

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Turner, Carlton E.: Files
Folder Title: [Administration Drug Policy –
September 1981]
Box: 5

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

MEMORANDUM

COPY

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

FILED

082574PI
H11111-0
FG00000

September 14, 1981

SEP 15 1981

To: Martin C. Anderson
Edwin J. Gray

Thru: Ron Frankum

From: ^{out} Carlton E. Turner
Daniel Leonard

- Drug Administration Office

Subject: Proposed Major Points for This Administration's Drug Policy.

1. Elimination of Drugs at the Source.
2. Strong Enforcement and Modification of Drug Laws.
3. Prevention and Education.
4. Treatment, Rehabilitation and Research.

Review SCRIPT

JA FE MR AP MY (JE) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25
JY AG SP OC NV DC 26 27 28 29 30 31

76 (77) A 1 2 3 4
78 79 (B) (5) 6 7 8

the-propaganda campaign-to-sell the-idea-that-it-isn't? In my own opinion,
it's rather obvious; decriminalization ^{isn't} leads to legalization and legalization
leads to commercialization. Already a number of marijuana trade names have

(of marijuana)

Marijuana

RAVING SCRIPT

JA FE MR AP MY (JE) 1 2 3 4 5 (6) 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 76 (77) A 1 2 3 4
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25
JY AG SP OC NV DC 26 27 28 29 30 31 78 79 (B) (5) 6 7 8

A few days ago I was approached by several young men who wanted to know my stand on marijuana. They frankly told me they were users ranging from pretty regular by one to now-and-then by the others. Just as frankly I gave my opinion that it was definitely harmful to health and probably represented a dangerous threat to an entire generation.

Marijuana

✓
 _____ RADIO SCRIPT
 _____ NEWSPAPER COLUMN
 _____ CFTR NEWSLETTER COLUMN
 _____ SPEECH
 _____ INTERVIEW
 _____ STATEMENT
 _____ PRESS CONFERENCE

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|------|----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|
| JA | FE | MR | AP | MY | JE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 75 | 76 | A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| JL | AG | SP | OC | NV | DC | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 77 | 78 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | (79) | 80 | (B) | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | | | | | | | |

~~danger of cancer from smoking tobacco~~, should give an ~~pot smoker pause to think~~. The
 smoke from burning marijuana contains many more cancer causing substances than tobacco.
 And, if that isn't enough, it leads to bronchitis and emphysema.

If adults want to take such chances, that's their business. But surely the commu-
 nications media and those public figures whose words get some attention should let the
 four million youngsters I talked about earlier know what they are risking when they
 light up a "joint" and pass it around because they think it's the in-thing to do.

Marijuana

RADIO SCRIPT

JA FE MR AP MY (JE) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (11) 12 13 14 76 77 A (1) 2 3 4
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25
JY AG SP OC NV DC 26 27 28 29 30 31 78 (79) (B) 5 6 7 8

~~to driving while high on pot.~~ I myself have had young people tell me they are actually better drivers when they've been smoking marijuana.

They are living in a dream world and that's not just a figure of speech. They think they are driving better but actual research has discovered their vision, memory span, attention, skill and tracking ability are all impaired. They imagine they are holding a steady course in the proper lane when in truth they are weaving from one lane to another.

Marijuana

for future negotiations. I don't know whether we will get down to hard issues and make any settlements in a first meeting of this kind, but we'll certainly lay the groundwork for trying to eliminate anything that could divide us or remain a stumbling block to better relations. This is part of what I talked about all during the campaign, from my first announcement on, and that is to start here in the Western Hemisphere with building an accord between the three great countries of North America—Canada, the United States, and Mexico.

So, I'm sure that all of these things will be out on the table when we get there, but we'll set an agenda for trying to resolve them.

Donna Smith [Oil Daily].

CANADIAN OIL PRODUCTION

Q. Mr. President, the Canadian Government has an energy plan calling for 50 percent Canadianization of oil interests in that country and also added taxation of their production. It's a plan that has caused some shift of production from Canada, I mean, of exportation from Canada to the United States. What will you be advising Mr. Trudeau next week when you visit with him on that plan? And how is it going to affect U.S. investments in that country?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, again, I think—I wish you were asking me this after we'd had the meeting. Things of this kind I would rather not state a case in advance. These are things that I would want to take up when I get there and see how we can, as I say, set an agenda for getting them resolved.

With regard to energy, I am determined that the proper goal for us must be energy independence in the United States, not that we would take advantage of either

of our neighbors there with regard to energy supplies.

Q. May I follow that up? Would you advise Mr. Trudeau to follow in your footsteps and speed up decontrol of oil and gasoline in that country as you have done here?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, there's a little touchy ground in a first meeting to try and advise somebody how to run their country. I don't know that I'll do that. I might talk about what we've done.

Forrest Boyd [International Media Service].

DRUG ABUSE PROGRAMS

Q. Mr. President, in light of what appears to be a growing concern about the drug abuse problem, especially among teenagers, what will your priorities be and specifically, do you expect to have a White House policy on drug abuse?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, I do. In fact, it can be stated as clearly as this: I think this is one of the gravest problems facing us internally in the United States. I've had people talk to me about increased efforts to head off the export into the United States of drugs from neighboring nations. With borders like ours, that, as the main method of halting the drug problem in America, is virtually impossible. It's like carrying water in a sieve.

It is my belief, firm belief, that the answer to the drug problem comes through winning over the users to the point that we take the customers away from the drugs, not take the drugs, necessarily—try that, of course—you don't let up on that. But it's far more effective if you take the customers away than if you try to take the drugs away from those who want to be customers.

We had a program in California—again, I call on that. We had an educa-

tion program in the schools. We had former drug users who had straightened out. We found that they were most effective in talking to young people. You could go in, I could go in, anyone else and try to talk to these young people and tell them the harm in this and get nowhere. But when someone stood in front of them who said, "I've been there, and this is what it was like, and this is why I'm standing here telling you today," we found they listened.

~~If envision whatever we can do at the national level to try and launch a campaign nationwide, because I think we're running the risk of losing a great part of a whole generation if we don't.~~

Tuna Koprulu [Hurriyet News]. Yes?

U.S. ASSISTANCE FOR TURKEY

Q. Mr. President, as you well know, Turkey has been hit hard during the 3½ years' arms embargo from the United States. Do you consider to increase aid to Turkey on or above the amount President Carter suggested for fiscal 1982 which is \$700 million? And also, would you favor a military grant to Turkey?

THE PRESIDENT. I—this is an awful thing to confess—I can't really out of all the programs remember where that figure stands.

Q. It stands, Mr. President, the \$400 million is the military aid and the \$300 million is the economic aid.

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, but I mean I can't recall where our figures stand in comparison to that, but I know that basically our philosophy is one of continued aid. And knowing the problems that have existed between Turkey and another friend and ally of ours, Greece, we are hopeful that whatever we can do in resolving any of the differences there we want to do. But both countries are vital to

us. I consider them the southern plank of the NATO line. And, yes, I think there will be improved relations.

Allan Cromley [Daily Oklahoman].

TAX REDUCTIONS

Q. Mr. President, if you get the personal income tax cuts that you want and if people use their tax savings to just simply pay their bills, as many of them may do, and make down payments on consumer goods instead of investing the money in things that increase productivity, where does that leave us? Wouldn't inflation then be worse than it is now?

THE PRESIDENT. It might be if that happened. And we have done as much studying as we can of that, including a thorough study of the 2-year program of tax cuts under President Kennedy—well, President Kennedy started them, and they went into effect following his tragic death. And we have been very interested to note—because there is a parallel between that type of tax cut and what it is we're proposing—at the bottom of the ladder, spending, yes, there were people pressed as they are by inflation who found that they needed that money for purchases. But as you went up the scale of earnings, there was a great savings—in following that 2-year program, during the program and following—a great increase in personal savings and investment by the American people.

Now, we have what I think has to include the total middle class of this country—from \$10,000 to \$60,000 a year—pays 72 percent of all the income tax. They are going to get 73 percent of all of the benefits. And it seems to me that in there, maybe at the 10 level or below, but as you begin to go up that ladder, that is where there is going to be savings and investment. And every indication we have

MEMORANDUM

"Copy"

082575 PD

Handwritten initials

Handwritten initials

Handwritten stamp

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

September 15, 1981

FOR: MARTIN ANDERSON
EDWIN J. GRAY

THRU: RONALD B. FRANKUM

FROM: CARLTON E. TURNER AND DANIEL F. LEONARD

SUBJECT: Seven Statements That Should Be Included In Any Public Announcement Of This Administration's Plan To Deal With Drugs And Enforcement

The following statements are basic and fit within or repeat the four (4) major categories of the proposed policy. They should fit well within any public announcement, speech, etc. by the appropriate Administration spokesman. Pros and Cons are listed.

1. Elimination of drugs at their source.
2. Strong enforcement and modification, when needed, of all laws dealing with drugs.
3. Take the profit out of drugs.
4. Comprehensive National Prevention-Educational Program against drugs in order to make public aware of drug hazards.
5. Research into better ways to solve bio-medical problems created by drugs and to understand the nature of the problem.
6. Provide treatment for those who have succumbed to drug use.
7. Allow regional and/or state priorities.

ELIMINATION OF DRUGS AT THEIR SOURCE

A sound policy statement, which will send a strong message that domestic and international eradication is necessary for a feasible drug policy.

PROS

1. The most cost-effective way to reduce drug availability.
2. Indications are licit drug manufacturers will support because illicit drug use hurts their image.
3. UN and other international groups have endorsed the eradication concept.
4. State narcotic unit commanders will take this statement as an endorsement for the eradication of domestically produced marijuana.
5. The flow of illicit drug money which affects the balance of payment and inflation will be reduced.
6. Corruption on the local, national and international level will be reduced.
7. Pressure generated by international smuggling operations on the criminal justice system will be relieved.
8. Redeployment of national enforcement resources will be possible.
9. Productivity nationally and internationally should rise.
10. Parent groups will support the program as will the enforcement community.
11. The control of drugs at their origin source must be integrated into our multilateral and bilateral relationships.

CON

1. Results will require coordination at the international level
2. Governments in many source countries are not in control of all their territory.
3. Pro-drug groups will oppose and try to stop the program.
4. Percy Amendment prevents a broad international initiative and creates a perspective of disinterest on our part.
5. It is easier said than done.

ALTERNATIVES TO ERADICATION

1. Seal U.S. Borders
2. Eliminate demand.
3. Be soft on drugs.

II. STRONG ENFORCEMENT OF AND MODIFICATION, WHEN NEEDED, OF LAWS DEALING WITH DRUGS

A very popular element easily equated with the mood in most communities: put dealers and smugglers in jail.

PRO

1. Strong enforcement is supported by members of law enforcement societies and society in general.
2. Strong enforcement will reduce crime, corruption, etc.
3. Strong enforcement nationally and internationally, if any eradication program is to be effective.
4. Strong enforcement will send a signal to other countries that the United States is serious about reducing drug abuse.
5. Strong enforcement will send a message to young people not to get involved with drugs.
6. Strong enforcement will be supported by parents.

CON

1. Strong enforcement will be opposed by civil libertarians, etc.
2. Strong enforcement will be opposed by some members of the judiciary system.
3. Strong enforcement will put more pressure on over burdened prison systems: both federal and state.
4. Strong enforcement, if abused, will cause a backlash by society.
5. Strong enforcement will require legislative action by Federal and state legislatures.

SOME ALTERNATIVES TO STRONG ENFORCEMENT

1. Eliminate illicit production
2. Eliminate diversion
3. Be soft on drug abuse

III. TAKE THE PROFIT OUT OF DRUGS

Extraordinary profits, provides excessive financial support for drug smugglers. This element of the drug program states clearly that drug smuggling is no longer a liability free occupation.

PROS

1. There will be an increased personal risk.
2. There will be an increased financial risk and the threat of losing all assets.
3. There will be interruptions in the smugglers logistical support,
4. Enforcement cost could be financed in part by seized money.
5. It will reduce drug supply and increase costs.
6. Reduction of profits will have a favorable impact on inflation.

CON

1. It creates a complex enforcement problem.
2. Coordination between many federal enforcement agencies is required.
3. Highly-skilled investigative expertise is necessary (accountants, auditors, etc.).
4. More trained prosecutors will be needed to present cases and get convictions.

SOME ALTERNATIVES TO TAKING PROFIT OUT OF DRUGS

1. Eliminate supply
2. Concentrate enforcement efforts on seizures
3. Eliminate demand
4. Legalize drugs and tax proceeds

IV. COMPREHENSIVE NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND PREVENTION PROGRAM AGAINST DRUGS IN ORDER TO MAKE THE PUBLIC AWARE OF DRUG HAZARDS,

Is an approach that will require a continuous effort. Previously educational-prevention programs were fragmented. Now is the time to put together a strong prevention program with emphasis on the under-18 age group.

PROS

1. Awareness of the hazards can prevent drug abuse casualties.
2. A successful prevention will reduce enforcements and treatment cost,
3. Prevention will reduce the demand for drugs.
4. Prevention will create reverse peer pressure.
5. A prevention program will be supported by concerned private enterprise.
6. Prevention concepts have and will be supported by parent groups.
7. Program will improve quality of life.
8. Productivity will be improved.

CONS

1. Program will generate opposition from treatment industry.
2. Program will be impossible to evaluate on a short-term basis.
3. Program will create conflict between established disciplines.
4. Broad Treatment Program will require training of new experts.

SOME ALTERNATIVES TO PREVENTION

1. Concentrate on enforcement
2. Reduce supply
3. Increase treatment facilities
4. Accept drug abuse as a way of life.

V. RESEARCH INTO BETTER WAY TO SOLVE BIO-MEDICAL PROBLEMS CREATED BY DRUGS AND TO UNDERSTAND THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

Research into the bio-medical problem of drug abuse offers an overall long-term return but will never eliminate the problem. Research findings can reduce suffering and offer new approaches; moreover, research is required to understand future trends and national needs.

PROS

1. Research will provide better understanding of the problem.
2. Research will provide new treatment and rehabilitation techniques.
3. Research will provide new data on trends.
4. Research can possibly provide cures.
5. Research can provide new educational materials for prevention programs and thus reduce demand.
6. Research can provide new information for the criminal justice system.

CONS

1. Research goals are long-term and not a quick fix.
2. Research is expensive.
3. Research often raises new questions.
4. Research can be too basic.
5. Research can be misinterpreted.

SOME ALTERNATIVES TO RESEARCH

Accept status quo.

VI. PROVIDE TREATMENT FOR THOSE WHO HAVE SUCCUMBED TO DRUG USE

This is a must in any program designed to reduce the cost of drug abuse and crime. Emphasis should be on detoxification, rehabilitation.

PROS

1. Program will be supported by the vast treatment industry.
2. Program will be supported by civil libertarians.
3. Program will be supported by parents of victims.
4. Program will be supported by concerned industry since it should result in increased productivity.
5. Program will be supported by the courts.
6. Program reduces demand for illicit drugs.

CONS

1. Some treatment programs create a diversion and enforcement problem.
2. Some programs substitute one drug for another.
3. Some programs perpetuate drug addiction.
4. Some programs are obstacles to drug-free rehabilitation.
5. Maintenance programs destroy self-discipline.

SOME ALTERNATIVES TO TREATMENT

1. Accept crime associated with drug addiction.
2. Treat addicts as criminals.

VII. PROVIDE FOR REGIONAL AND/OR STATE PRIORITIES

The current concept of one region, state or city setting drug priorities for the nation is counter-productive. Any national program must provide a flexible model whereby enforcement and other resources can be utilized in a positive way.

PROS

1. Local priorities will generate support from local, state and regional enforcement communities.
2. Local priorities will foster better cooperation between all enforcement agencies.
3. Local priorities will make more efficient use of limited resources.
4. Local priorities will provide an atmosphere whereby the State will be more supportive of overall drug program.
5. Local priorities will change public perception that only one drug creates problems.
6. Local priorities will force the judiciary system to change its views on "recreational drugs."

CONS

1. Any change from present priority will be perceived as an attack on the disadvantaged.
2. Any change will be perceived as a lowering of the support for heroin enforcement and treatment communities in certain large cities.
3. Any change will arouse the ire of some Members of Congress and enforcement communities from traditional heroin using regions.
4. Any change may create opposition from select local politicians.
5. Any change will be seen as a threat to current funding mechanism.

POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES TO REGIONAL PRIORITIES

1. Continue heroin priority.
2. Accept all other drugs as low priority

These are not all inclusive but are samples. We will need additional time to produce a strategy on how to implement.