the main producers of opium, the legalization of opium in China in 1856 led Chinese farmers to discover that they could grow it in South China in the high mountains. This led to increased competition between Chinese opium and Indian and Turkish opium and, together with the tax on opium after 1856, this gradually forced other traders to shift to other products after 1875. Consequently, the British and American firms slowly withdrew from the trade. Opium production spread to neighbouring countries and the border states of Laos, Burma and Thailand quickly became involved. World War I put a complete end to British and American trading of opium into China. The opium monopolies in Indo-China, originally controlled by the French and then by the Japanese colonial governments, sought new and closer sources for opium and found them among the Meo tribes of Laos. Opium production leapt from 7.5 tons in 1940 to 60.6 tons by 1944. When the Chinese Liberation Army emerged victorious in 1949, the supply of opium from China disappeared. By this time, the Golden Triangle comprised of Laos, Thailand and Burma, and increased international control of opium shipments from Iran and Turkey, stimulated the opium growing in the Golden Triangle.

**“Markets, Profits, Labour and Smack” by William J. Chambliss (1977) 1, Contemporary Crisis – Crime, Law, Social Policy, Number 1, pp. 58 – 59;**

**Affidavit of Randall G. Shelden, sworn June 12, 2000, paragraph 3 and Exhibit "B".**

81. Opium smoking and trafficking were encouraged and stimulated by governments. Addiction provided profits for governments and created a dependent labour force for employers. France used its opium trade as a source of revenue to finance its clandestine intelligence operations in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. The money earned paid for government administrative costs and the opium trade was a carrot given to hill tribes and local leaders to support the French struggle against the communists. When the United States took over management of Indo-China from France, it inherited the link between military control and opium production in these countries. It was necessary and highly expedient to adopt the French policy of encouraging friendly tribesmen to grow and traffic in opium in return for fighting the communists. Accordingly, the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) became a major trafficker in the international narcotics industry. The governments of Thailand, Laos and South Vietnam continued to be dependent upon the opium trade as the profits are immense. Both governments and individuals profited immensely from the trade and corruption became widespread. Laos would not have survived without the huge traffic between it and Saigon. The U.S. provided airplanes and other military equipment to enable the shipments from Laos to Saigon where it was processed into heroin and either sold to American G.I.'s in Vietnam or shipped back to the U.S., sometimes in the coffins of American soldiers. Opium traffic continues to play an important part in Capitalism's political economy. The Shan tribesmen in Southeast Asia, the KMT (Chinese Nationalist Army) and the Laotian Armed Forces were, until the Cambodian Revolution, the three principal sources of transporting and marketing opium from hill tribe growers in the Golden Triangle to the middlemen that oversee its passage to the laboratories in Bangkok and Hong Kong. The Shan, KMT and the Laotian Armed Forces are supported by arms and technical assistance from the United States as they are believed to be serving U.S. interests in providing a wedge against the Communist Liberation Armies in Burma, Laos, Cambodia and Thailand.

**"Markets, Profits, Labour and Smack" by William J. Chambliss (1977) 1, Contemporary Crisis – Crime, Law, Social Policy, Number 1, pp. 60 – 63;**

**Affidavit of Randall G. Shelden, sworn June 12, 2000, paragraph 3 and Exhibit "B";**

**Affidavit of Michael Craig Ruppert, sworn November 26, 1999, generally and, in particular, paragraphs 23 – 34 and the Exhibits attached;**

**See also “A DEA Agent Joins The Fight Against The War On Drugs”, Ex-DEA Agent Celerino Castillo, III, Prevailing Winds Magazine, Number 5;**

**See also “The Dark Alliance”, by Gary Webb, San José Mercury News, August 1996.**

**ii) Developments in North America and Europe – From World War I and II until the ‘60’s – The Nixon War on Drugs**

82. The first major influx of opium smokers into the United States and Canada came when the Chinese emigrated to the West Coast to work in the gold and silver mines and on the railroads which connected the eastern manufacturing centres with the western frontier. Working conditions were terrible. Workers, without their families, were forced to labour long hours under terrible conditions with little relief. Opium smoking lulled the psychological pain of the conditions and reduced the pain of physical illness. Employers, by controlling the importation and distribution of opium, made a further profit by selling it to the workers. Further, an opium addicted labour force was a highly competent labour force and the threat of withdrawing the supply kept many labour complaints to a minimum. This is how opium smoking began a slow and steady growth through the American working class, particularly in the West. Opium was legally imported and sold in the late 1800’s and the market supplied by normal business channels. By the early 1900’s, opium dens had spread from the West to the East and south to New Orleans and north to Montreal. By the late 1800’s, the annual importation into the United States of opium exceeded 500,000 pounds.

**“Markets, Profits, Labour and Smack” by William J. Chambliss (1977) 1, Contemporary Crisis – Crime, Law, Social Policy, Number 1, pp. 63 – 64;**

**Affidavit of Randall G. Shelden, sworn June 12, 2000, paragraph 3 and Exhibit “B”.**

- 83 By the late 1800’s, mining and railroad building began to decline in the West and the need for cheap labour declined as well. The U.S.

Government became concerned over the large number of immigrants entering the U.S. that were becoming a burden rather than a economic asset. They sought cooperation with China in reducing immigration to the U.S. and China was willing, provided the U.S. took steps to reduce the opium being brought into China by American ships. While the business was substantial for a small group of ship owners, it was primarily controlled by the British and was already rapidly declining. The U.S. agreed and passed the first anti-opium legislation in the world in 1886 making it illegal to trade in opium. With this decline in markets and demand for labour, anti-opium legislation began to appear in most western countries. A series of international opium conferences in Shanghai in 1909, the Hague in 1911 – 1914 and Geneva in 1924, helped spread anti-opium sentiment and subsequent legislation. In 1939, the Bayer Corporation began distributing heroin which it claimed was a non-addictive drug with the same medical value as opium without the undesirable side-effects. It was marketed, among other things, as a sedative for the common cough. By 1914, the U.S. Harrison Act made it illegal to trade in opium or its derivatives (including heroin) without registering with the U.S. government and paying a tax. U.S. bureaucratic maneuvering and a selection of cases resulted in the Federal Bureau of Narcotics succeeding in getting the Courts to make it illegal to prescribe morphine, opium or heroin to anyone who was an addict.

**“Markets, Profits, Labour and Smack” by William J. Chambliss (1977) 1, Contemporary Crisis – Crime, Law, Social Policy, Number 1, pp. 64 – 66;**

**Affidavit of Randall G. Shelden, sworn June 12, 2000, paragraph 3 and Exhibit “B”.**

84. **World War I** interrupted the traffic in opium. However, enough opium and heroin was imported throughout the war to supply the stable addict population. All of the trade routes with India and Turkey were cut off. This increased the incentive to grow the poppy in China and Southeast Asia and also opened up connections with Turkish and Middle East opium sources. The business in the U.S. was apparently highly competitive and run by local merchants making special arrangements with merchant seaman and mercantilists. There appeared to be some connection between those involved in the heroin business and the illegal liquor business. By 1938, it had become one of the nation’s larger industries and it was estimated that the sale of heroin exceeded a billion dollars per year. Apparently, the underworld had gained control over a considerable portion of the heroin business by the late ‘30’s. **World War II** interrupted the flow of morphine and heroin from Europe to the United States and opium from Asia. By the end of the war, the addict population in the

United States had declined significantly and was felt to be quite manageable. However, the affluence of the '50's created an unprecedented demand for many things, including heroin and other narcotics, resulting in the return of suppliers to the market for a significant profit. American businessmen, such as **Meyer Lansky, Vito Genovese** and **Joe Adonis**, had accumulated large profits in gambling and real estate investments in the 30's and '40's and had developed organizations capable of organizing international cartels for the production, shipment and distribution of illegal commodities for a substantial profit. Lansky purchased control of the heroin monopoly out of France and Turkey and Marseille became the major suppliers of American's illegal opiates by the '50's. By the 1970's, it was estimated that the average heroin addict in the United States was spending \$30,000.00 a year on heroin. Based on an estimate of at least 1,000,000 addicts in the United States at the time, this meant an annual gross sale of heroin exceeding \$30 billion making it an industry comparable in gross volume of business to some of the other largest corporations in the United States such as General Motors, Exxon and IBM. The importance of this industry to the national economy was, therefore, apparent.

**“Markets, Profits, Labour and Smack” by William J. Chambliss (1977) 1, Contemporary Crisis – Crime, Law, Social Policy, Number 1, pp. 66 – 69;**

**Affidavit of Randall G. Shelden, sworn June 12, 2000, paragraph 3 and Exhibit “B”.**

85. Throughout the period from 1930 to 1960, the major businessmen who owned and managed the heroin industry in the United States were well represented by key people in State and Federal Governments who in turn were involved in either regulating the industry or influencing those political leaders who could most directly affect the industry. As the industry emerged during the heyday of the Democratic Party, the ties of these bureaucrats were stronger to the Democrats than to the Republican politicians. This hegemony was undermined in the '60's when even old labour union ties, such as those between the Teamsters and the Democrats, began to break down when Jimmy Hoffa was put in the prison at the insistence of a Democratic controlled Attorney General's office. Soon, the Teamsters shifted their allegiance from the Democrats to the Republicans. The emergence of **Richard Nixon** as a political force of substance posed a significant threat to the established monopoly in the heroin industry. The Nixon administration adopted policies that were against the interests of the established monopolies. Pressure was brought to bear on Turkey to curtail production of opium. The Nixon administration used the threat of dissolving massive contributions of



foreign aid in order to get Turkey to enforce its laws restricting the growth of opium. **The Bureau of Dangerous Drugs** (formerly the Federal Bureau of Narcotics) was expanded and given substantial encouragement to curtail heroin traffic from Latin America and France. However, the first proclaimed “War on Drugs” by President Nixon in 1969 might have succeeded had it not been for the fact that new sources of opium and heroin were being exploited by people connected to the Republican administration. While the amount of heroin coming from Turkey and Europe declined by almost 50% between 1968 and 1971, the amount coming from Southeast Asia increased during that period by the same amount. In 1962, it was estimated that 95% of the heroin entering the U.S. came from Turkey but by 1971 it was estimated only 45% of the heroin came from Turkey and the rest from Southeast Asia. By the end of 1970, the Nixon administration’s government had seized three times as much heroin as in the preceding years and by 1972 almost 15 times as much as had been seized compared to four years earlier. By 1972, the Nixon administration had seriously disrupted the established monopoly and control over the Southeast Asian supply was becoming established. In 1968, the Federal Bureau of Narcotics was transferred from the Treasury Department to the Justice Department and renamed the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. In 1973, the Attorney General and the President reorganized the narcotics enforcement process once again culminating in the formation of the **Drug Enforcement Administration** (DEA). The seizure of heroin plummeted in 1973 and 1974 and the head of the Bureau quit, accusing the Nixon administration of interference with the Agency. Nixon was then removed from office for other reasons. The Turkish and French connections were re-established and Southeast Asia continued to be a significant source of supply. While there are problems from time to time as to who might control the heroin business nevertheless, it is clear, as Prof. Chambliss concludes:

“What is not problematic, however, is the state of this industry: it will continue to thrive, to expand, to reap large profits and to support large numbers of law enforcement people, politicians and specialists in illegal business.”

**“Markets, Profits, Labour and Smack” by William J. Chambliss (1977) 1, Contemporary Crisis – Crime, Law, Social Policy, Number 1, pp. 70 – 75;**

On Wednesday, September 6, 2000, the Vancouver Sun reported the seizure of 99 kilos of heroin in the frame of a container that arrived in Vancouver from China. Simultaneously, another large heroin seizure was made in Toronto, Ontario. The police described that busts as the largest heroin seizures in Canadian history.

**Affidavit of Randall G. Shelden, sworn June 12, 2000, paragraph 3, Exhibit "B";**

**Affidavit of Michael Craig Ruppert, sworn November 26, 1999, generally and, in particular, paragraphs 23 – 34 and the Exhibits attached;**

**"Big Haul", The Vancouver Sun, Wednesday, September 6, 2000, p. A1 and B2.**

86. In Canada, particularly in the western provinces, and most particularly in British Columbia, we enjoyed a large population of Chinese immigrants. Like those who immigrated to the United States, they worked in our mines and particularly on the railroads. When the demand for their labour decreased and we had a labour surplus in the 1900's, there were race riots in Vancouver, Victoria and New Westminster and the Chinese were blamed for stealing jobs from the "white men". MacKenzie King was then our Deputy Minister of Labour and he conducted a Royal Commission of Inquiry into the riots and the labour unrest. In conducting his inquiries, he determined that there were large claims of loss of opium product from Chinese businessmen who operated the opium dens. In the result, MacKenzie King submitted his own separate report to Parliament on the opium narcotic trade in Canada, calling for its suppression because white women were being seduced by "yellow peril" in these opium dens. This resulted in our first Opium Narcotic Act. An examination of the statistics in the **Dominion Annual Review** for that period will show a frequent entry of "Chinamen deported for possession of opium product". This was during the same time frame when there were Poll taxes on the heads of Chinese coming into the country and a thriving business in the smuggling of the Chinese into the country.

**R. Solomon & M. Green, "The First Century: The History of Nonmedical Opiate Use and Control Policies in Canada, 1870-1970" (1982) 20 *University of Western Ontario Law Review* at p. 307;**

**"Drug Offences in Canada", (Second Edition) by Bruce A. MacFarlane.**

### **iii) 1989 – The Renewed War on Drugs – From Reagan to Bush**

87. The new "War on Drugs" was re-declared with appropriate fanfare by **President Bush** in September of 1989, 20 years after Nixon. To lay the

groundwork for the new Drug War then drug czar, **William Bennett**, announced that there had been a remarkable doubling in the frequent use of cocaine since 1985 indicating that there was a continuing epidemic that had far from run its course, that we were faced with “intensifying drug related chaos” and an “appalling, deepening crisis”. A few months later, they announced a new study showing that their national drug strategy was succeeding and that cocaine use was becoming unfashionable. However, upon close examination the **Federal Household Survey** on drug abuse showed that there had been decline of 37% in cocaine use from 1985 to 1988 and the decline in 1989 had simply continued a trend that began in 1985 for cocaine and in 1979 for other illicit drugs and also a decline in alcohol consumption among the elderly although no “War on Alcohol” had been announced. There had been a 24% decline in cocaine use in 1989 before the drug war was declared and this according to the Government’s own figures.

**“The Drug War” by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, pp. 27 – 28.**

88. As Professor Chomsky points out, 70% of the Bush – Bennett drug budget was for law enforcement. Czar Bennett clearly preferred a “get tough” policy over drug education programs. After the murder of Presidential candidate, Luis Carlos Galan, in Columbia, the U.S. Government proposed military aid to Columbia notwithstanding the fact that Alberto Galan, the Presidential candidate’s brother, pointed out that, “the drug dealers core military power lies in the paramilitary groups they have organized with the support of large land owners and military officers”. Apart from strengthening “repressive and anti-democratic forces” Washington’s strategy avoids “the core of the problem” – that is, “the economic ties between the legal and illegal worlds”, the “large financial corporations” that handle the drug money. “It would make more sense to attack and prosecute the few at the top of the drug business rather than fill prisons with thousands of small fish without the powerful financial structure that gives life to the drug market”.

**“The Drug War” by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, p. 28.**

89. When George Bush was the drug czar in the Reagan administration, he was instrumental in terminating the main thrust of the real “War on Drugs”.

Apparently, officials in the Enforcement section of the Treasury Department monitored a sharp increase in the cash inflow to Florida and Los Angeles banks when the cocaine trade boomed in the '70's. They connected it to large scale laundering of drug receipts and brought detailed information about this to the DEA and Justice Departments. The Government launched Operation Greenback in 1979 to prosecute money launderers. It soon foundered because the banking industry was not a proper target for the Drug War. Bush wasn't too interested in financial prosecution and the Reagan administration reduced the limited monitoring. The program was soon defunct and the War took aim at more acceptable targets. While William Bennett raised no questions about the morality of the banks' practices and initiated no inquiries, he did expedite eviction notices for low income, mostly black residents of public housing in Washington where drug use had been reported.

**“The Drug War” by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, pp. 28 – 29;**

**Affidavit of Michael Craig Ruppert, sworn 26 November, 1999, generally and, in particular, paragraphs 23 – 34 and the Exhibits attached.**

#### **iv) U.S. Government complicity**

90. When a drug policy advisor at the **Congressional Research Unit** estimated that more than 90% of the chemicals used to produce cocaine came from the United States and Columbian Police announced that they had seized 1.5 million gallons of such chemicals, many of which displayed U.S. corporate logos, nevertheless the chemical companies did not become targets. The C.I.A. study concluded that the U.S. exports these chemicals to Latin America in amounts that far exceed the legal commercial use requirements and concluded that enormous amounts were being siphoned off to produce heroin and cocaine. Still, most D.E.A. offices have only one agent working on the chemical diversion question so monitoring is impossible.

**“The Drug War” by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, p. 29.**

91. Chomsky also echoes the comments of Professor Chambliss in reference to the C.I.A., as follows:

“The C.I.A. and other U.S. Government agencies have been instrumental in establishing and maintaining the drug rackets since World War II, when Mafia connections were used to split and undermine the French labour unions and the Communist Party, laying the groundwork for the “French Connection” based in Marseilles. The Golden Triangle (Laos, Burma, Thailand) became a major narcotic centre as Chinese Nationalist troops fled the region after their defeat in China and, not long after, as the C.I.A. helped to implement the drug flow as part of its effort to recruit a mercenary “clandestine army” of highland tribesman for its counter-insurgency operations in Laos.”

**“The Drug War” by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, p. 29;**

**See also Affidavit of Michael Craig Ruppert, sworn November 26, 1999, generally and, in particular, paragraphs 23 – 34 and the Exhibits attached, to the same effect.**

92. Chomsky points out that over the years the drug traffic came to involve other U.S. clients as well. He points to the involvement of the **Phillipines** in 1989 as a trans-shipment point for drug syndicates operating in the Golden Triangle to other parts of Asia and the West and the evidence that military officers were involved. Similarly, when the C.I.A. shifted its attention to the terrorist war against **Nicaragua** and the Afghan resistance against Soviet occupation, the effect was the same. Complicity of the Reagan – Bush administration in the drug rackets in **Central America** as part of their Contra support operations is well known. **Pakistan** is reported to have become one of the major international centres for the heroin trade when Afghan manufacturers and dealers were restricted after the 1979 Soviet invasion. The U.S. Government has for several years declined to investigate reports of heroin trafficking by Afghan guerrillas and Pakistani military officers with whom it cooperates. United States officials have received first hand accounts but have failed to investigate or take any action. Similarly U.S. allies in Central America are involved in drug trafficking. The **Costa Rican Legislative Assembly’s Drug Commission** recommended that **Oliver North**, Admiral **John Poindexter**, former Ambassador **Lewis Tambs**, former C.I.A. Station Chief **Joe Fernandez** and General **Richard Secord** “never again be

allowed to enter Costa Rica” as they were blamed for opening the gate for arms and drug trafficking as they illegally organized the “Southern Front” for the Contras in Costa Rica. Oliver North was charged with setting up a supply line with **General Noriega** that brought arms to Costa Rica and drugs to the U.S. In other words, the U.S. Government and its representatives and citizens were directly involved in opening up Costa Rica to trafficking in arms and drugs by the underworld, in part as an excuse to help the Contras.

**“The Drug War” by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, pp. 29 – 30;**

**See also Affidavit of Michael Craig Ruppert, sworn November 26, 1999, generally and, in particular, paragraphs 23 – 34 and the Exhibits attached, to the same effect.**

93. These examples demonstrate how the U.S. Government is complicit in drug trafficking when it suits its purposes and is perfectly satisfied to ignore it when it is convenient to do so. Professor Chomsky notes that there are good reasons why the C.I.A. and drugs are so closely linked. “Clandestine terror requires hidden funds, and the criminal elements to whom the Intelligence agencies naturally turn expect a quid pro quo. Drugs are the obvious answer. Washington’s long term involvement in the drug racket is part and parcel of its international operations, notably during the Reagan – Bush administration. One prime target for an authentic drug war would, therefore, be close at home. These facts are too salient to have been ignored completely, but one has to look well beyond the media to become aware of the scale and significance of the ‘Washington connection’ over many years. The public image conveyed is very different.”

**“The Drug War” by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, pp. 30;**

**See also Affidavit of Michael Craig Ruppert, sworn November 26, 1999, generally and, in particular, paragraphs 23 – 34 and the Exhibits attached, to the same effect.**

v) **Creating and Maintaining ‘the Menace’: Media Complicity, Political Hypocrisy, Free Trade and Fraud**

94. The complicity of the mainstream media and its willingness to unquestionably accept whatever misinformation the White House put out in orchestrating the War on Drugs, particularly under the Bush administration is also apparent. For example:
- a) In 1990, the **New York Times** published an article indicating that Southeast Asia was now the number one source of heroin coming into the United States. It claimed that the U.S. Government had been trying to control this problem for 25 years, namely since 1965. The significance of the year of 1965 was not raised in the story and there is no mention of the role of the United States Government and its clandestine terror agencies in creating and maintaining the problem in the first place. The U.S. is portrayed as a victim and guardian of virtue.
  - b) In 1988, 34% of the American public selected the budget deficit as the topmost priority of President Elect Bush when he was to take office, while only 3% selected drugs as the top priority. After a massive media blitz in 1989, the **Wall Street Journal** reported that 43% of Americans polled selected drugs as the country’s single most important issue while the deficit was selected as a distant second by a mere 6% of the populace.
  - c) A microcosm of these results was also apparent in New York where taxes were selected as the top priority in 1987 by 15% of voters, with drugs considerably down the list at 5%. In September 1989, however, results of a similar poll found taxes selected by 8% while the drug problem was dramatically favoured by a healthy 46% of New York voters. The real world had hardly changed. Its image had, however, as transmitted through the ideological institutions which reflected the current needs for power.
  - d) In addition, the Government - media campaign helped create the required “War” atmosphere among the general public and Congress in order to secure broader benefits and advocate State violence and repression.

**“The Drug War” by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, pp. 30 – 31.**

95. A closer look at the so-called “drug crisis” is instructive. It demonstrates the sheer hypocrisy and fraud of the “Drug War” to the extent that it focuses on illicit drug use as opposed to the consequences of legal drug use and the role of the U.S. Government and U.S. businesses in that regard. While the problem of substance abuse is clearly serious, the real facts behind the problem are as follows:
- a) Deaths attributable to tobacco consumption are estimated at over 300,000 per year. [**Nadelmann**, "Drug Prohibition in the United States: Costs, Consequences and Alternatives," *Science*, September 1, 1989]
  - b) Alcohol causes 50,000 to 200,000 deaths every year. [**Nadelmann**]
  - c) Among 15-24 year olds, alcohol is the leading cause of death and also serves as a 'gateway' drug that leads to the use of others. [**Catherine Foster**, *Christian Science Monitor*, September 18, 1989]
  - d) According to 1985 statistics, 3562 deaths were reported from illegal drug use that year.
  - e) A quick calculation of the above figures derives a quotient of 99% of deaths from substance abuse attributable to tobacco and alcohol.
  - f) There are also enormous health costs of substance abuse, primarily from alcohol and tobacco use. The health costs of the use of marijuana, cocaine and heroin combined amount to a small fraction of those caused by either of the two legal substances, alcohol and tobacco.
  - g) It is also notable that illicit drugs primarily affect the user of the drug, whereas the abuse of legal drugs seriously affects others, including 'passive smokers' and victims of drunken driving and alcohol-induced violence.
    - i) **The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency** estimates that 3800 nonsmokers die every year from lung cancer caused by breathing other people's tobacco smoke.
    - ii) The Environmental Protection Agency suggests that the death toll of passive smokers could be as high as 46,000 per year if heart disease and respiratory ailments are included.



- iii) Government officials indicate that if the above facts are confirmed, the conclusions would require tobacco smoke to be listed as a serious hazardous carcinogen (Class A), along with such chemicals as benzene and radon.
- iv) University of California statistician **Stenton Glantz** describes passive smoking as “the third leading cause of preventable death, behind smoking and alcohol”.
- v) Further, illegal drugs are far from uniform in their effects. Taking marijuana as an example, **Nadelmann** points out that among the roughly 60 million Americans who have smoked marijuana, not one has died from a marijuana overdose. The Federal Drug War has helped to shift drug use from relatively harmless marijuana to far more dangerous drugs.
- h) Even if the official figures are far from the mark, room is left for little doubt that Bennett is correct in speaking of “drug related chaos” and an “appalling, deepening crisis” but this is largely due to alcohol and tobacco consumption, not to illicit drugs.

**“The Drug War” by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, pp. 32 – 33.**

96. Other human and social costs include the victims of drug related crimes and the enormous growth of organized crime which apparently derives more than half its revenues from the drug trade. However, these costs are associated with illicit drugs because they are illicit and not because they are drugs. The same was true during the Prohibition era with respect to alcohol. The question is one of social policy subject to decision and choice. **Nadelmann** advocates legalization and regulation, as does the economist, **Milton Friedman** and others. In response, **William Bennett** points out how alcohol use soared after the repeal of Prohibition and that, therefore, legalization cannot be considered. However, Mr. Bennett obviously does not take his argument seriously because he does not propose the reinstatement of Prohibition or the banning of use of tobacco. His position is that “drug use is wrong” and, therefore, it must be barred. The implicit assumption is that the use of tobacco, and alcohol are not “wrong” on grounds that remain unspoken but the State must prohibit and punish what is “wrong”. In this way, Mr. Bennett portrays himself as a humanist taking a moral stance, insisting on the “difference between right and wrong”. Clearly, it is “wrong” to deceive the public and Mr. Bennett’s position is transparently a sheer fraud.

**“The Drug War” by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, pp. 32 – 33.**

97. The social policies implemented by Washington in relation to legal drugs such as alcohol and tobacco not only contribute substantially to the number of victims of drug use but further illustrate the U.S. Government’s hypocrisy and fraud in the so-called “Drug War”;

a) In September 1989, the **U.S. Trade Representative Panel (USTR)** held a hearing in Washington to consider a tobacco industry request that the U.S. impose sanctions on **Thailand** if it did not agree to drop restrictions on the import of U.S. tobacco. The U.S. Government had already rammed tobacco down the throats of consumers in **Japan, South Korea and Taiwan** resulting in immeasurable human costs from tobacco’s known health risks;

b) **The American Heart Association, American Cancer Society and American Lung Association** criticized this industry request and condemned the cigarette advertising in “countries that have already succumbed to the U.S. Trade Representative (U.S.T.R.) crowbar of trade threats,” and in their campaign that was “patently designed to increase smoking by....young Asian men and women who see U.S. men and women as role models”;

c) **U.S. Surgeon General Everett Koop** testified at the U.S.T.R. panel, stating that:

“When we are pleading with foreign governments to stop the flow of cocaine, it is the height of hypocrisy for the United States to export tobacco....[denouncing the trade policy] to push addicting substances into foreign markets” [regardless of health hazards], “years from now, our nation will look back on this application of free trade policy and find it scandalous”.

**During his eight years in office, Surgeon General Koop** backed reports branding tobacco a lethal, addictive drug responsible for some three hundred thousand deaths a year and opposed the actions of the **Reagan** administration to force Asian countries to import U.S. tobacco;

- d) Thai witnesses protested, predicting that the consequence would be to reverse a decline in smoking achieved by a 15 year campaign against tobacco use. They also noted that U.S. drug trafficking would interfere with Washington's efforts to induce Asian governments to halt the flow of illegal drugs. Responding to the claim of U. S. tobacco companies that their product was the best in the world, a Thai witness indicated that some of their products from the Golden Triangle were also the best in the world but that didn't cause them to invoke principles of free trade to enable them to import them into the United States. Quite the contrary, they moved to suppress them;
- e) The tobacco industry and its protectors in government today invoke similar free trade arguments in support of Western civilization and its historic purpose. The analogy is drawn to the opium war, 150 years ago, when the British Government compelled China to open its door to opium from British India, sanctimoniously pleading the virtues of free trade as they forcefully imposed large-scale drug addiction on the Chinese. It must be recalled that **John Quincy Adams**, a member of the **American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions**, denounced China's refusal to accept British opium as a violation of the Christian principle of "love thy neighbour" and "an enormous outrage upon the rights of human nature, and upon the first principles of the rights of nations".

**"The Drug War" by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, pp. 33 – 34.**

98. While this U.S.T.R. hearing was perhaps the biggest drug story of the day, coming as it did at the peak of the government-media campaign against illicit drugs orchestrated by the White House in September of 1989, nevertheless the story passed virtually unnoticed and without a hint of the obvious conclusion that the U.S. Government is perhaps the world's leading drug peddler, even if we put aside its role in establishing the hard drug racket after World War II and maintaining it ever since.

**"The Drug War" by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, p. 34.**

**"Defying the world – America: The Outlaw State" by Noam Chomsky, August 2000, LeMonde diplomatique, pp. 1 – 3.**

99. The significance of U.S. drug trafficking to the U.S. economy is not trivial. Tobacco exports doubled in annual value in the 1980's contributing nearly \$25 billion to the trade ledger over the decade according to a report of the **Tobacco Merchants Association**, rising from \$2.5 billion in 1980 to \$5 billion in 1989. Tobacco provided a \$4.2 billion contribution to the trade balance for 1989, when the deficit for the year was \$109 billion. Removal of overseas trade barriers, primarily in **Japan, Taiwan** and **South Korea** contributed to the benefits to the U.S. economy from tobacco exports according to the testimony of the President of the **American Farm Bureau Federation**. **Senator Mitch McConnell** of **Kentucky** also took due note of these figures when testifying in support of the tobacco industry at the Senate hearings.

**"The Drug War" by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, p. 34;**

**See also Affidavit of Michael Craig Ruppert, sworn November 26, 1999, generally and, in particular, paragraphs 23 – 34 and the Exhibits attached, to the same effect.**

100. In April of 1990, **Dr. James Mason, Assistant Secretary for Health**, spoke out in opposition to the tobacco exports declaring that it was "unconscionable for the mighty trans-national tobacco companies – and three of them are in the United States – to be peddling their poison abroad, particularly because their main targets are less developed countries". He was scheduled to appear before a congressional hearing a few weeks later on the matter but his appearance was cancelled because the Department said that "the issue was one of trade, not health" and backed away from its past criticism of efforts to open new markets for American cigarettes around the world. Another official criticized Mason's citing of trade figures as "an unwelcome intrusion on the administration's efforts to open new cigarette markets" – particularly in Thailand.

**"The Drug War" by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, p. 34.**

101. **U S. Trade Representative, Carla Hills**, dismissed Thai protests about U.S. imperialists thrusting cancer sticks upon them by saying, "I don't see how health concerns come into the picture if the people are smoking their own cigarettes". [Hilts, *New York Times*, May 18, 1990; **Mary Kay Magistad**, *Boston Globe*, May 31, 1990].

Professor Chomsky notes that the same logic could be applied to the smoking of their own crack cocaine. In the U.S. passion for free trade, it should surely allow the Medellin Cartel to export cocaine freely to the United States, to advertise it to young people without constraint and to market it aggressively.

**"The Drug War" by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, p. 34.**

102. Some others continue to voice objections to the U.S. Government and the hypocritical implications of its drug policy, as follows:
- a) **Peter Bourne**, who was the **Director of the Office of Drug Abuse Policy** in the **Carter** Administration, wrote an open letter to **Colombian** president **Virgilio Barco**:
 

"(P)erhaps nothing so reflects on Washington's fundamental hypocrisy on (the drug) issue as the fact that while it rails against the adverse effects of cocaine in the United States, the number of Colombians dying each year from subsidized North American tobacco products is significantly larger than the number of North Americans felled by Colombian cocaine."
  - b) **The Straits Times** in **Singapore** found it "hard to reconcile the fact that the Americans are threatening trade sanctions against countries that try to keep out U.S. tobacco products" with U.S. efforts to reduce cigarette smoking at home (let alone its efforts to bar the importation of illicit drugs);
  - c) **The American Medical Association** condemned U.S. trade policies that ignore health problems estimating that some 2.5 million excessive or premature deaths per year are attributable to tobacco – about 5% of all deaths;
  - d) At a world conference on lung health in May 1990, former **Surgeon General Everett Koop**, noting that

U.S. tobacco exports had risen 20% the preceding year while smoking dropped 5% in the U.S., again called the export of tobacco “a moral outrage” and denounced it as “the height of hypocrisy” to call on other governments to stop the export of cocaine “while at the same time we export nicotine, a drug just as addictive as cocaine, to the rest of the world”. He pointed out that the government in **Taiwan** had been able to cut smoking drastically by an anti-smoking campaign until **Washington** threatened trade sanctions in 1987, leading to a 10% increase.

- e) **Congressman Chester Atkins** at a news conference said, “America better stop being a drug pusher if we expect to have any credibility in our war on drugs”.
- f) **Public Health Experts** warned of a “global epidemic” from tobacco related deaths as a result of a surge in sales overseas which now comprise one-sixth of U.S. production. These officials predicted that the death toll would rise to 12 million annually by the mid 21<sup>st</sup> century.

**“The Drug War” by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, p. 34 and 35.**

103. Recently, the Vancouver Sun and Ottawa Citizen has published a special series entitled “How America Dictates the Global War on Drugs” by Dan Gardiner. Mr. Gardiner commenced his series by pointing out how some 800 philosophers, scientists and statesmen on June 6, 1998, delivered a letter to the United Nations’ Secretary General, Kofi Annan, asserting that the global War on Drugs was by this causing more harm than drug abuse itself. Among those signing the letter included former U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar; George Schultz, a former American Secretary of State; Joycelyn Elders, a former American Surgeon General; Nobel Laureates Milton Friedman, Adolfo Perez Esquivel, John Polanyi and Gunter Grass; 4 former Presidents and 7 former Cabinet Ministers from Latin American countries and several eminent Canadians, including Senator Sharon Carstairs and Body Shop founder, Anita Roddick, author Stephen J. Gould and Canadian author and urban planning critic, Jane Jacobs and Toronto lawyer, Edward Greenspan, Q.C. Gardiner goes on to point out that this group, nevertheless, constitutes a minority and that the approach of the United States still has many reporters. Gardiner reviews the history of the drug war from the early years to the present and

cites numerous examples of American policies and pressure tactics on other countries, including the direct intervention in 1996 in Australia and, in particular in the State of Tasmania, when Australia was considering a series of heroin maintenance trials for its addicts. The U.S. threatened the Tasmanian opium poppy industry if the trials were to proceed. While Australian Government Commissions still recommended that the heroin trials proceed, it was the lobbying from the frightened poppy industry and the Government of Tasmania that ultimately caused the Australian Federal Cabinet to not go ahead. Gardiner reviews the many similar interventions in Latin America and notes that the 1998 protest letter was also signed by the former Presidents of Columbia and Costa Rica. Fierce attacks on the Dutch policies in Holland by General Barry McCaffrey are also documented, including outright lies. Gardiner further points out how the U.S. controls the main bodies of the United Nations involved in international drug control, namely the International Narcotics Control Board (INCB) and the United Nations International Drug Control Program (UNDCP). In 1999, the INCB made the same threats towards the Tasmanian opium poppy industry, as made by the U.S. State Department in 1996, only this time it was to prevent Australia from creating safe injection sights for heroin addicts. It is clear that the INCB is being led by U.S. State Department policy. The suppression of the world health organization report on cocaine by the UNDCP illustrates the U.S. control and influence over that U.N. body. Mr. Gardiner also extensively investigates and reports on the situation in Columbia and particularly the new “plan Columbia” and its consequences and the repeated failure of U.S. driven United Nations crop eradication program and the economics of the market place, including the significant impact on the environment from the crop eradication approach.

**“How America Dictates The Global War On Drugs” a series by Dan Gardner, the Vancouver Sun, September 2000.**

Mr. Gardiner also points out how these drug control efforts have caused the cartels to merely shift their basis of operations and what effect this has had in recent times on Mexico, leading to a situation which is now described by many as far worse than prohibition in the 1920’s as evidenced by far more killings than during that period and massive amounts of corruption throughout the country.

104. In **England**, a multi-million dollar marketing drive by **British American Tobacco** (BAT) to sell cheap and highly addictive cigarettes in **Africa** with levels of tar and nicotine far above those permitted in the West, was exposed in the media. The Company told the head of the country’s medical services that it didn’t believe that cigarette smoking was harmful to health and essentially didn’t want to limit its potential to export to

countries that didn't require a health warning on the packs. A British cancer specialist described the situation in the Third World as similar to what existed at the time of the Opium Wars when one in ten men was dying of lung cancer. He estimated that in China alone 50 million of today's children will die of tobacco related diseases.

**“The Drug War” by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, p. 35.**

105. U.S. social policy further contributes to the “drug crisis”. While U.S. farmers can easily be encouraged to produce crops other than tobacco, the same is not true for Latin American peasants who have far fewer options. They have to turn to cocaine production for survival as subsistence agriculture and profits from traditional exports declined. For example, in **Columbia**, in July of 1988 as a result of U.S. actions based on alleged fair trade violations, the international coffee agreement was suspended leading to a fall of 40% in coffee prices within two months. Similarly, the **U.S. “Food for Peace” program** undermines domestic crops production which cannot compete with subsidized U.S. exports. Official U.S. policy encourages Latin American countries to consume U.S. surplus and to only produce specialized crops for the U.S. market. According to the **Council on Hemispheric Affairs**, “only economic growth in Latin America, the promotion of financing of alternate legal crops and a decrease in U.S. demand will provide a viable alternative” to cocaine production.

**“The Drug War” by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, p. 35 and 36;**

**“Interview with Noam Chomsky”, High Times Magazine, April 1998.**

106. U.S. social policy at home further contributes to the problem. While U.S. demand for illegal drugs amongst the middle class is apparently decreasing, the story in the inner city is quite different. Restoring U.S. global dominance by a tax on labour to restore corporate profit, stagnation of wages since 1973, a shift in employment to highly skilled labour or service jobs that are dead end and low paying, contributed towards the creation of a two-tiered society with a large underclass where drug trafficking provides profits for ghetto entrepreneurs that have few other



alternative options and provides temporary relief from a hopeless and despairing existence amongst the drug consumers.

**“The Drug War” by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, p. 36;**

**“Interview with Noam Chomsky”, High Times Magazine, April 1998.**

107. The **Reagan** and **Bush** administration by contributing to the growth and punishment of the underclass has helped create the current crisis. The current “Drug War” may well exacerbate the crisis. proposal to pay for the costs of his drug plan included the elimination of almost \$100 million from public housing subsidies and a juvenile justice program. The **National Centre on Budget Priorities** estimated that the program would remove \$400 million from social programs. This will lead to an increase in the misery of the poor, along with the demand for drugs and the construction of prisons for the superfluous population.

**“The Drug War” by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, p. 36;**

**“Interview with Noam Chomsky”, High Times Magazine, April 1998.**

108. The U.S. military aid program to **Columbia** illustrates other facets of the U.S. “Drug War”. It has been clearly documented that this aid supports “murderous and repressive elements” of the military with ties to the drug business and landowners. The funds contribute to counter-insurgency operations and the destruction of popular organizations. This substantial aid to the Columbian military was first made in September of 1989. Shortly after the media announcement, the **Andean Commission of Jurists** published a report on the Columbian military entitled, “**Excesses in the Anti-Drug War Effort**”. This report pointed out how the military had ransacked grass root organization headquarters, the homes of political leaders and had ordered many arrests. The **Columbian Department of Security Administration** (DAS) apparently ransacked the homes of peasants, arrested labourers, searched houses principally of members of the **Patriotic Union** and the **Communist Party**. Activists and civic leaders were arrested in poor neighbourhoods. Two union leaders and one attorney were assassinated and another disappeared. Many leaders received death threats. Three members of the **National**

**Organization of Indigenous People** were murdered. These incidents, occurring at the time that **President Bush** pledged U.S. aid, were not brought to the attention of the American public or taxpayers who were funding the program. Instead, publicity was given to the arrest in September of 28 people charged with being leftist guerrillas, working with the drug cartel. These assertions were made against the Popular Education Institute (IPC). What was not reported were the conclusions of the **Andean Commission of Jurists** that stated that these charges against the IPC are “clearly a set-up by the military forces which are looking to discredit the popular work (of) the IPC, which was a community based organization working in popular education, training and human rights”. According to the **Columbian section of the Andean Commission**, the staff, workers and the Director were held incommunicado and tortured.

**“The Drug War” by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, pp. 37 & 38.**

109. The **Columbian Human Rights Committee** in Washington reported increasing harassment of popular organizations as new aid flowed to the military in the name of the “War on Drugs”. Others have warned of these consequences as the U.S. consolidates its links with the **Columbian** and **Peruvian** military. Similar events, though not on as great a scale, have occurred in **Bolivia**. Little of this makes its way into the U.S. mainstream media, given the U.S. government support by the contribution of substantial funds. On the other hand, **Alfredo Vasquez Carrizosa**, president of the **Columbian Permanent Committee for Human Rights** has pointed out that Columbia is still a militarized society behind the façade of a constitutional regime that has suffered from extensive violence since the 40’s and 50’s. As Mr. Carrizosa states, “This violence has been caused not by any massive indoctrination but by the dual structure of a prosperous minority and an impoverished, excluded majority, with great differences in wealth, income and access to political participation”. He notes, however, in addition to these internal factors, violence has been exacerbated by external factors referring in particular to the 1960’s **Kennedy administration** that took great pains to transform the regular armies into counterinsurgency brigades which led to the “**National Security Doctrine**” which made the military the masters in Latin America. This gave the military the right to combat the “internal enemy” which has resulted in the extermination of social workers, trade unionist and other men and women who are not supportive of the Columbian establishment.

**“The Drug War” by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, p. 38.**

111. On the first anniversary of the Drug War, the **House Government Operations Committee** released a study concluding that the U.S. anti-drug efforts had made virtually no headway in disrupting the cocaine trade in **Peru** and **Bolivia** largely because of “corruption” in the armed forces of both countries. It is now well known that the “drug dealers” core military power lies in paramilitary groups that have organized with the support of large landowners and military officers that are the beneficiaries of U.S. aid.

**“The Drug War” by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, p. 38.**

112. Professor Chomsky notes that the “domestic enemy” in the U.S. is just as likely to be subjected to the same kind of treatment as the poor abroad. The general commitments of neo-conservatism leads the Drug War to seek to undermine civil liberties with a broad range of measures such as random searches based on police suspicion, aimed primarily at young blacks and Hispanics. This attack on civil rights only arouses some concern when it starts to shift away from the underclass to include “middle-class whites who are casual drug users”, citing an article by **John Dillin** entitled, “Nations’ Liberties At Risk?” appearing in the Christian Science Monitor, February 2, 1990.

**“The Drug War” by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, p. 38;**

**See also Affidavit of Michael Craig Ruppert, sworn November 26, 1999, generally, to the same effect;**

**See also Affidavit of Randall G. Shelden, sworn June 12, 2000, generally.**

113. When the Bush Drug War plan was announced, the **American Civil Liberties Union** branded it a “hoax” and a strategy that was “not simply unworkable” but “counterproductive and cynical”. As Professor Chomsky

asserts, if the true intent was to stop the drug trafficking, then the civil liberties union would be correct. However, if the objective of the War is population control and the pursuit of traditional U.S. policy goals, then the strategy has some logic to it. However, as he continues to note, the short term successes of the drug war are unlikely to persist as the propaganda system will probably be unable to maintain the proper attitudes amongst the populations for a long period of time. Fundamental social and economic problems cannot be swept under the rug for ever. The temporarily convenient program of punishing the underclass carries serious potential costs for interests that really count in corporate circles. To quote **Brad Butler, former chairman of Proctor and Gamble** – “a third world within our own country” will harm business interests.

**“The Drug War” by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, p. 40;**

**See also Affidavit of Michael Craig Ruppert, sworn November 26, 1999, generally and, in particular, paragraphs 23 – 34 and the Exhibits attached, to the same effect;**

**See also Affidavit of Randall G. Shelden, sworn June 12, 2000, generally.**

114. Regretfully, in the year 2000, the U.S. continues the same approach. In June, 2000, the U.S. Senate voted to spend about \$1 billion dollars on military assistance to the Columbian army under the banner of the anti-drug war. This was raised by the House of Representatives to \$1.3 billion. The “**Plan Columbia**”, as it is called, is apparently an open-ended commitment to throw huge quantities of U.S. military hardware and know-how into a short, sharp fix for the drug epidemic. In theory, this will enable the Columbian army to clean out the vast coca plantations supposedly controlled by insurgent armed forces controlling large parts of the country. According to **Julian Borger**, reporting in The Guardian Weekly **June 29 – July 5, 2000**, it is expected that the European Union States are going to match or better the U.S. donations. According to Borger, there is an overwhelming consensus that this plan will do very little good and probably a lot of harm and no one thinks that it will reduce the number of drug addicts in the U.S. or Europe or make Columbia a less murderous place except, of course, those in the offices of the U.S. anti-drug czar, **General Barry McCaffrey**, and his European counterparts. Apparently a recent **Rand Corporation** study concluded that each dollar spent on the treatment of addicts in the drug markets of **Washington, London or Paris**

was as effective in containing the hard drug epidemic as ten dollars spent chasing the narco-traffickers in the jungle.

**Guardian Weekly, June 29 – July 5, 2000, “US sidesteps its drug problem with \$1.3bn military fix in Columbia” by Julian Borger.**

115. Mr. Borger quotes outgoing **Columbian police chief, General Rosso José Serrano**, a respected veteran in the Drug War, who apparently stated just before his retirement, “We’d rather see drug consumption drop than get any of this aid. If demand for drugs could be curtailed, Columbia could go back to what it once was, a place that grew coffee, where people worked hard and sweated for a paycheck”.

**Guardian Weekly, June 29 – July 5, 2000, “US sidesteps its drug problem with \$1.3bn military fix in Columbia” by Julian Borger.**

116. An attempt by United States’ **Senator Paul Wellstone** to divert \$225,000,000.00 of the military aid Bill to domestic substance abuse programs was defeated by a vote of 89 to 11.

**Guardian Weekly, June 29 – July 5, 2000, “US sidesteps its drug problem with \$1.3bn military fix in Columbia” by Julian Borger.**

117. As Borger points out, a lot of the money is designed to help the army spray herbicides on drug plantations but, as in the past, the herbicides will inevitably poison all crops including those that the farmers have been encouraged to produce by foreign aid programs. Fumigation will also poison water, food and soil and frequently the coca plant is the last one standing because it is a resistant plant. Victims of this program will then become willing guerrilla fighters or refugees.

**Guardian Weekly, June 29 – July 5, 2000, “US sidesteps its drug problem with \$1.3bn military fix in Columbia” by Julian Borger.**

118. Borger notes, that it is well known that while the enemy is portrayed in Washington as the “narco-terrorist” the real target is the **FARC (Revolutionary Armed Forces of Columbia)** and the **National Liberation Army (ELN)**. Because they tax all businesses in the regions that they control, they thrive on the cocaine producers but apparently remain distant from that industry that helps sustain them. FARC has been demanding fundamental land reform and income redistribution but that is unacceptable to the political groups in Bogotá. The war will apparently

unlikely do more than simply inconvenience the drug barons who will shift production as circumstances dictate.

**Guardian Weekly, June 29 – July 5, 2000, “US sidesteps its drug problem with \$1.3bn military fix in Columbia” by Julian Borger.**

119. Borger confirms that much of Columbia’s cocaine is produced under the patronage of right wing paramilitary groups sponsored by large land owners and the army who are responsible for three quarters of the country’s human rights violations, according to U.S. and Columbian estimates. It is very unlikely that these paramilitaries will be on the receiving end of the war. As Borger points out, the real logic behind “**Plan Columbia**” is in Washington because in a year where there is a U.S. election, no one wants to be labelled soft on drugs and addiction treatment centres are portrayed as mere pandering to drug fiends. The other significant factor is the jockeying between lobbyists of military hardware, such as helicopters, to ensure that their products are purchased by this government plan thereby substantially contributing to U.S. corporate profits.

**Guardian Weekly, June 29 – July 5, 2000, “US sidesteps its drug problem with \$1.3bn military fix in Columbia” by Julian Borger.**

120. As **Professor Chomsky** says at the commencement of his essay:

“To fit the part, a menace must be grave, or at least portrayable as such. Defense against the menace must engender a suitable martial spirit among the population, which must accord its rulers free rein to pursue policies motivated on other grounds and must tolerate the erosion of civil liberties, a side benefit of particular importance for the statist reactionaries who masquerade as conservatives. Furthermore, since the purpose is to divert attention away from power and its operations – from federal offices, corporate boardrooms, and the like – a menace for today should be remote: “the other”, very different from “us”, or at least what we are trained to aspire to be. The designated targets should also be weak enough to be attacked without cost; the wrong color helps as well. In short, the menace should be situated in the Third World, whether abroad or in the inner city at home. The war against the menace should also be designed to be winnable, a precedent for future operations. A crucial requirement for the entire effort is that the media launch a properly structured propaganda campaign, never a problem.”

**“The Drug War” by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, p. 27;**

**See also Affidavit of Michael Craig Ruppert, sworn November 26, 1999, generally;**

**See also Affidavit of Randall G. Sheldon, sworn June 12, 2000, generally.**

121. It follows that the American “War on Drugs” is merely a tool used by the government elites for the purpose of serving their own ends. The main purposes of this drug war are neither the humanitarian goal of protecting health nor that of deterring crime. This effort is a means to serve the governmental ends of controlling the American population and redirecting public attention from matters of legitimate social concern toward this fanciful conception as a means of boosting public support for the government of the day. Furthermore, this effort is a means of controlling other countries based on an intrusive foreign policy designed to ensure American economic dominance.

**“Interview with Noam Chomsky”, High Times Magazine, April 1998;**

**Affidavit of Harold Michael Gray, sworn March 28, 2000, paragraphs 2 and 3 and Exhibit “B”, his book, “Drug Crazy: How we got Into This Mess and How We Can Get Out”.**

122. For U.S. elites, the easing of Cold War tensions was a mixed blessing. Problems arose in controlling the ever-threatening public at home and maintaining influence over the allies, who are now credible rivals in terms of economic power and ahead in the project of adapting the new Third World to their needs.

**“Interview with Noam Chomsky”, High Times Magazine, April 1998.**

123. Peace threatens the regular resort to the military Keynesian programs that have served as the major device of state economic management through the post war years. A capital intensive and high tech military will ensure a big business out there for industry, but is difficult to convince the American public to pay the costs without a plausible **Red Menace** on the horizon. **“Peace scares”** have given rise to uneasiness and anxiety from the early days of the Cold War. Unless driven by fear, the public will neither choose

the path that serves corporate interests nor support foreign adventures undertaken to subordinate the Third World to the same demands.

**“Interview with Noam Chomsky”, High Times Magazine, April 1998;**

**See also Affidavit of Michael Craig Ruppert, sworn November 26, 1999, generally;**

**See also Affidavit of Randall G. Sheldon, sworn June 12, 2000, generally.**

124. Problems of social control mount in so far as the state is limited in its capacity to coerce. It is hardly a law of nature that a few should command while the multitude obey; that the economy should be geared to ensuring luxuries for some instead of necessities for all; or that the fate of future generations be dismissed as irrelevant to planning. The general populace, therefore, must be indoctrinated or diverted in their thinking.

**“Interview with Noam Chomsky”, High Times Magazine, April 1998.**

125. Engendering a fear of a threatening enemy has always been a powerful tool used to divert public attention. **“Human rights”** has been used in this way to give credence to America’s invasive foreign policy.

“(H)uman rights have served to legitimize a part of the nation’s post-Vietnam foreign policy and to give policy a sense of purpose that apparently has been needed to elicit public support....(T)he simple truth (is) that human rights is(sic) little more than a refurbished version of America’s historic purpose of advancing the cause of freedom in the world undertaken in defense of a free people resisting communist aggression.”

**Robert Tucker “Reagan’s Foreign Policy”, *Foreign Affairs, America and the World* (1988 – 89).**

126. In the **Reagan years**, a quest for ‘democracy worldwide’ was used as a means of American population control; giving America a “right of intervention” [Tucker] against illegitimate governments. Illegitimate governments have always, and exclusively, been those without a commitment to democracy. This explains the lack of American intervention in countries such as **South Korea, Malaysia, South Africa, or El Salvador**. These countries are committed to democracy in the operative meaning of the term. This term refers to unchallenged rule by elite elements (business, oligarch, military) that generally respect the



interests of U.S. intervention, with appropriate forms for occasional ratification by segments of the public (and when these conditions are not satisfied, the American government does perceive intervention as legitimate to 'restore democracy).

**“The Drug War” by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, generally.**

127. Through means such as skilful manipulation of human rights concerns and a finely tuned ‘yearning for democracy’ the ideological institutions have labored to reconstruct the image of benevolence. The complementary task has always been to reconstruct the climate of fear. Previously, bewailing the triumphs of the Soviet enemy marching from strength to strength conquering the world, building a huge military system to overwhelm the United States accomplished this. In retrospect, however, it is evident that such reports of Soviet aggression were inflated.

“It is now clear that the gravity of developments in 1980 was exaggerated”.

**Robert Tucker “Reagan’s Foreign Policy”, *Foreign Affairs, America and the World* (1988 – 89).**

128. In a careful reanalysis of the data, economist **Franklyn Holzman** concludes that the ratio of **Soviet** military expenditures to GNP scarcely changed after 1970 and the total appears to be considerably less than US expenditures.

“The Soviet military spending gap, like the ‘bomber gap’ of the 1950’s and the ‘missile gap’ of the 1960’s turns out to be a myth.”

**Holzman, “Politics and Guesswork: CIA and DIA estimates of Soviet Military Spending,” *International Security* (Fall 1989).**

129. From the early years of the Cold War, the real menace has been “Soviet Political aggression” (**Eisenhower**) and what **Adlai Stevenson** and others called “internal aggression”. This understanding was common among rational planners, which is not to deny that they readily convinced themselves that Soviet hordes were on the march when such doctrines were useful for other ends. Part of the concern over the fading of the Soviet threat is that the appropriate images can no longer be conjured up

when we must again rush to the defense of privileged sectors against internal aggression. In the early **Reagan years**, the Soviet threat was manipulated for the twin goals of Third World intervention and entrenching the welfare state for the privileged. With the demise of the Soviet Union as a threat to democracy, a new threat was badly needed to keep the population on course. Such a menace was found in the drug trade.

**“The Drug War” by Noam Chomsky in Questioning Prohibition, 1994 International Report on Drugs, International Anti-Prohibitionists League taken from ch. 4 of Deterring Democracy, 1991, by Noam Chomsky, generally;**

**“Interview with Noam Chomsky”, High Times Magazine, April 1998;**

**See also Affidavit of Michael Craig Ruppert, sworn November 26, 1999, generally;**

**See also Affidavit of Randall G. Shelden, sworn June 12, 2000, generally;**

**See also Affidavit of Harold Michael Gray, sworn March 28, 2000, paragraphs 2 and 3 and Exhibit “B”, his book, “Drug Crazy: How we got Into This Mess and How We Can Get Out”.**

130. In a recent article entitled **“Shield against a fearful world”**, **Peter Preston**, writing in **The Guardian Weekly**, echoed Professor Chomsky’s perspective in writing about the proposed new missile defense system (NMD). Mr. Preston points out what an appalling waste of money the program is and how that money could help the third world of Africa or, more pertinently, the third world tension simmering near social explosion in the American urban ghetto. He points out how most of us have spent our lives living with threat, referring to the Cold War, and how it became a defining theme of political life. “It became a cast of mind, a framework for existence”. He goes on to point out that “the business of disengaging from threat is hardest of all for the United States, where threat is a way of life and where sacrifice to counter that threat has been the refrain of every presidency for 60 years”.

**The Guardian Weekly, June 8 – 14, 2000, “Shield against a fearful world”, June 29 – July 5, 2000, by Peter Preston, p. 12.**

131. After commenting on the power of the military industrial complex and how its spending program is designed to assist American industry and jobs and

the effect of elections on this process, he notes that, nevertheless, it doesn't tell the whole story. As he points out:

“Something deeper than that has burned into the American psyche through the long, cold years. Threat equals sacrifice – equals a way of life. Without that feeling of sacrifice (real or imagined) the pattern of life itself seems in question. All the easy stuff about world leadership and solitary super powerdom doesn't resonate unless there are dark forces to challenge such hegemony. Therefore, there has to be a threat.”

**The Guardian Weekly, June 8 – 14, 2000, “Shield against a fearful world”, by Peter Preston, p. 12.**

132. The following week, **Hugo Young** also writing in **The Guardian**, informed us via the leak from **Theodore Postol**, a professor at **Massachusetts Institute of Technology**, who worked on the anti-missile defense system in the Reagan administration, that he had examined the \$60 billion NMD proposition and denounced previous tests as being fraudulent and that the upcoming tests were designed not to fail. Apparently, Mr. Postol obtained data that showed that the tests were rigged. He was quoted in the **New York Times** as saying, “Officials [were] systematically lying about the performance of a weapon system that is supposed to defend the people of the U.S. from nuclear attack...They've been caught in one outright lie after another”.

**The Guardian Weekly, June 22 – 28, 2000, “Secrets of Washington's nuclear madness revealed – leaks blow a hole in missile defence claims”, by Hugo Young, p. 12.**

133. As Mr. Young points out in the same article, while we would have expected that the world was supposed to be safer with no big enemy after the Cold War, it apparently turns out that the nuclear threat has not changed because instead of reducing its nuclear plans, the U.S. has increased its nuclear targets. While they used to be focused on **Russia**, they have been expanded to take in **China, Iran, Iraq and North Korea**. The source of this information came principally from **Bruce Blair**, a twenty-five year specialist in strategic operations that was once a missile launch officer in strategic air command who published classified details from the war plan in the **New York Times**.

**The Guardian Weekly, June 22 – 28, 2000, “Secrets of Washington's nuclear madness revealed – leaks blow a hole in missile defence claims”, by Hugo Young, p. 12.**

134. To return to the current “Drug War” threat and the U.S. Government’s latest chapter, namely “**Plan Columbia**”. As **Duncan Campbell** reported in **The Guardian Weekly**, “**Drugs in the firing line**”, **July 27 – August 2, 2000**, **General Barry McCaffrey**, the current drug czar, is leading the charge. He apparently recently appeared on B.B.C. television in a documentary about Columbia and claimed that the “greatest threat” to human rights in Columbia was the F.A.R.C. and that it posed “a huge threat, not only for its neighbours but also the U.S.”. Mr. Campbell points out that this is nonsense in that all the human rights reports, whether from the United Nations or the United States own State Department, indicate that the “greatest threat” to human rights is posed by the far right paramilitaries that are linked to the Columbian military. While officially the money is to be used for weapons and helicopters to attack the coca and opium poppy fields, unofficially it is well known that the military hardware will be used in an attempt to destroy the F.A.R.C. Duncan Campbell points out that the real problem in Columbia is poverty. If the **U.S. Libertarian party** won the presidency and formed the Government of the United States, it has announced that its first act, if elected, would be to pardon every non-violent drug offender and the money saved from this act would go along way to addressing Columbia’s real concerns. Mr. Campbell opened his article by pointing out that the United States is currently holding 400,000 prisoners of war in jails across the United States and that most of them have “never picked up a weapon or threatened anyone”. As he ironically points out, the civil war in Columbia will have one side funded by the U.S. taxpayer and the other side funded by the U.S. drug taker.

**The Guardian Weekly** , **July 27 – August 2, 2000**, “**Drugs in the firing line**”, by **Duncan Campbell**, p. 11.