

which to understand the implications of the proposal by this old fascist, Milton Friedman, to legalize drugs. This is warfare against the very existence of our nation. It is the destruction of the minds of the users. It is the destruction of our youth. It is the targeting of those dark-skinned, brown-skinned Americans whom some white-skinned Americans think are breeding too numerous; therefore, let them get rid of themselves with drugs, such as crack, which is moving from its original target, the black and brown youth of the ghettos, into the youth of the WASP communities and others.

The question of legalization of drugs, or the proposal to legalize drugs, by some people, is an attempt to further the effect intended by Mao Zedong, by Khrushchov, by Andropov as head of the KGB in 1967, and by other enemies of the United States and Western civilization. This proposal to legalize drugs is a declaration of war against humanity. Those who propose it must be likened to the mass murderers and

their fellow travelers, because that is in fact what they are doing. It would be mass murder.

So the question of the war on drugs is not whether we can win. The question is, either we win it, or there is no United States, there is no humanity, there is no future; and those who think otherwise have simply got to get out of the way, and let those of us who are prepared to fight the war on drugs, at last, be free to do our job as we know how to do it. If that occurs, we shall win.

So let us put aside these sophistries of "there's no difference between cocaine and alcohol," and that type of nonsense. Get rid of that nonsense, those lies, those cheap tricks, those sociologist's tricks, those sophist's tricks. We are not going to see our civilization, and possibly the futures of our great grandchildren, destroyed by a few idiots who are so stupid that they think that Milton Friedman is an intelligent person, on this issue and other issues.

## Legalizers gloat at Bush drug policy

Spokesmen for the drug legalization movement continue to tell journalists that they see a move toward rejection of the Bush administration's cosmetic anti-drug program, and they intend to turn this into support for the cause of legalization.

Kevin Zeese, speaking for the Drug Policy Foundation, said that he sees the administration boxing itself into increasingly "extremist" positions in order to justify its anti-drug campaign (i.e., in order to preserve Bush's millimeter-thin anti-drug "image.") Zeese commented that "they have accomplished what they set out to do, which was to increase the number of arrests, convictions, and seizures," and in addition to virtually paralyzing the criminal justice system, "cocaine prices are down, shipments are up, and now we have crack."

Not that the Bush administration has ever been serious about fighting drugs. Under the terms of the Bush-Gorbachov alliance, the strategic role of the drug trade in international conflict between East and West is being covered up, limiting all serious anti-drug efforts from the outset. Administration actions, no matter how militaristic or violent, can never actually hit nations like China, the Soviet Union, and Syria. That lack of commitment is eminently clear in the administration's refusal to give adequate funding to real anti-drug effort.

The big crunch on local officials is due to hit during

the current round of federal budget negotiations, gloated Zeese. State officials are being told that federal assistance for various programs will be cut unless they rigidly conform to the administration's own guidelines. Since the implementation of many of these programs requires expenditure of local revenues with little federal assistance, state officials are balking. Drug Policy Adviser William Bennett has been telling cash-strapped state officials that they will have to bear 80-90% of the law enforcement costs of the drug war. Bennett has faced his own, similar problem in his attempts to win financing from the budget-crazed cabinet, where Budget Director Richard Darman has been a leading opponent of Bennett, according to the Nov. 30 *Wall Street Journal*.

Zeese pointed to hearings on legalization which have taken place in New Hampshire and New York as signals of future support for legalization. He claimed that many state governors are privately in support of legalization, but are waiting for the issue to become more acceptable before stating so publicly. Drug Policy Foundation assessments on this issue are usually very reliable.

William Bennett himself has admitted that the will to fight the drug battle is seriously eroded at the state and local government level (although not among private citizens), and told reporters that he is "worried that people are going to give up and say, 'The hell with it.'" Bennett continued, "I'm mad, I'm frustrated, I'm worried. I'm concerned about the leadership. Some of the people who say they speak for Americans, be it at the state or federal level, are going to lose interest in this." He said that congressional and state leaders, in his estimation, "lacked the will, the patience—and maybe the stomach" to fight the drug battle.