

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records

Subgroup/Office of Origin: Domestic Policy Council

Series/Staff Member: Jose Cerda

Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 5317

FolderID:

Folder Title:

Clinton/Gore Crime Positions

Stack:

S

Row:

98

Section:

2

Shelf:

6

Position:

3

CLINTON • GORE ON CRIME AND DRUGS

Despite all the tough talk we hear from Washington, crime is expanding dramatically in America. Today more people are victims of crime, more crime is drug related, and more people are addicted to drugs than ever before. Across the country tens of thousands of volunteers are fighting to take back their streets from criminals and drug dealers. But they need more support. We have a national problem on our hands that requires a tough national response.

It's time to get tougher on crime by getting smarter about how to stop it. Bill Clinton and Al Gore have a national crime and drug strategy that will use the powers of the Presidency to prevent and punish crime and control the abuse of drugs.

We need to put more police on the streets of our cities and more dangerous criminals behind bars. We need to fight drugs on all fronts, both to staunch international supply, and to cut domestic demand. We need to help communities that fight crime and drugs in strong and sensible ways. Bill Clinton and Al Gore will do that.

THE CLINTON/GORE PLAN

Put 100,000 new police on our streets

Keep guns out of the hands of criminals

Make our schools and neighborhoods safe from drugs and crime

Crack down on violence against women

Staunch the international supply of drugs

Cut drug addiction to cut crime

Cut demand through treatment and education programs

Launch a new anti-heroin initiative

Tackle rural drug abuse and crime

Target drugs and AIDS

A system of justice that treats a rich offender who steals millions through insider trading better than a poor criminal who steals a car sends a cynical message to America: that justice is not blind if you happen to be rich. We'll send a tough message to white collar criminals. Those at the top of the totem pole who have benefited from the opportunities our society offers have a special responsibility to uphold the law, and if they don't, they should be punished.

more officers back on the beat, cities are winning the war on crime. Local residents must be able to get to know, trust and work with their police to make their neighborhoods safe.

- Keep our streets free from drug dealing and drug related violence. Community policing will help cut the local supply of drugs on the streets.
- Invest in hard hit urban communities. Provide jobs, opportunities and hope for local people. Give residents economic alternatives to drugs and crime.

Take back our schools

- Create a Safe Schools Initiative, so that children can focus on learning again. We will increase funding so that local school officials can provide the strong security and monitoring they need to ensure a safe learning environment. Expand funding for mentoring, counseling and outreach programs through partnerships with business so kids in trouble with crime, gangs or drugs can turn to someone for help.

Get tough on white collar crime

- Work to pass tougher criminal penalties for white collar crimes - including environmental crimes - so that serious white collar criminals serve jail time.
- Plea bargaining will be limited to questions of prison time, not how much money a white collar crook gets to keep.
- Jail sentences will be served in real prisons, not high-tech summer camp.

Crack down on violence against women

- Sign the Violence Against Women Act which would provide tougher enforcement and stiffer penalties to deter domestic violence.

Lead a national and international fight against drug abuse

- Appoint a national drug expert at the Cabinet level with the power and authority to lead a comprehensive crusade against drugs.
- Make the war on drugs a foreign policy priority. Lead a global fight against illegal drug production and trafficking, working through the United Nations and other international organizations.
- Launch an immediate and thorough review of the drug interdiction program. In 1991 interdiction stopped only one kilo in every hundred being imported into the country. We must ensure existing resources are

used in the most cost-effective way in this crucial fight to keep drugs out of America.

- Work toward centralizing operational authority for the nation's drug interdiction efforts, with the purpose of cutting the duplication of effort and reducing competition.
- Anticipate and tackle emerging drug problems before they become crises through long term planning. Crack cocaine took this Administration by surprise. We cannot let the same happen with the pending heroin epidemic.
- Pursue drug dealers with aggressive enforcement of asset forfeiture laws.

Cut addiction to cut crime

- Expand treatment of alcoholics and other addicts in prison to break the revolving door of recidivism. More than half the 1.2 million offenders currently behind bars have committed drug-related crimes. And in Federal prisons less than 1% get any form of drug treatment at all. Every year offenders are turned back out onto the streets with their addictions untreated. Yet recovering from drug addictions and alcoholism significantly reduces the chance they will offend again. We have to get offenders off drugs for all our safety.
- Explore innovative ways to stop drug related crime, and keep offenders on parole and probation free from drugs, including court mandated urine testing alongside treatment programs, and drug courts like those in Miami and Phoenix.

Expand treatment

- Treat more addicts to prevent crime and save resources. Many addicts have not committed violent crimes, but we have to treat them before they do. Their dependency destroys lives, drains the economy, health and social services and supports a violent and dangerous illicit drug market. Drug abuse is costing our country \$300 billion a year. Curing addicts saves the taxpayer money and prevents crime.
- Increase the effectiveness and success rate of treatment programs by expanding aftercare. More than half of treated addicts relapse. We have to expand support including skills training and job assistance where appropriate for recovering drug addicts and alcoholics to stop them relapsing.
- Cut dropout rates by making sure addicts are directed to the treatment program which is most appropriate to their circumstances, including outpatient programs, community based programs and residential programs.
- Provide cost effective drug dependency treatment on demand for those who need it. By working in partnership with private clinics, and self help organizations, federal assistance will help communities dramatically increase their ability to offer treatment and support to everyone who needs help.
- Target new treatment at pregnant women who are turned away from many clinics. Less than one in ten pregnant addicts were treated last year; 375,000 drug exposed babies were born.
- Help kids who get hooked on drugs and alcohol through school based clinics and outreach programs.
- Review and evaluate the effectiveness of drug treatment programs and instruct states to set up mechanisms to check that the money is well spent.

Crime breeds poverty just as much as poverty breeds crime. We must not permit another generation of Americans to grow up on streets too unsafe to walk. For the last eleven years we have reduced our efforts to put police on the street when we should have intensified them.

Put more police on our streets and more criminals behind bars

- Fight crime by putting 100,000 new police officers on the streets; create a National Police Corps; and offer veterans and active military personnel a chance to become law enforcement officers.
- Invest in our police force by offering them Law Enforcement Scholarships to prepare themselves for their increasingly complex duties.
- Discipline young people on their first encounter with the judicial system through Certainty of Punishment programs such as community service and restitution. Americans must be able to rest assured that young offenders receive more than unrestricted probation and suspended sentences.
- Give young offenders a second chance in community "boot camps" which will instill discipline, treat drug abuse, boost self esteem, teach decency and respect for the law and provide education and job assistance to help them start new lives. This will open up more space in our prisons for the truly hardened criminals.
- Support a Federal death penalty for heinous crimes, and habeas corpus reforms for death penalty appeals.

Keep guns out of the hands of criminals

- Provide the leadership we need to pass the Brady Bill, which will create a waiting period for handgun purchases to keep firearms off the streets and out of the hands of criminals.
- Ban assault weapons, like the "Street Sweeper", that have no legitimate hunting or sporting purpose; limit access to multiple round clips like the one used in the tragic killings in Killeen, Texas.

A partnership to make our neighborhoods safe

- Back effective community anti crime and drug projects with increased federal assistance. A renewed government commitment to acknowledge, support and expand effective community-based prevention programs will provide federal matching funds for communities hardest hit by crime.
- Empower local communities. We will work with residents and local law enforcement to enable them to reclaim neighborhoods and public housing from crime and drug abuse; support efforts like Operation Clean Sweep in Chicago, which helps residents take back their housing from gangs and dealers.
- Support community-based policing. Across America, local law enforcement officials are stopping crimes before they happen by moving from emergency response to community-based law enforcement. By putting

Drug education and prevention

- Stop our children abusing drugs and alcohol. Work with states and local communities to bring parents, educators, students, private business, local media, law enforcement personnel and community service workers together to prevent drug use. Provide worthwhile alternative activities and interests to keep youth off the streets.
- Review and evaluate the effectiveness of different drug and alcohol education programs. Schools must be able to show parents and local officials exactly what and how much alcohol and drug education children are receiving.
- Require training in drug education, prevention and intervention for teachers and other professionals.
- Combat rising drug use. Drug education must include extensive information on the risks of heroin, of hallucinogenic drugs, and of the new drugs produced by home chemists such as “ice” and “ecstasy”. Abuse of these drugs is on the upsurge.
- Prevent drugs in the work place. Encourage business to provide employee assistance programs to identify drug and alcohol dependency among workers. Drug abuse and alcohol reduce productivity and threaten the safety of others.

Target groups at high risk of getting involved in crime and drugs

- Reach out to children and young adults in high risk situations to give them valued ties and commitments and hope and opportunities for the future.
- Fully fund the Head Start Program. Head Start was described by the Eisenhower Foundation as “the best drug prevention program we have.” It provides children from low-income families with confidence and commitment to learning.
- Offer non college bound students valuable training and job opportunities by creating a National Apprenticeship Program in partnership with business.
- Give school dropouts a second chance through a Youth Opportunity Corps. Teenagers will be matched with adults who care about them and will help them develop self discipline, literacy and valuable skills.

A new strategy against heroin

- Launch an anti-heroin strategy. We have to take seriously the threat of a heroin epidemic. The dangers of heroin must be a part of drug education programs, and concerted effort made to target new heroin users with AIDS awareness education, as IV drug users are high risk for HIV infection.
- Target the international supply of heroin through a coordinated international effort beginning with a Pacific Rim Drug Summit.

A new strategy for rural drug abuse and crime

- Tackle rural drug abuse and alcoholism. Illegal drug abuse is not just an inner cities problem. We will ensure that policing, treatment and drug education are available to protect rural commu-

nities from the risks of drug related crime. We will create rural drug task forces linking up local law enforcement, DEA officers, and local community groups to fight illegal drugs.

Drug abuse and AIDS

- Target AIDS education at drug abusers. Drug use is now the number one cause of infection with the AIDS virus. Approximately 32% of all adult/ adolescent AIDS cases are related to IV drug use. To stop AIDS we must stop drug abuse. We have to make everyone aware of the twin risks, and support local efforts to reduce the spread of AIDS through drug abuse.

Governor Clinton's Responses to the American Bar Association

1.

(a)

Ultimately, I believe that the attitude of the President toward the role of the federal courts and the importance of constitutional rights will be the critical determining factors in how federal judges will be selected. As a lawyer, a former law professor and attorney general of my state, I have a deep commitment to our legal system and a reverence for the role that federal judges play in our system as both the interpreters of federal law and the protectors of constitutional rights. I would appoint to the federal bench only men and women of unquestioned intellect, judicial temperament, broad experience and a demonstrated concern for, and commitment to, the individual rights protected by our constitution, including the right to privacy.

For the past twelve years, Presidents Reagan and Bush have pursued a single-minded effort to remake the federal judiciary by selecting judges who shared their restrictive view of constitutional rights. Sadly, because of the timing of the expansion of the federal judiciary, through the creation of new judgeships, Mr. Reagan and Mr. Bush have had a profound, and negative, impact on the federal judiciary. If elected, I would strive to bring the federal courts back toward their traditional role as guardians of constitutional rights.

(b)

I believe that public confidence in our federal judiciary is furthered by the presence of more women lawyers and minority lawyers on the bench, and the judicial system and the country benefit from having judges who are excellent lawyers with diverse perspectives. Although, Mr. Reagan certainly deserves credit for nominating the first woman justice to the Supreme Court, one of the troubling aspects of the Reagan and Bush federal court appointments has been the sharp drop-off in selection of women and minority judges, at precisely the time when more and more qualified women and minority candidates were reaching the time of their lives where they could serve as judges. The number of women and minority attorneys has increased exponentially since I graduated law school nearly 20 years ago. There is no shortage of women and minority attorneys all over the country who would potentially be superb federal judges. It may well be, however, that there is a real shortage of women and minority candidates who share Mr. Reagan and Mr. Bush's right wing, doctrinaire views of the Constitution.

(c)

Given the current caseload and backlog in the federal courts, filling any judicial vacancies promptly would be a high priority for me if elected. Some of the delay in recent years can be traced to the increasing politicization of the appointment process. If elected, I would hope to select an attorney general whose knowledge of lawyers around the country would enable our administration to more rapidly to identify potentially excellent judges. Because Presidents Reagan and Bush have clearly sought to move the federal judiciary toward a restrictive view of the constitution, the Senate has on occasion delayed the confirmation process because of serious reservations about the nominees chosen. I would hope that the nominees that I would suggest would meet with more general approval and be processed more

rapidly.

- (d) I think that the American Bar Association has played a thoughtful and valuable role in evaluating the professional qualifications of prospective nominees, and I would hope that the ABA would continue to play that role with respect to the judicial nominees that I make if elected.

2.

- (a) I believe strongly in the mission of the Legal Services Corporation -- to provide legal help in civil matters to those who are too poor to afford an attorney's help when they need it. Since the LSC has long been one of the favorite targets of the right wing of the Republican Party, it is worth remembering that the LSC was created by President Nixon. My wife was one of the original board member of the LSC, and I have followed the Corporation throughout its history because of her interest as well as my own. The failure of the LSC budget to keep up with inflation has had a serious impact on the Corporation. I hope that the budget can be increased to keep up with inflation, but I recognize the competing demands on scarce budgetary resources will be intense.

- (b) I believe that a thorough review of the LSC and the damage done in the last 12 years is necessary. At the present time, I am not prepared to specify restrictions on the type of legal services which LSC-funded programs can provide to their clients or suggest whether there are any restrictions presently place on the programs that I would favor lifting.

- (c) President Reagan came to office with an established, intense dislike of the LSC based on his experiences as Governor of California, when the California Rural Legal Assistance program was a thorn in his side, doing a great deal to bring simply justice to the agricultural workers of California. Mr. Reagan and Ed Meese made it the declared policy of their administration to try to destroy the LSC. First, they tried to eliminate its funding; when Congress refused to go along, they stacked the Board with people who were unremittingly hostile to the concept of the LSC. Sadly, as Senator Rudman, a stalwart supporter of the Corporation, has noted, President Bush's record has not been much of an improvement on the Reagan years. If elected, I would appoint to the Board people whose commitment to the mission of the LSC, and whose interest in providing legal services to the poor, was absolutely cleared out.

3. There is indeed a very serious problem in both our criminal and civil justice systems at both the state and federal levels. An increase in caseloads, caused in large part by an explosion of drug cases, has seriously impacted the quality of the system.

However, the epidemic of drug and other substance abuse remains one of the most serious problems facing this country today. This is true despite 12 years of Republican Administrations claiming to be waging a war on drugs. President Bush

promised in his inauguration address that he would end the scourge of drugs. But it is not enough to just talk tough -- you have to act tough and smart.

Despite the Administration's tough talk it is clear to everyone that we are no closer to solving the drug abuse problem than we were twelve years ago. Anyone trying to raise a family with drug dealers selling their poison on the street corner knows this. It is proven by the record numbers of babies born addicted to crack cocaine every year. Recent studies have shown that both casual and hard-core use are back on the upswing. More drugs are flowing into the country than ever before - and they are cheaper and of higher quality. And, of course, the link between drug abuse and crime is well established. Drug use and drug dealing leads to gunfights, murders, and drive-by shootings and has turned our cities and towns into armed camps. All this despite billions and billions of dollars spent on the effort.

We need to rethink our drug control strategy. To be sure, drug kingpins and big-time dealers must be caught and severely punished. If you sell drugs to a minor or use kids to sell drugs you have got to be stopped. At the same time we need to realize that a large part of the substance abuse problem can be best dealt with as a public health and education issue. We need to do a better job educating our young people about the dangers of drug abuse as well as giving them alternatives to getting involved with drugs. It is also shameful that there are people who desperately need and want drug treatment who are denied it because program space is limited. In my view, limited law enforcement and judicial resources should be aimed at the middle and upper levels of the drug organizations.

We must also work to simplify our legal system, both criminal and civil. Endless and wasteful criminal appeals must be limited and curtailed.

Finally, we must recognize that approximately 95% of criminal prosecutions take place at the state and local level so it is there that the bulk of the resources should be directed. One of the most important roles for the federal government is to provide resources, expertise, leadership and emphasis on interstate crime organizations.

4. My emphasis in this area would be to ensure that guns do not get into the wrong hands and that criminals who commit crimes with firearms are severely punished. We cannot allow convicted felons to legally regain access to firearms -- something that is happening all too often. There are a number of ways available to keep guns out of felons' hands while ensuring the right of legitimate gun owners and sportsmen to possess firearms.

The first thing I would do is provide the presidential leadership required to enact the Brady bill. The Brady bill is a modest measure that represents very little inconvenience to the law-abiding gun purchaser. It merely requires a short waiting period before the purchase of a handgun so that law enforcement can check to determine whether the would-be purchaser has a criminal record or a history of

mental illness. The Brady bill has the support of over 90% of the American people and almost the same percentage of gun owners. It has passed both houses of Congress. The problem is that the President has been unwilling to stand up to the NRA leadership and support the bill.

I also support restrictions on the domestic manufacture and sale of assault weapons. These weapons of war, such as the "Streetsweeper" and the AK-47, have no legitimate sporting purpose and are of no use to lawful citizens. They are, however, one of the weapons of choice of drug gangs for use in drive-by shootings. The President restricted the importation of such weapons but is unwilling to do the same for those domestically manufactured. This is senseless. It makes no difference to the victim's family whether the gun used in the killing was imported or stamped "Made in the U.S.A."

Both these measures are reasonable and represent little if any inconvenience for the average gun owner. They are both overwhelmingly supported by law enforcement officers all across the country. But I recognize that gun control, no matter how reasonable and effective, is not the sole answer. We need to ensure that armed criminals are prosecuted and put behind bars for a long time. Therefore, I support long prison sentences for armed and career offenders.

5. The prison overcrowding situation at both the State and Federal level is reaching explosive proportions. On any given day there are approximately one million people behind bars in this country. The federal prison system is operating at more than 160% capacity and state prisons and city and county jails are even worse. And the reason so many states are having such fiscal problems is due to an abdication of federal leadership and responsibility.

What we need is to get smart about prisons. Prisons are expensive. It costs between \$20,000 and \$35,000 a year to house one prisoner. We need to make sure that people who belong in prison are sent there and that people who do not need to be there are not taking up expensive space. The violent and recidivist offenders must go to prison for long periods of time. But there are a number of non-violent and youthful offenders who are sent to prison because of lack of meaningful alternatives. We need to make those alternatives more available. They include boot camps, work programs, restitution, electronic surveillance, home incarceration, intensive supervision probation and others.

It is essential that we insist that prisoners undergo drug treatment while they are incarcerated. This is a simple issue of crime prevention. Studies have shown that offenders who receive mandatory drug treatment in prison are much less likely to commit additional crimes upon release than those who do not undergo such treatment. We must also ensure that all prisoners are doing meaningful work and education programs while in prison.

We need to face the facts that until we get a handle on the crime and serious

drug problem in this country we will need to devote more resource to increase our prison capacity.

We also need truth in sentencing -- prisoners should be required to serve the length of their sentence and not be released after serving very little time by faceless parole boards just to free up prison space.

And finally, and perhaps most importantly, we must do more to prevent crime through measures like community-based policing, the Police Corps, drug treatment, education, and job training. Tough punishments for criminals is critical but not enough. Our goal should be prevention before the facts not just punishment afterwards.

6. Without doubt, the civil justice system is imperfect. There is too much abusive litigation in this country, the system is too expensive, consumers and businesses face too many delays, and too many citizens are not able to get redress. We should work to reduce the cost of litigation. However, we must ensure that consumers injured by a defective product can seek compensation, that workers who suffer from asbestosis or other occupational diseases get their day in court, and that victims of fraud can pursue wrongdoers.

The proposals advanced by George Bush and Dan Quayle are dramatically tilted toward big polluters, manufacturers and insurance companies, and against consumers and victims. Their plan won't help competitiveness or ensure responsible behavior in the marketplace. Bush and Quayle want to cap the ability of juries to award victims punitive damages, even when that's the only way to bring a powerful offender to justice, or to keep a dangerous product off the market. They want to make victims pay the legal fees of big manufacturers if, for some reason, they sue and lose. It's nothing more than trickle-down justice.

As a general matter, I believe that legal reform should be enacted in the laboratories of the states, rather than at the federal level. In my view, the best reforms are those that make it less likely for people to go to court. We should encourage greater use of alternative dispute resolution to give consumers redress without having to litigate, such as mediation, mini-trials and the "multi door courthouse." We should also encourage the use of special masters to help sort through complex cases. And we should restrict the use of secrecy agreements, which too frequently force litigants to refight the same battles, over and over, while endangering public health. But I will oppose any proposals that pretend to "reform" lawsuits while actually encouraging dangerous products or marketplace fraud.

7. Clearly when most members of the House Ways and Means Committee no longer calculate their own taxes, the time has come to consider tax simplification. As President, I will take a comprehensive and critical look at the tax code to see where there is room for improvement.

I am also interested in making our tax system fairer and will work to cut income tax rates on the middle class. I support cutting the average family's tax bill by 10%, a savings of \$350 a year. To pay for this tax cut, I will ask the top 1% of income earners to pay their fair share.

8. I believe we can no longer be the only industrial nation without a family leave policy. Workers should not have to choose between the jobs they need and the families they love; they should be allowed to take unpaid leave to spend time with newborn children and sick family members. As President, I will sign the Family and Medical Leave Act.

Beyond that, we need to strengthen American families by investing in them and their futures. If family values are to mean anything, we must value families. Families today are working harder and earning less. Millions of parents who work full-time don't earn enough to keep their families above the poverty level, and a million more children live in poverty than ten years ago. I believe we must expand the Earned Income Tax Credit to guarantee a "working wage." No family member who works full-time should be forced to live in poverty. I will put an end to welfare as we know it by making it a legitimate second chance, not a way of life. We should provide people on welfare with the education, training and child care they need, for up to two years, so that they can empower themselves and move on to good-paying jobs. Afterwards, I believe those who can work should find a job either in the private sector or in community service.

I have made a series of related proposals on education, training, health care and welfare reform the centerpiece of my campaign, and the goal of all those proposals is the strengthening of the American family, which has been battered by the harsh economic conditions and the neglect of pressing domestic needs that have characterized recent administrations.

9. For the criminal justice system to function effectively, we must provide sufficient funding for all segments of the system. Judges, prosecutors, defense lawyers, law enforcement, law enforcement officers, support personnel, and correctional facilities are all integral and interrelated parts of the system. When one part is underfunded, no other part of the system can function effectively.

In recent years, legislatures on the federal and state levels have redirected the focus of the fight against crime. They have criminalized new conduct, and federalized what were previously state crimes. Increased and mandatory minimum sentences have created enormous stresses on our judicial and prison systems. We need increased resources to support our criminal justice system. We clearly need more judges, prosecutors, law enforcement officers, support personnel, and prisons to accommodate these changes. And in general, new funding for the criminal justice system has been directed to these functions.

But the system will not work unless the defense function receives equal

attention. When the federal system recently ran out of money to pay "panel" lawyers who represent indigent criminals defendants, the pivotal function of defense lawyers became clear. Without defense lawyers, criminal defendants were denied their Sixth Amendment rights, trials were delayed, and Speedy Trial Act time limits threatened to cause the dismissal of important charges.

The Sixth Amendment mandates lawyers for indigent defendants. It mandates effective representation of counsel. Without adequate funding, we cannot fulfill these mandates. Equally important, inadequate and poorly paid defense lawyers contribute to the inefficient functioning of the system. If we want to eliminate needless delays, if we want a system that functions fairly and efficiently, the federal and state governments must ensure that all parts of the system are adequately funded.

10. Whenever a serious third party candidate runs for president, there are call for changes in our electoral system. This year, proposals encompassed various reforms of the Electoral College, or even its elimination to permit the direct election of the President.

The Framers of our Constitution deliberately created our current system in an effort to protect the election of the President from local corruption and narrow political perspectives. So far, the system works well, and our Presidents have received the mandate of the country through their elections.

However, constitutional scholars and others have raised serious questions about whether the system works as well as it should, and about whether reform is appropriate. We should not rush to abandon the system the Framers so conscientiously created, but we must listen carefully to those who say it may be time for change.

MANDATE FOR CHANGE

"The Progressive Policy Institute's *Mandate for Change* charts a bold new course for reviving progressive government in America. It offers creative ideas for tackling America's toughest problems and a new governing philosophy based on opportunity, responsibility and community. This book really looks beyond the old Left-Right debates of the past and tries to move us toward a better future."

—President-elect Bill Clinton

BERKLEY • 0-425-13964-6 • (\$15.50 CANADA) • \$11.95 U.S.

Edited by
Will Marshall and Martin Schram
THE PROGRESSIVE POLICY INSTITUTE

from the government; others merely need the government to be on their side when it comes to helping them work and raise children. Still other families need large and substantial help, from social workers and therapists, just to function at all. The new President needs to recognize these differences as he works toward a progressive family policy for the 1990s.

MANDATE FOR ACTION

1. **Wage an intense media campaign against teen pregnancy and out-of-wedlock births.** Our leaders should also encourage social responsibility in the area of children's broadcasting.
2. **Pass an \$800-per-child tax credit for all preschool children.** The credit should be phased out between the ages of 6 and 10.
3. **Expand the Earned Income Tax Credit for all working poor families.** The benefits should be tied to family size.
4. **Establish a federal system of child-support payments.** Also, paternity must be established for all children whether or not their parents have been married.
5. **Establish model state codes for divorce law.** Such codes should stress the primacy of the children's well-being in divorce proceedings.
6. **Encourage parental responsibility.** This should be done through the bully pulpit of the presidency and through the promulgation and evaluation of state initiatives that seek to reinforce parental responsibility.
7. **Pass the Family Leave Bill and promote family-friendly workplaces.** The federal government should also become a pioneer in telecommuting.
8. **Help families under acute stress to stay together.** The new administration should establish early intervention programs and home-based social service delivery for troubled families.

8

Safer Streets and Neighborhoods

ED KILGORE

TAKING CRIME SERIOUSLY

The most fundamental right any government owes its citizens is personal safety—the right to live, work, and move about peaceably, secure in one's person and property. America's abhorrently high crime rates, especially the grim statistics of violent crimes, document a fundamental failure of domestic government.

By any measure, crime is at shocking levels. In 1991, nearly 15 million crimes were reported—more than four times the number in 1960.¹ Violent crimes rose 14 percent between 1980 and 1988,² and then 23 percent between 1988 and 1991.³ During the last four years, reported murders have jumped 23 percent, rapes 17 percent, robberies 33 percent, and aggravated assaults 28 percent. Yet, it is estimated that 52 percent of violent crimes are not even reported.⁴

Most dramatically, it is estimated that eight out of every ten Americans can expect to be victimized by violent crime at some point in their lives.⁵ Technicians look at our crime statistics and lock into an irrelevant debate: Has more frequent reporting spurred recent increases?⁶ But whether our violent crime rate is skyrocketing or leveling off at a barbarous plateau, it remains the industrial world's worst. Our homicide rate is more than five times

that of Europe, and four times that of Canada, Australia, or New Zealand. Our rate of rapes is nearly nine times that of Europe.'

The fear of crime, moreover, dissolves the social fabric that binds Americans together into a community of common experience. It turns strangers into enemies, unfamiliar ground into dangerous turf, and random social contact into risky business. When crime afflicts a neighborhood, those who can avoid it, stay away; those who cannot, suffer alone. The former become isolated, the latter abandoned.

Crime and its consequences sharpen every racial and economic division of our nation, and blunt every popular impulse toward faith in government and willingness to undertake shared sacrifice. More than any other national problem, the failure to ensure domestic security undermines equally the basic values of opportunity, responsibility, community, and national security. Any progressive agenda for America that does not make this issue a top priority cannot pass a threshold test of credibility.

The new administration has a particular responsibility to take crime seriously. The last two Republican administrations waged a harsh inflammatory rhetorical war on crime, a war of words that masked a record of indifference to the measures that might have actually decreased crime and increased domestic security. The new President must have the courage to wage a real war on crime and make the necessary commitment to produce results. The new Democrats must be willing to commit themselves to "put people first" with strong actions that defend people's right to be safe from crime.

Taking crime seriously means *directly* addressing crime and its immediate breeding grounds—reclaiming public places, so that people no longer fear to walk the streets, patronize commercial areas, ride the buses and subways, or send their children to school. To help communities accomplish this, the new President should:

- Establish a national Police Corps—an initiative that can put 100,000 new cops on the streets. Under this plan, the federal government would pay for the college educations of students who, in turn, would commit to serve four years as police officers.
- Encourage community-policing deployment strategies and make them a condition to various federal law enforcement financial assistance programs.
- Promote community self-defense efforts to reclaim public

places, public housing, and public schools from the unsafe conditions that breed crime.

- Support police officers by proposing tough, long-overdue gun laws—a ban on Rambo-style assault weapons, a bill to make all crimes committed with guns federal offenses—and demand Congress finally enact the Brady Bill, a national waiting period for gun buyers. These laws would protect our police and civilians without infringing upon the right to bear arms for self-protection, hunting, or sports.
- Reduce the demand for drugs by increased funding for treatment and education. A million untreated addicts on the street are a constant contributor to crime and unsafe conditions.

Most of all, taking crime seriously means understanding the terrible human cost of crime, and moving beyond the equally empty rhetoric of many on the Right and the rationalizations of many on the Left.

A WAR OF WORDS AND RATIONALIZATIONS

Since Ronald Reagan's election in 1980, national crime policy has been bound up in a rhetorical war of words increasingly remote from the day-to-day struggle against crime. According to popular conservative mythology, we should blame our crime problems on permissive judges, guilt-ridden parole officers and parole boards, subversive civil liberties attorneys, and weak-kneed liberal law-makers who have managed over the years to riddle the criminal justice system with "loopholes" and vitiate the deterrent power of apprehension and incarceration. They are the reason, say conservative mythmakers, why criminals are often "sprung" on "technicalities," given sentences too soft and too short to inspire fear, or paroled after serving just a fraction of their sentences.

But in their 12 years in power, the conservatives wound up subordinating real-life crime fighting and settling for mere symbolic measures. While the Reagan officials were giving ringing speeches calling for drastic action against crime, they were steadily reducing federal assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies, which employ 93 percent of all law enforcement personnel and spend 87 percent of all crime-fighting funds.⁸ Then the Bush administration teamed with congressional Republicans to block action on sweeping anticrime legislation—on grounds that

the Democratic bill did not impose the death penalty for a tiny class of federal felonies.⁹

In 1988 and again in 1992, the Bush campaign blamed lenient sentencing and parole policies for crime. Yet the number of inmates in U.S. prisons doubled during the last decade. America has by far the highest incarceration rate in the world: more than ten times Japan's, four times China's, and 46 percent higher than our nearest rival, South Africa.¹⁰

The disjunction between conservative anticrime rhetoric and real anticrime measures reached an all-time high in 1989, when President Bush called a press conference to announce his own package of crime legislation. It largely neglected assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies, and instead focused on federal prison construction, the death penalty for a few new federal offenses, and restrictions on use of habeas corpus petitions by criminal defendants.¹¹ Bush called this package "Take Back the Streets," which must have amused the vast majority of street criminals who manage to avoid federal offenses as they commit their crimes.

Finally, in 1992, President Bush made his chief anticrime promise of the presidential campaign—to make carjacking a federal offense—in response to an egregious crime that happened to occur within the Washington media market.¹²

But the failure of the Right's paper-tiger crime rhetoric does not mandate a return to the habit of many on the Left who instinctively respond to public demands for fighting crime by rationalizing crime as primarily a symptom of social injustice.

While poverty, lack of job opportunities, discrimination, inadequate housing, poor schools, and disintegrating families are all "root causes" that contribute to crime, they do not excuse it. Nor do they excuse reluctance to tackle crime directly as well as indirectly.

Crime is a cause, as well as an effect, of poverty and social discrimination; and the victims of social injustice tend also to become the preeminent victims of crime. Consider: Nearly half of all homicide victims are blacks—murder has now become the leading cause of death among young black urban males.¹³

Those who would deflect concern about crime into concern about social injustice must also consider that crime profoundly erodes the sense of community and mutual obligation that must serve as the foundation for any broad-based progress toward justice and equality. On a more practical level, the fear of crime, especially in urban settings, has led those citizens who have a

choice, to exercise it—to avoid living, working, or shopping in high-crime neighborhoods or public facilities. By doing this they lose most, if not all, immediate experience of the worst of the root-cause social conditions. To cite the most obvious example, middle-class suburbanites, whose experience of the homeless population is often limited to a few fearful experiences of intimidation or psychotic behavior, are unlikely to explore, much less support, options for creating affordable housing.

As Professor Alexander Bickel of Yale said during the civil disorders of the 1960s: "No society will long remain open and attached to peaceable politics and the decent and controlled use of public force if fear for personal safety is the ordinary experience of large numbers."¹⁴ Just because conservative "get tough" rhetoric has failed is no reason to conclude that crime should be tolerated as the inevitable if deplorable result of social pathology. Indeed, one reason the public has continued to support the Right's prescriptions despite evidence of their failure is the corresponding failure of the Left to generate a credible alternative approach that takes crime seriously. Also, the Right has won public support through its willingness to emphasize moral accountability in the fight against crime—an accountability too many on the Left felt uncomfortable in publicly espousing. It is simply this: Those who commit crimes deserve to be punished and those who are victims of crimes deserve to be protected. Regrettably, after the strife-torn struggles of the civil rights and antiwar eras, and the abuses of power committed in the name of law enforcement, it simply became unfashionable to be a self-declared law-and-order liberal.

IDEOLOGICAL CO-DEPENDENCY

In the final analysis, conservatives and liberals have unwittingly cooperated to make crime a symbolic issue, rather than a serious challenge. A deadly example of this ideological co-dependency was supplied by the Rodney King case and the resulting riots.

A habitual offender was caught after leading Los Angeles police on a high-speed chase, risking the lives of officers and bystanders. The police were caught on videotape using unconscionable excessive force in subduing him. A suburban jury, clearly more concerned with the symbolism of the case than the facts, acquitted the police of criminal charges.

Riots broke out, and an understaffed, out-of-touch police department led by a get-tough conservative icon, failed to gain con-

trol. Opportunists joined the disorders, which turned into the most destructive civil violence since the mid-1960s, spreading to several other cities.

The news media highlighted incidents of violence against innocent, and usually white, bystanders, drawing explicit parallels with the King beating. And too many politicians focused on the symbols that fit their ideology. Liberal politicians hastened to blame American society generally, and the Reagan and Bush administrations specifically, for not tending to the root causes of the violence. Conservative politicians rushed to react to the most extreme liberal rhetoric. The result: ethnic tensions were exacerbated in Los Angeles and many other cities, the police were demoralized, and crime remained as large a problem as before.

Ideological ax grinding is not only an impediment to anticrime efforts, but an actual inducement to crime. Those who would justify riots to vindicate Rodney King, and those who would justify a vigilante jury's vindication of his tormentors, are equally to blame for the resulting collapse in law and order.

Since tough talk is not deterring crime, and crime itself undermines progress on its root causes, the search for an approach that can produce results must begin by looking squarely at crime as it actually occurs. This means looking to the streets—where police officers can deter crime through creating increased risk of apprehension; where the most immediate causes of crime can be isolated and reduced; and where the community support critical to any anticrime initiative can be mustered and mobilized.

TOO MUCH CRIME—TOO FEW COPS

For all the tough anticrime rhetoric heard in recent years, governments at all levels have failed to supply the most basic crime-fighting resource available in the quantities necessary to keep pace with, much less overcome, rising crime: police officers.

In 1951, cities with populations over 50,000 employed more than three police officers for every violent crime. By 1988, the ratio was reversed, with three violent crimes occurring for every police officer.¹⁵

In practical terms, this means our effective strength in police per violent crime has been reduced by about 87 percent since 1951, despite ever-increasing public concern and repeated official pledges to wage war on crime.

This true reduction-in-force is all the more remarkable because

it has coincided with steady increases in other areas of public employment, especially at the state and local levels where most law enforcement officers work. From 1975 until 1988, a period of soaring state and local employment, police manpower actually dropped as a percentage of population.¹⁶

Even within the criminal justice system, cops have gotten the short end of the fiscal stick. From 1979 to 1990, total per capita spending by all levels of government on justice system activities rose 35 percent, with a 31 percent increase for courts, 55 percent for prosecutors, and 99 percent for corrections. But spending on police rose just 6 percent.¹⁷

Not surprisingly, a 1985 survey of police chiefs showed that 70 percent indicated serious manpower shortages, many of critical dimensions.¹⁸ In addition to shortcomings in the quantity of police officers, there are serious concerns about the quality of their preparation and the degree to which they adequately represent the population they must protect.

Most police recruits still have only a high school education, even though average starting salaries nearly doubled between 1978 and 1988.¹⁹ And despite widespread use of advanced technology in police work, average training hours have barely increased since 1967.²⁰

Most big-city police forces have adopted some sort of affirmative action program to recruit more officers familiar with minority communities. Still, most cannot remotely meet their minority recruitment targets. Currently, New York City's police force is only 11 percent black, about the same proportion as in 1983, though the black population of the city is now nearly 29 percent.²¹

THE POLICE CORPS

Given the fiscal constraints facing state and local governments in the 1990s, some national effort is in order to help reverse the unequal struggle between police and criminals on our streets. Fortunately, there is one well-defined approach that would simultaneously increase both the quantity and quality of police officers, while promoting minority recruitment and opening a new "upward mobility" track whereby high school graduates could earn the means to go to college.

The Police Corps Act, introduced in the Senate in 1989 by Democrat Jim Sasser and Republican Arlen Specter, and in the House by the remarkable duo of Democrat Barney Frank and

Republican Bob Dornan, aims at increasing state and local police forces by 100,000 college-educated officers within four years.²² The Police Corps concept has been spearheaded since 1982 by Adam Walinsky, a New York attorney and former chief legislative assistant to Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

The Police Corps would offer prospective college students up to \$10,000 per year in college assistance in exchange for a four-year commitment to serve as police officers. Participating state and local police departments would pay the recruits the normal entry-level salary, but would realize a 40 percent reduction in personnel cost per recruit by avoiding pension obligations and other costs associated with career officers. Police Corps members would also receive 16 weeks of federally operated preassignment training.²³

The first-year cost to the federal government, based on an enrollment of 25,000 Police Corps members, would be roughly \$1.7 billion, significantly less than the law enforcement expenditures in the last omnibus drug legislation.²⁴ It would raise the total federal contribution to crime efforts to no more than 10 percent of national expenditures, but would increase total force levels by over 20 percent, total patrol units by 40 percent, and the percentage of college-educated officers by as much as 50 percent in many cities—the largest step toward reversing the unequal struggle between cops and criminals in a generation.

There is clear evidence that the Police Corps could meet its recruitment goals while attracting a much higher percentage of minority officers. A survey of Boston-area students found that 40 percent of all college attendees would “very likely” or “fairly likely” make the four-year commitment the Police Corps requires. The positive reaction rose to more than 50 percent among minority students.²⁵ This showing of disproportionate interest in the Police Corps among the best-educated segment of minority Americans is an especially promising sign.

Aside from its law enforcement benefits, the Police Corps would quite obviously have a major impact on the ability of young people to obtain college educations at a time of rising tuitions and inadequate student financial assistance. By allowing them to earn cash benefits through a commitment to serve the community in a vital capacity, it incorporates the principle of the GI Bill, offering the means to upward mobility and reinforcing the ethic of mutual obligation.

In addition, the Police Corps could help reduce the dependence of college students on loans. The federal government is currently spending about \$1.6 billion per year to cover defaulted student

loans, about half of all annual student loan expenditures, and roughly equivalent to the annual cost of a full-fledged Police Corps program.²⁶

A demonstration Police Corps program was included in the Senate's version of omnibus crime legislation—but it was stalled throughout the last Congress due to wrangling between congressional Democrats and President Bush over details of the package's death penalty provisions.

We recommend a full-scale commitment to the Police Corps. Rarely has this country had an opportunity to accomplish so many vital objectives with one breakthrough initiative, and the new administration should pursue this opportunity immediately. One element of the Police Corps Act strongly promotes the next recommendation this chapter makes: redeploying police officers to prevent crime through community policing.

911: THE SLOW DEMISE OF RAPID RESPONSE

Despite rising evidence of its futility, most local police forces in America today remain addicted to a deployment strategy that treats communities as enemy territory. A 1988 Justice Department report summarized recent police tactics as concentrating on motorized patrol forces, rapid response to calls for service—usually through 911 telephone systems—and retrospective investigation of crimes.²⁷

This “rapid response” strategy became standard procedure for most police departments during the 1980s. Given the limited resources available to police forces, its popularity was understandable: It placed a premium on the use of telecommunications technology as opposed to manpower; it allowed fewer officers to cover greater territory; and most of all, it supplied an apparently objective measurement of police effectiveness: number of calls responded to, and speed of response.

This strategy is also, of course, inherently reactive, and tends to become a circular exercise. Once police deployments and department budgets are organized to reflect the rapid-response approach, then any and all negative evidence of its effectiveness simply becomes a justification for more motorized units and more rapid response times.

As James Q. Wilson and George Kelling observed: If each call is treated as a separate incident with neither a history nor a future,

then each incident will be handled by police officers anxious to pacify the complainants and get back on patrol as quickly as possible.²⁸

More succinctly, Boston Police Commissioner Mickey Roache admitted: "I hate to say this, but in Boston we run from one call to another. We don't accomplish anything. We're just running all over the place. It's insane."²⁹

A 1988 Justice Department study surveyed the available evidence on the effectiveness of rapid-response as "uniformly negative."³⁰ Most striking was an experiment in Kansas City where doubling the number of patrol cars had no significant effect on crime. In fact, the Kansas City study concluded that the speed with which police arrived on the scene in response to a 911 call had no real effect on the probability of making an arrest.³¹

Aside from its apparent ineffectiveness, the rapid-response strategy has levied a high cost in police-community relations and the overall understanding police departments have of the crime problem and its most immediate causes.

Like the French and American armed forces deployed in Southeast Asia from the 1950s until the 1970s, motorized rapid response forces have surrendered control of the territory to the enemy. Stationed in garrisons remote from the population, our police use the best available technology to arrive on the scene in response to unconfirmed reports of enemy activity. After surveying the scene and filing the necessary paperwork, they return to "base," with no better understanding of the conditions that produced the particular incident. As Commissioner Roache said, it is indeed "insane."

AN ALTERNATIVE TO 911 JUSTICE— COMMUNITY POLICING

As the deficiencies of rapid-response became more apparent during the 1980s, a number of police forces around the country experimented with an alternative approach, generally known as "community policing" or "problem-solving policing." The key to community policing is to think in terms of patterns of crime, not individual 911 calls; to deploy police visibly and continuously in specific neighborhoods, not occasionally when incidents have occurred; and to work actively with citizens to identify crimes-in-the-making and conditions likely to produce crime.³²

Whether it is implemented through foot patrols in an urban setting, or through a highly organized neighborhood watch in the

suburbs, community policing makes long-term progress against crime the objective, rather than number of calls received and average response times.

Most of all, there is strong evidence community policing works. Foot patrol experiments in Newark, New Jersey, and Flint, Michigan, were very popular with residents, reduced fear of crime, and improved police morale. In Flint, the crime rate dropped significantly, along with emergency calls for service.³³ In New York City, a broader commitment to community policing was made, and may have had something to do with the first across-the-board decrease in every major crime category in 36 years.³⁴

New York's community policing effort includes one innovation that should vitally contribute to long-term cooperation between citizens and police: community advisory boards that supply police with feedback on deployment decisions and an early warning of conditions likely to generate crime.³⁵

Given the dismal record of rapid-response, there is absolutely no reason to further delay a national commitment to this alternative approach, which clearly improves police-community relations, creates a framework for a more sustained assault on crime, and seems to work.

One of the most attractive features of the Police Corps Act is that it requires police departments to deploy most corps members through community policing methods. As a result, the overall percentage of police officers working in communities will rise significantly, with a corresponding drop in the high percentage of officers currently assigned to both administrative positions and motorized rapid-response.

We strongly recommend other administration efforts to encourage community policing, including Justice Department assistance, more widely disseminated research, and vigorous use of the bully pulpit of the White House. Indeed, until community policing has at least been tried in every American city, we recommend that any and all federal law enforcement assistance be made contingent upon an agreement to experiment with the community policing strategy.

One encouraging recent development in law enforcement was the partial conversion of the Bush administration to community policing during 1992. The administration-supported "weed and seed" initiative aimed at low-income urban neighborhoods incorporated both community policing strategies and an attack on the immediate conditions leading to crime—both unprecedented experiments, given the administration's previous exclusive commit-

ment to high-tech law enforcement and postapprehension punishment as crime-fighting measures.³⁶

The new administration should capitalize on this emerging consensus, and use every opportunity to promote community policing.

Dealing with the immediate causes of crime. One aspect of the crime problem that community policing is especially suited to address is the variety of neighborhood-specific factors that directly breed crime.

While root-cause explanations of crime tend to become justifications for doing nothing directly about crime, addressing these more immediate causes can become an important part of a community-based assault on crime.

Community self-defense. A community's first line of defense against crime is often right on the surface, in its appearance.

In their highly influential 1982 article "Broken Windows," James Q. Wilson and George Kelling argued that "signals" of disorder, including neglected buildings, trash-littered vacant lots, and instances of intimidating behavior, "both create fear in citizens and attract predators." Intimidated citizens gradually abandon the territory to the arriving predators, and before long, what began as noncriminal disorder can develop into a steep rise in actual crime.³⁷

Where the territory affected by disorder is a public facility or a widely used commercial or retail area, the chain of intimidation and abandonment can have serious consequences for an entire city or metropolitan area.

A good recent example of this pathology and efforts to reverse it has occurred in the New York subway system's Operation Enforcement. In recent years, subway cars and stations in New York became heavily populated with the homeless, many of them substance abusers or mentally ill, who refused requests to move to available shelter space. Gradually, the disorderly behavior of the homeless and other transients began to affect subway ridership, and at the same time, violent crime in the system was rising steadily. The "Broken Windows" chain of events was fully underway, in a city uniquely dependent on public transportation.³⁸

Operation Enforcement is based on a simple premise: no one, homeless or otherwise, will be barred from the subway system, but basic rules of orderly behavior will be insisted upon. The program is gradually having a positive effect, but has been opposed vociferously in the courts and in public forums by civil liberties groups and homeless advocates, who believe the presence of the homeless

population in so visible a public facility will help generate support for better services.³⁹

If the new administration is to make community policing successful, it will need to take a firm stand in favor of efforts to maintain order in public places without compromising anyone's constitutional rights. The way to maintain our communities and fight crime is to insist that Americans accept a mutual obligation to allow each other use of common areas without intimidation or fear of crime.

Special attention should be paid to reducing disorder in public facilities especially vulnerable to crime, such as schools and public housing projects. Students and public housing tenants can never be "empowered" so long as they cannot insist on being treated decently and with basic civility in their daily lives.

Chicago's Operation Clean Sweep is an especially instructive example of both the dramatic effect on crime that can be produced by a concentrated effort to enforce rules in public housing projects, and of the misguided resistance of the traditional Left to initiatives that empower low-income citizens.⁴⁰

In Operation Clean Sweep, public housing officials, assisted by police, targeted high-crime projects and moved in to simultaneously take care of repair needs and identify unregistered tenants, guns, and drugs. At one project where the violent crime rate was 13 times the national average, crime dropped 32 percent. An interesting byproduct of the effort was a marriage boom, as unregistered tenants who were living in violation of housing authority rules against overnight visits chose to establish two-parent families rather than face eviction.⁴¹

Local civil liberties lawyers fought Operation Clean Sweep on grounds that it violated the constitutional protection against unreasonable search and seizure. But all opposition ceased following a highly publicized incident in which a child living in the Cabrini-Greene project was gunned down while walking hand-in-hand with his mother.⁴²

Both Operation Enforcement in New York and Operation Clean Sweep in Chicago show that we can reclaim public places lost to crime—if we listen to the people most affected, rather than defer to their self-appointed advocates.

The new President should personally take the initiative to encourage community self-defense against crime. At the earliest possible occasion, he should say to all Americans: If you have the courage to reclaim your communities from crime, I'll be with you, with every resource available to the federal government.

GUNS

Perhaps the greatest dereliction of duty in today's much-promised war on crime has been government's unwillingness to heed the pleas of our nation's police officers who have testified they are being out-gunned on our streets by gangs armed with military-style, semiautomatic assault weapons. Gangs have been able to purchase with ease weapons made only for the mass-murder of people, not for hunting or sports shooting; weapons that can be equipped with magazines loaded with 20 rounds of ammunition and often many more, and with Rambo-style, spray-from-the-hip gunstocks, and flash-suppressors and silencers. Yet the official policy of the Bush administration was to look the other way.

In 1989, after the nation was shocked by horrifying pictures from a schoolyard in Stockton, California, where a deranged man killed five children and wounded 30 more by firing 100 rounds in two minutes, the Treasury Department's Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms identified a list of assault weapons manufactured overseas—such as China's AK-47—that they said were made only for combat use and not for hunting or sports. President Bush banned the importation of these foreign-made weapons—but, yielding to the lobbyists of the National Rifle Association and the gun industry, he refused to ban sales of identical weapons that are made in the U.S.

There is no justification for the past administration's failure to respond to the urgent calls for help by leading law enforcement officials who feel their cops are in daily danger from these most dangerous weapons. After two Los Angeles police officers were killed by assault weapons, Police Chief Daryl Gates pleaded before Congress for a federal ban on the sales and import of assault weapons. "I do not want any more officers to be spray-gunned to death by street punks armed with high-tech killing machines," said Gates, who had also been Bush's 1988 campaign adviser on crime issues.

No president or political party can pose as a friend of police officers so long as it tolerates the sale and distribution of cop-killing weapons in the name of individual rights. The Bush administration's bizarre "buy American" policy on assault weapons, which opposes their importation but not their domestic manufacture, is an especially egregious example of official hypocrisy on guns and crime. And even Bush's political allies know that.

Consider the views of former Senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona. Not only was this 1964 Republican presidential standard

bearer the original "conscience of the conservatives," but he has also posed with his favorite hunting rifle in the NRA's national magazine advertisements that proclaim: "I am the NRA." He champions the right of every American to own firearms—"I've been a member of the NRA," Goldwater has said. "I collect, make and shoot guns." But he has no fear of taking direct aim at his NRA friends when he knows they are wrong. So, in 1989, he was quoted by the *Washington Post's* Chuck Conconi as saying: "I'm completely opposed to selling automatic rifles. I don't see any reason why they ever made semiautomatics. . . . I've never used an automatic or semiautomatic for hunting. There's no need to. They have no place in anybody's arsenal. If any SOB can't hit a deer with one shot, then he ought to quit shooting."

Today, the urgent need to rid our streets of uncontrolled firearms, including military assault weapons, is recognized by an overwhelming majority of Americans—even an overwhelming majority of the gun owners. In a poll for *Time* magazine, a national waiting period for gun purchasers was backed by 87 percent of America's gun owners—law-abiding citizens whose main concern was to keep guns out of the hands of felons. But President Bush, bowing to the lobbyists of the NRA, vowed to veto the Brady Bill, the measure passed by both the House and Senate that would order a modest five-working-day national waiting period for a background check on gun purchasers.

At a minimum, the new President should insist on a national waiting period for gun purchases, and a ban on military assault weapons. Neither step could even conceivably limit the legitimate purchase of firearms for use in hunting, collecting, or self-protection.

This is one area of criminal justice where tougher laws and courts might help. We suggest making the commission of a serious felony with a firearm a federal offense punishable by long mandatory sentences.

DRUGS

The effect of drug abuse on crime rates is universally accepted, but again, our attack on drugs has been heavy on rhetoric but light on systematic efforts to reduce demand as well as supply for drugs.

During the Bush administration roughly 70 percent of federal antidrug spending was channeled into reduction of drug supplies—mainly through interdiction of drug shipments by law en-

forcement officials. Only 30 percent of the federal funding was aimed at reduction of demand, this nation's voracious appetite for drugs—an appetite that is fed and financed by addicts who commit crimes to pay for their drugs.⁴³ The new President should give treatment and education—the demand-side drug efforts—equal priority and equal funding with law enforcement and other interdiction efforts.

Despite recent claims that the Bush administration's supply-side attack on drugs is working, the evidence is at best mixed. A just-completed national survey of schools found drug use among high school students rising during the last school year in seven of ten drug categories. More alarmingly, drug use rose in all categories for junior high school students. At every age level, increased drug use was pronounced among African-American students, with use of uppers, downers, and hallucinogens among the black high school population rising more than 25 percent in just one year.⁴⁴

Most antidrug experts agree that a much higher emphasis on treatment and education is in order. An immediate problem is the lack of treatment facilities. There are currently about one million treatable hard-core drug addicts in America who do not receive treatment, often because it is not available.⁴⁵ For example, every day the Fulton County Treatment Center in Atlanta places an average of 20 new addicts requesting treatment on a waiting list with 2,000 already in line.⁴⁶

We should make sure that addicts seeking treatment are immediately helped. Otherwise, they often return to, or resort to, crime to support their habits. In particular, we should insist that inmates in our prison system with drug problems—nearly half according to one estimate—receive drug treatment and education.⁴⁷ A current federal Bureau of Prisons effort to treat inmates before they are released back on the streets should be extended to state correctional facilities.⁴⁸ Making funds available for that purpose is one crime-fighting investment the federal government should undertake immediately.

CONCLUSION

We can make progress on crime in this new administration, and the federal government can make a valuable contribution to this effort. We need only abandon yesterday's empty rhetoric and rationalizations about crime, and quickly embrace tactics and strate-

gies that not only work against crime and the conditions that breed it, but that restitch the fabric that holds our communities together.

MANDATE FOR ACTION

1. **Establish a national Police Corps.** This initiative can put 100,000 new cops on the streets while raising the educational level and representative character of police departments and supplying a new "upward mobility track" for young people willing to serve their communities in exchange for help in going to college.
2. **Promote community policing through every available avenue.** Require police departments receiving federal law enforcement assistance to adopt community policing methods.
3. **Order federal agencies to use all available resources to support community self-defense against crime.** In particular, public places, public housing, and public schools should be reclaimed from the unsafe conditions that breed crime.
4. **Enact the Brady Bill, ban assault weapons, and make the commission of crimes with guns a federal offense.** We can protect our police and our citizens from gun-toting criminals without abridging the right to bear arms for self-protection, hunting, or sports.
5. **Give drug treatment and education efforts equal funding with law enforcement efforts.** All addicts should have access to treatment, beginning with those already in prison.