

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: owner-drc-natl (owner-drc-natl@drcnet.org@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-NOV-1998 08:57:00.00

SUBJECT: The Week Online with DRCNet, Issue #66

TO: David B. Des Roches (David B. Des Roches@EOP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

The Week Online with DRCNet, Issue #66 -- November 6, 1998

A Publication of the Drug Reform Coordination Network

----- PLEASE COPY AND DISTRIBUTE -----

(To sign off this list, [mailto: listproc@drcnet.org](mailto:listproc@drcnet.org) with the line "signoff drc-natl" in the body of the message, or <mailto:lists@drcnet.org> for assistance. To subscribe to this list, visit [<http://www.drcnet.org/signup.html>](http://www.drcnet.org/signup.html).)

(This issue can be also be read on our web site at [<http://www.drcnet.org/wol/066.html>](http://www.drcnet.org/wol/066.html). Check out the DRCNN weekly radio segment at [<http://www.drcnet.org/drcnn/>](http://www.drcnet.org/drcnn/).)

PERMISSION to reprint or redistribute any or all of the contents of The Week Online is hereby granted. We ask that any use of these materials include proper credit and, where appropriate, a link to one or more of our web sites. If your publication customarily pays for publication, DRCNet requests checks payable to the organization. If your

publication does not pay for materials, you are free to use the materials gratis. In all cases, we request notification for our records, including physical copies where material has appeared in print. Contact: Drug Reform Coordination Network, 2000 P St., NW, Suite 615, Washington, DC 20036, (202) 293-8340 (voice), (202) 293-8344 (fax), e-mail drcnet@drcnet.org. Thank you.

ONLY TILL THURSDAY: The DRCNet Drug Crazy Book Giveaway is

still open to entrants, but only till midnight on Thursday!

Enter or get more info at <http://www.drcnet.org/contest/>,

and you might win a free, personally autographed copy of this exciting new book from Random House by author Mike Gray.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. SWEEP!!!

<http://www.drcnet.org/wol/066.html#sweep>

2. District of Columbia: Silencing the Voice of the Voters

<http://www.drcnet.org/wol/066.html#devote>

3. Arizona: Restoring the Will of the Voters

<http://www.drcnet.org/wol/066.html#arizona>

4. Colorado: Ballot Status Uncertain, Voters Certain

<http://www.drcnet.org/wol/066.html#colorado>

5. Oregon Perspective

<http://www.drcnet.org/wol/066.html#oregon>

6. Report Finds Injection-Related AIDS Ravaging African

American and Latino Communities -- Police Presence a

Factor in Disease's Disproportionate Impact

<http://www.drcnet.org/wol/066.html#emergency>

7. Supreme Court Hears Car Search Case

<http://www.drcnet.org/wol/066.html#court>

8. DRCNet Launching STOPTHEDRUGWAR.ORG Web Site

<http://www.drcnet.org/wol/066.html#newsite>

9. DRCNet Launches New "Activism" Online Discussion Group

<http://www.drcnet.org/wol/066.html#drc-active>

10. High School Honor Student Expelled for Sipping Sangria

at Internship Party

<http://www.drcnet.org/wol/066.html#expelled>

11. EDITORIAL: Message Sent

<http://www.drcnet.org/wol/066.html#editorial>

12. A Message from DRCNet to You

=====

1. SWEEP!!!

Election Day 1998 turned into a stunning sweep for advocates of drug policy reform as voters in Alaska, Washington, Oregon, Nevada, Colorado, Arizona and Washington, DC rejected the extremist rhetoric of national officials.

While many of the newly passed laws still face uncertain futures in the face of federal law and congressional disapproval, the impact of the votes is sure to be dramatic.

In Oregon, a medical marijuana initiative passed while a bill which would have enhanced penalties for personal possession of marijuana was soundly defeated. In Alaska and Washington State, medical marijuana initiatives won handily.

In Nevada, voters approved an amendment to the state constitution legalizing the medicinal use of marijuana.

That amendment will be on the ballot again in 2000 as voters must approve constitutional measures in consecutive elections. In Colorado, an on-again off-again initiative was ruled invalid by a state appeals court just days before the election, after two disputed counts by the Secretary of State's office found petition signatures insufficient to qualify for the ballot (see below); but voters registered

their support nonetheless, giving the initiative nearly 60% of the vote. The following several articles discuss some of the more complex votes and situations surrounding this year's drug policy votes, and additional info is available on our web site at <<http://www.drcnet.org/election98/>>.

=====

2. District of Columbia: Silencing the Voice of the Voters

In Washington, DC, a last-minute addition to the DC Appropriations Bill, submitted by Rep. Bob Barr (R-GA), forbade the use of district monies for the certification, not the counting, as erroneously reported in the Washington Post this week, of the medical marijuana vote. The initiative was a grass-roots effort with strong backing and support by ACTUP DC and the Marijuana Policy Project.

On Tuesday (Election Day) the District of Columbia Board of Elections and Ethics issued a release which said that "under pressure and mandate from Congress," they would not release the results of the vote on I-59. "While the votes on Initiative Measure 59 will be counted," it said, "the Board has been instructed by Congress that the DC Appropriations Act, 1999, prevents the Board from making the results of the tabulation available to the public."

Ken McGhie, Counsel to the Board, told The Week Online, "Over the past week, there have been concerns, expressed by the Congress, as to whether or not the Board could count and announce the results in light of the Barr Amendment. The Board and the Corporation Council decided that they could justify counting the ballots, since they were already printed with I-59 on them among the other races, and the computer was already programmed to count everything on the ballot. But we were concerned that announcing the result would be viewed as an attempt to defy the will of Congress. We felt it would be more prudent to wait for some direction from the court."

The Board, McGhie said, would file a motion for declaratory judgement later this week, along with a request for expedited consideration.

When asked if he knew of any precedent for the results of an American election being kept from the people on orders from the Congress, McGhie said "none that I've been able to find."

The ACLU announced that in addition to the lawsuit filed this week to get the results of the election certified, they would be filing a Freedom of Information Act request to get the results of the election released to the public.

Exit polling, conducted by Americans for Medical Rights, found that 69% of voters cast ballots in favor of the initiative.

Arthur Spitzer of the ACLU, National Capital District, told The Week Online that the ACLU had already filed suit to force the certification of the vote on First Amendment grounds. "Our position is that while the Constitution puts the District under Congressional control, and the Congress could, for example, tell the district that they cannot use voter initiatives at all, they cannot pick and choose which are okay and which are not. The Barr amendment said that District monies could not be used for an initiative which would lower penalties for marijuana, but it doesn't say, for example, that the district cannot certify an initiative to increase penalties for marijuana. That's like saying, 'you can vote for a Republican, but not a Democrat.' Congress cannot pass laws, in the District or anywhere else, that violate the First Amendment."

On the day after the election, the ACLU also filed a Freedom of Information Act request to have the results of the vote released to the public. "There are several statutory defenses to such a request, for instance the government is not required to release personal files, or details of an ongoing criminal investigation," Spitzer said. "But we are confident that the results of a public election will not fit

under any of those exceptions. Assuming that is so, they have ten days to release the information. But we have also reminded them that they are free to release the information sooner, and we're hoping that they will do so."

Alice Miller of the DC Board of Elections and Ethics told The Week Online, "We were stuck between a rock and a hard place, to tell you the truth. On the one hand, it's the Board's responsibility to announce and certify the results of elections, but on the other, there was the Barr amendment, which seemed to override that responsibility. Right now, we're just waiting for some direction from the federal court as to what we should do."

=====

3. Arizona: Restoring the Will of the Voters

In Arizona, voters reinstated a proposition that was gutted by the legislature after it was first approved at the ballot box in 1996. Originally Proposition 200, the initiative gave physicians the right to prescribe any drug, as long as they could show a second opinion and some medical evidence that it would benefit patients. Prop. 200 also eliminated jail sentences for persons convicted of first-time non-violent drug offenses.

After the legislature gutted the new law, The People Have Spoken, a group dedicated to preserving the reforms that Arizonans had voted for, gathered over 200,000 signatures to put the legislature's changes on the ballot in '98. These changes to Prop. 200 were rejected this week, thus restoring the broadest reform measure in the nation to its original terms. A companion initiative, 105, was also passed this week. Prop. 105 mandates that the legislature now needs a 3/4 majority in order to make changes to voter-approved initiatives.

=====

4. Colorado: Ballot Status Uncertain, Voters Certain

A state court ruling just days before the election eliminated Colorado's medical marijuana initiative from the ballot. However, as the ballots had already been printed, many voters pulled the lever anyway. CBS News reported on election night that 59% of voters approved the measure, although the issue was locked out in certain districts, thereby making an official count impossible.

There is an ongoing appeal in Colorado regarding alleged mismanagement of both signature counts by the Secretary of State, leading to the disqualification of the initiative. If proponents can show that the measure was wrongfully

disqualified, it would then automatically be placed on the ballot in 2000, and it's possible that damages could be awarded. The Week Online will keep you up to date as this story progresses.

=====

5. Oregon Perspective

- Bear Wilner

(Editor's Note: Bear Wilner, flush with the heady glow of victory, sends us his observations on the elections from his perch in Eugene. This week, we're letting him wax editorial... being that we're all in such a good mood. Thanks again, Bear, for keeping us abreast as the campaigns unfolded in the Beaver state.)

The election of 1996 was the most important in the history of US drug policy reform to date. We must continue to give credit to the tremendously revitalizing impact of the passages of California's Proposition 215 and Arizona's Proposition 200. Yes, they built on decades of activism and countless hours of hard work, but their demonstration of massive popular support for change was what dealt the deathblow to so many years of Drug War status quo.

Still, hard beset as they were by federal and state

officials hostile to any weakening of the prohibitionist edifice, California's and Arizona's new situations were close to succumbing in recent months. Now, with the universal ballot-box victory of the reform legislative positions that were up for a vote and with the election of a number of more reform-minded candidates across the nation, California and Arizona will never again be forced to stand alone on this issue. I am deeply proud to be able to announce that the state of Oregon has joined the rest of the US jurisdictions that have signaled their intent to begin moving toward a new approach to drug law -- and not a moment too soon.

Final results have been delayed by the count of many hundred thousand absentee ballots, but it is clear that Oregonians rejected Measure 57, which would have recriminalized the possession of under an ounce of cannabis, by an even larger margin than they passed Measure 67, which will allow severely ill Oregonians and their caretakers to grow and possess cannabis in order to alleviate their symptoms. Even a last-minute infusion of money could not salvage the poorly run anti-reform campaigns; this election was about decency, not dollars, and voters were acting on a real understanding of the issues at stake. Nevertheless, the same governor and essentially the same state legislature will continue in office with the new year. For that reason, Oregon reformers must continue to work, to organize, and to remain vigilant

against any tampering with the people's will.

The state's largest newspaper, the Portland Oregonian, which had printed a blistering anti-67 editorial as well as voicing support for 57, has begun urging lawmakers to tinker in the guts of the medical-cannabis legislation even before it has gone into full effect. With its editorial board expressing their fear of "the prospect of a plague of pony-tailed doctors prescribing reefer for the blues," the Oregonian's language is a far cry from the kind of balanced journalism to be found in Phoenix's normally quite conservative Arizona Republic (<http://www.azcentral.com>) two days after the election. Oregon activists were expecting this sort of sore-loser response, though, and had already begun planning their campaign in support of the newly approved Oregon Medical Marijuana Act well in advance of November 3rd. The sorts of extra-constitutional legerdemain that the likes of outgoing California Attorney General Dan Lungren loved to practice in response to the people's mandates are not foreseen as having much impact here in fiercely independent-minded Oregon.

=====

6. Report Finds Injection-Related AIDS Ravaging African American and Latino Communities -- Police Presence a Factor in Disease's Disproportionate Impact

A report released last weekend by the Dogwood Center, Health Emergency 1999, found that injection-related AIDS and other diseases have continued to take an enormous toll in the African American and Latino communities. Further, Health Emergency found that the likelihood of an African American or Latino injection drug user is several times more likely to catch HIV/AIDS than a white injection drug user -- illustrating how drug enforcement drives up the spread of HIV by encouraging users in heavily policed communities to dispose of syringes quickly to avoid discovery and arrest. In all cases, the risk of catching HIV or other deadly diseases from a shared syringe is several times greater than the likelihood of dying from an overdose.

Health Emergency 99 was introduced by former US Surgeon General Dr. Joycelyn Elders, at the US Conference on AIDS in Dallas last weekend. The full text of the report can be found online at <<http://www.drcnet.org/healthemergency/>>.

=====

7. Supreme Court Hears Car Search Case

The Supreme Court heard arguments this week (11/3) in the case of a Patrick Knowles, whose car was searched by officers in Iowa, against his wishes, incident to a speeding

ticket. Officer Ronald Cook, who conducted the search, testified at trial that other than speeding he had no reason to suspect Knowles of illegal activity.

The search, however, turned up a pipe and a small amount of marijuana, and Knowles was arrested.

The Iowa Supreme Court found that Iowa law allows for a search in any instance where the officer could have made an arrest, and state law allows for an arrest in the case of speeding. The US Supreme Court, however, ruled in 1973 that police can search people upon arrest, citing a need to disarm the arrestee and preserve evidence.

At argument, the Justices seemed wary of allowing such a broad interpretation of the right to search. At one point, Justice Scalia asked the attorney for the state of Iowa whether an officer could stop someone, arrest them, search them and then release them. When the attorney answered in the affirmative, Scalia responded "Wow."

Justice Kennedy noted that while an officer is permitted to conduct a search incident to an arrest, "you want to turn it around and have an arrest incident to a search. It seems to me that would be an abuse of authority."

A decision on the case is not expected until early next

year.

=====

8. DRCNet Launching STOPTHEDRUGWAR.ORG Web Site

This afternoon, DRCNet will be launching the first sections of what will be a unique, major new reform web site. The stopthedrugwar.org web site will be more than a DRCNet web site, but a gateway to both the issues and the movement, designed to inform people about the consequences of current drug policy, while connecting them with the groups that are working in their areas of interest and other resources and opportunities for involvement.

When fully developed, stopthedrugwar.org will point visitors to organizations and resources in their states as well as in their issues. Today we are presenting the first of our issue overviews, giving readers an introduction to topics such as chronic pain, drug-related AIDS, medical marijuana, kids in the drug war, and more, and ask for your feedback. Check it out at <http://www.stopthedrugwar.org> and let us know what you think.

We anticipate that stopthedrugwar.org will become our principal means for promoting DRCNet and bringing new people into the movement. You can help! Stick a link or banner on

your web site, write about it in your newsletter, put a bumper sticker on your car or other visible locations. (Bumper stickers sent free to all making donations, and upon request to those who have made donations in the past or who can't afford to donate. E-mail your requests to bumpersticker@drcnet.org -- normally we just send one, but if you have a use for more, tell us what you will be doing with them, and we'll consider your request.)

Note that stopthedrugwar.org will not supersede our current web sites, drcnet.org and druglibrary.org, but will play a new and different role. Stopthedrugwar.org is being built as a "gateway to the movement"; drcnet.org will continue to be "DRCNet Central" while druglibrary.org will continue to be "Information Central".

=====

9. DRCNet Launches New "Activism" Online Discussion Group

The drug policy reform movement is on the fringes no more. So now, more than ever, it is time to DO SOMETHING! Toward this end, DRCNet proudly announces DRC-Action. DRC-Action is an open email discussion list for people who need or want to share support and ideas on WHAT TO DO to begin having a real impact through realistic strategies. The focus of the list will be primarily on local and statewide action, with

an eye toward educating and involving key players and constituencies in the struggle to end the war.

The list will not be moderated, but in the interest of making it as productive as possible, DRCNet will be quick to remind those who clutter participants' boxes with non-action related materials or posts. DRCNet will also be inviting several movement professionals and effective activists from various parts of the country to participate and to lend their ideas and expertise, and we believe that the resulting discussion will be both interesting and useful for all involved.

So, if you've been waiting for some guidance, ideas or a support system to help you to make concrete and meaningful progress, please subscribe to DRC-Action today. The movement, and your country, needs you now! See you there.

To subscribe, send e-mail to listproc@drcnet.org with the words: "subscribe drc-action your name" in the body (not the subject) of the message. (Leave out the quotes and substitute your own name where it says "your name".) You will receive a confirmation message if you have successfully joined. The address for posting is drc-action@drcnet.org, and only subscribers will be able to post.

=====

10. High School Honor Student Expelled for Sipping Sangria at Internship Party

Jennifer Coonce, 17, a National Honor Society member, has been suspended for ten days, and barred from her high school campus for the remainder of her senior year, for taking two sips of sangria at a party in the offices of a design firm for whom Coonce had just begun interning. She will take classes from home over an independent teleconference system to complete her high school degree, and will lose both her Honor Society membership and her advanced placement credit, as the necessary classes are not offered through the teleconference program.

Ironically, it was Coonce's mother who alerted the school to the fact that her daughter had sipped the wine out of concern that the company, Interiors by Terry D, a design firm, had inappropriately offered the wine to her daughter at a going-away party for another employee.

=====

11. EDITORIAL: Message Sent

In the hours and days after the election, the mainstream media was, predictably, teeming with analysis and debate,

provided by the usual voices, on what, exactly, it all meant. Democrats, to be sure, bucked both Clinton's lack of self control and the historical trends by gaining, rather than losing seats in the house in the sixth year of their president's administration. And Republicans had accomplished what they had not done in seventy years, keeping control of both houses for three straight election cycles.

Was the election a referendum on impeachment? On the religious right? Was it the Democrats' ability to get out the African American vote? Was it Social Security? Health care? The Budget?

Over and over, on op-ed pages, radio talk shows, and on a dozen or more 24-hour news and political TV stations, the debate roared: What were the voters saying? What was the trend? What did it all mean?

The pundits and prognosticators, bought and paid for by the corporate media, are very comfortable discussing politics around the edges. They are good at debating the often meager differences between the major parties, offering their opinions on the well-rehearsed theatrics that pass for political dialogue, and making predictions based on polls made up of questions devoid of nuance or context asked of the small percentage of voters who will still take the time

to speak to a pollster.

But present the "experts" with the unfamiliar, with a scenario that does not fit into their experience, confront the editors, the anchors, the talking heads with a sign of change so dramatic that it portends a seismic shift in the political reality, and you've lost them. Unable to make it fit, they will chalk it up as an anomaly and move on to more comfortable material.

On Election Day 1998, every single ballot measure that would reform an element of our nation's drug policy passed, and passed comfortably. In each case, the usual band of drug warriors, including, most significantly, the federal government itself -- and a majority of both political parties -- were vehemently opposed. Yet in each case the voters ignored them. Whether it was medical marijuana, decriminalization of personal, recreational marijuana use, or an end to jail time for non-violent possession of any drug, the voters supported reform.

In assessing the media's silence on this trend, one should note that is not as if the drug war is an unimportant or inexpensive issue. Tens of billions of tax dollars are spent year after year, while hundreds of thousands of Americans are forced into a broken justice system. Civil liberties are eroded, institutions and entire governments

are corrupted, global criminal enterprises are enriched and empowered and the nation's children are confronted with a black market that is more than eager to have them as customers.

Neither was it the case that a single initiative, stealthily ushered onto a ballot, passed under the noses of an unsuspecting public. Initiatives passed in places as diverse as Arizona, Oregon and the District of Columbia, often after fierce debate and much media coverage. In addition, California's voters rejected Dan Lungren, widely known as the state's staunchest opponent of patients' access to medical marijuana, in his race for governor. And in Minnesota, the voters shocked the experts by selecting Jesse Ventura as their governor, a Reform Party candidate who has publicly stated that the drug war doesn't work.

And yet, in the nation's media, a puzzled silence. Not a word about the implications for the drug war, certainly our most disastrous and destructive domestic policy. A policy, it bears repeating, that both major parties have fallen over themselves to support. Not a word about what the results tell us about voters' confidence in their leaders on this issue, after their leaders ridiculed the reforms and warned of dire consequences in the event of their passage. Not a word about what all of this means for the future earnings of pharmaceutical companies and the prison industry and all the

other big political contributors who reap enormous profits from the prosecution of various elements of the war. Not a word about the singular clear trend to come out of the election of 1998.

Those Americans who were watching with their own, rather than the pundits' eyes, however, could scarcely have missed it. Election '98 was a sweep in the most resounding sense of the word. It showed clearly that the people no longer trust their government, not either party, on the vital issue of the Drug War. It was a stunning refutation of the status quo.

The experts in the mainstream media, for all their air time and all their knowledge and experience, missed the boat on the only clear message that was sent from the voters to the politicians in Election '98. Perhaps they will get it next time, in 2000, when the victories keep coming and it is the drug warriors themselves, and not just their policies, that suffer ignominious defeat. But they will likely be left only to analyze in the aftermath, as they have already shown that they are too blind to predict the demise of this ignoble war.

The results, collectively, indicate in no uncertain terms that the movement has begun in earnest. That movement represents, perhaps, far too substantive a change to be

acknowledged or even comprehended by a media elite beholden to the status quo. Voters, in 1998, sent a message of freedom and of personal dignity, of their rejection of absurd and alarmist rhetoric and of their confidence in the judgment of individuals over the judgment of the state. And as clear as that message was, it was predictably unfamiliar to the sorry group of Washington apologists assigned to explain our political reality to us. But ignoring the signs does not change their meaning. Nor can it alter the course of events that they portend.

Adam J. Smith

Associate Director

ajsmith@drcnet.org

=====

12. A Message from DRCNet to You

The exciting events of the past week have filled reformers with energy and hope. Over the next few weeks, we at DRCNet, and our colleagues at other drug reform groups, will be charting plans for how to best apply our efforts at this historic juncture, how to most powerfully move forward from the Victory of '98 -- how to bring sanity to this important social issue that touches so many different aspects of our lives. We hope soon to announce an "action plan" --

hopefully a plan involving many reform groups acting in coalition -- so keep reading The Week Online and DRCNet action alerts, to make sure you are informed and can be part of this historic movement for change. Our time is here, now, and you are a part of the answer.

Your enthusiasm during DRCNet's lifetime is what has made the organization thrive. But though we wish it weren't the case, your support through financial contributions is an important part of what has made the organization actually exist. You might not have realized just how important member support is to this organization, but the following explanation will explain very specifically how your support is irreplaceable and necessary to the effort.

DRCNet, in the legal sense, is made up of two different parts -- the DRCNet Foundation, a 501(c)(3) educational organization, and the Drug Reform Coordination Network, a 501(c)(4) organization that is free to do educational work, but which exists to allow us to do more grassroots lobbying than the DRCNet Foundation as a 501(c)(3) can do. Most of our funding comes in the form of grants and major tax-deductible gifts to the Foundation, 95% of the expenditures of which must go to strictly educational activities or work that supports those activities. And indeed most of our work, including the writing of most of the articles in The Week Online and on our web site, is educational.

But what this means that our crucial legislative action alerts -- and the larger grassroots political projects that we are contemplating for the near future -- must be financed and carried out by the Network instead. And the Network's principal source of income is the many small and mid-size contributions made by members of DRCNet.

In a real way, then, we are dependent on hundreds or thousands of you sending in small or large contributions -- be they as low as \$5 or \$10 or as high as \$100 or more -- to make our legislative work possible. Without your continuing support, that important part of our work could not continue. And without the support of many of you who have not yet contributed membership dues, that work will not be able to expand to meet the phenomenal opportunities created by the victories of Election '98.

DRCNet readers are busy people, perhaps never more so than when reading their e-mail! But if you want to see this movement grow to meet the challenge of the times, please take a moment to visit our member registration/donation form at <https://www.drcnet.org/cgi-shl/dcreg.cgi> (encryption protected, recommended for credit card donations), or <http://www.drcnet.org/cgi-shl/dcreg.cgi> (no encryption, fill it out and print it out to send in by mail) -- or just send your check or money to: DRCNet, 2000 P St., NW, Suite

615, Washington, DC 20036. Consider becoming a monthly credit card donor! THOSE DONATING \$35 OR MORE WILL RECEIVE A FREE COPY OF SHATTERED LIVES: PORTRAIT'S FROM AMERICA'S DRUG WAR -- see <http://www.drcnet.org/rapid/1998/9-14.html> for more. Note that contributions to DRCNet are not tax-deductible. (If you prefer to make a tax-deductible contribution, please send a check or money order made payable to the DRCNet Foundation, at the same mailing address.)

Another way to support the organization financially, without actually having to part with any money yourself, is to enroll in the eyegive online fundraising program. Just go to <http://www.eyegive.com/html/ssi.cfm?CID=1060> to enroll with DRCNet as your recipient non-profit (or to read more about eyegive). DRCNet will immediately earn \$2 just for you signing up, and you can earn us \$50, \$100 or more, just by visiting the eyegive home page at <http://www.eyegive.com> on a regular basis for just a few seconds each time.

We hope you'll do both, however, for the following three reasons. One is that when a member sends us a check or a credit card donation, we can then count that person as a member, and the number of paying members we have supporting us is an important measure that we present to our funders on a monthly basis. The more of you join, the more confidence they will have to invest in DRCNet, providing the backing

needed to do outreach in the form of mailings, promotion of stopthedrugwar.org, and more, building the movement to something much larger than that which we know today. The second reason is that if we know who you are and where you are, we will be able to alert you if there is a special way that you can advance the effort in your community, Congressional District or state. The third reason is that the eye-give earnings come to after three months (which they need for their auditing purposes), but we have opportunities at DRCNet that need a little bit more money right now. Two students who have interned for us already and done great work are waiting to know if we can hire them part-time for certain important projects that will contribute greatly to the movement's objectives. They'll do a little bit as volunteers anyway, but having to take classes and work other jobs means their time for DRCNet is limited. Your support with a donation today will help us bring these bright young people on board and will be a very efficient use of funds to achieve results.

Thank you for being a part of DRCNet. Whether you are able to contribute at this time or not, we are glad to have you on our list. And stay tuned -- there's been good news this week, but the best is yet to come!

David Borden

Executive Director

borden@drcnet.org

DRCNet DRCNet DRCNet DRCNet DRCNet DRCNet DRCNet

JOIN/MAKE A DONATION <http://www.drcnet.org/dcreg.html>

DRUG POLICY LIBRARY <http://www.druglibrary.org/>

REFORMER'S CALENDAR <http://www.drcnet.org/calendar.html>

SUBSCRIBE TO THIS LIST <http://www.drcnet.org/signup.html>

DRCNet HOME PAGE <http://www.drcnet.org/>

ONLINE LIBRARY <http://www.druglibrary.org/> ===== ATTACHMENT 1

=====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)

id <01J3UJVO9CR4001CU1@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov; Fri,

6 Nov 1998 09:23:54 EST

Received: from Storm.EOP.GOV by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)

with ESMTP id <01J3UJVHIQOW001CZE@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov;

Fri, 06 Nov 1998 09:23:47 -0500 (EST)

Received: from www.drikka.net ([209.235.14.254])

by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-12 #29131)

with ESMTP id <01J3UJVCADQW0007TO@STORM.EOP.GOV> for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov;

Fri, 06 Nov 1998 09:23:33 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from server@localhost) by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9)

id JAA11075; Fri, 06 Nov 1998 09:18:24 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from drcnet@localhost) by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9)

id IAA00852 for server; Fri, 06 Nov 1998 08:55:20 -0500 (EST)

Received: from avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net

(avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net [207.217.120.50])

by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9) with ESMTP id IAA00823 for

<drc-natl@drcnet.org>; Fri, 06 Nov 1998 08:55:17 -0500 (EST)

Received: from drcnetisdn.earthlink.net

(ip94.washington11.dc.pub-ip.psi.net [38.30.47.94])

by avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.8.7/8.8.5) with SMTP id FAA22900 for

<drc-natl@drcnet.org>; Fri, 06 Nov 1998 05:55:05 -0800 (PST)

X-Sender: drcnet@drcnet.org

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.2

X-Listprocessor-version: 8.2.08 -- ListProc(tm) by CREN

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

**Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System
[EMAIL] and Tape Restoration Project [Email]**

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

This marker identifies a responsive email, already made available within another collection.

Collection: 2019-0145-F

Bucket: Default

Creation Date: 1998-12-04

Subject: The Week Online with DRCNet, Issue #69

Creator: owner-drc-natl owner-drc-natl@drcnet.org@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: owner-drctalk (owner-drctalk@drcnet.org@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-DEC-1998 13:49:00.00

SUBJECT: Comments Requested: Future of Drug Policy Reform

TO: David B. Des Roches (David B. Des Roches@EOP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

The Future of Drug Policy Reform

Can you move forward after the election without a movement?

From Laura Kriho <cohup@levellers.org>

Colorado Hemp Initiative Project

December 9, 1998

Fellow reformers:

As you may know, many activists around the country have been very critical of the tactics used by Americans for Medical Rights in their medical marijuana ballot initiative campaigns this year. AMR employed a strategy of dividing and demoralizing grassroots organizations in most of the states they worked in. We criticised this as being a serious threat to the reform movement. Our analysis of the AMR strategy is available online at:
<http://www.levellers.org/inits98anal.htm>

AMR has been mostly silent about these criticisms, refusing to answer even the simplest questions about their initiatives, until recently. Bill Zimmerman, the head of AMR, spoke at the NORML conference on November 12. Some of his comments are transcribed below.

Surprisingly, Bill Zimmerman confirmed many of the criticisms that activists around the country have been making against AMR for over a year. But he also continued the pattern of lies used by AMR, when he said "AMR never, ever tried to shut down local activists."

Partial Transcript of the panel on medical marijuana initiatives at the NORML conference in Washington, D.C. on November 12, 1998.

This conference session is available online at:

<http://www.legalize-usa.org/TOCs/video7.htm> (76 minutes)

Q and A part of session:

Author Chris Conrad asked a question about how the differences between activist/grassroots organizations and the funded groups could be resolved.

Bill Zimmerman replied:

"We did not run grassroots campaigns in the states where we ran initiatives."

...

"We came in with outside money. We bought the signatures and we didn't use volunteers to get them. We had television advertising. We had sophisticated press strategies" that were not targeted at the activists but at the mainstream public.

...

"We did that because we were playing an electoral game, not a movement-building game and there's a big difference."

...

"You cannot build a mainstream campaign, generally, unless there is first an activist movement that brings the issue that you're trying to mainstream to the public..."

"But once you're ready to move from an activist, movement-building stage...to mainstreaming an issue ... you've got to go about it in a different way."

"Election campaigns...are focused on the people in the middle because they're the people whose votes can be moved..."

"Who are those people? They're the people that don't give a shit about most things."

...

"So you're stuck in a bad dynamic when you work on elections and that dynamic is you've got to talk to people who are least informed. That's exactly the opposite dynamic than when you're trying to build a movement. When you're trying to build a movement, and you're trying to recruit activists and you're trying to get people to do something more than just punch a hole in the ballot on election day, then you've got to educate people; you've got to talk to what's best in people. You don't manipulate them, you educate them because you know there's time and there's commitment and there's energy to learn things, develop new knowledge, read magazines, read books, get educated, come to meetings, talk to people, all those things."

...

"So those of us that work on movement building and developing activism and coordinating grassroots movements, have a set of requirements or procedures or biases that are very different from those of us who work on election campaigns."

"We shouldn't be enemies because neither of us can work without the other. You can't bring an issue to the ballot unless there has been, in the years preceding your bringing it to the ballot, a great deal of activism. We can only do elections standing on the shoulders of the activists that came before us."

Don Wirtshafter, of the Ohio Hempory, asked whether AMR had learned anything from the campaign in Washington state where the Killian brothers had been able to get the activists and the funded people to work together on a common goal.

Bill Zimmerman replied, "No," he had not learned anything.

Don Wirtshafter also asked if AMR had purposefully tried to alienate the activists in the states that they worked in.

Bill Zimmerman replied, "AMR never, ever tried to shut down local activists or prevent them from talking. What we did instead was ignore them."

<End partial transcript>

-

Commentary and Request for Comments

This last statement is a continuation of a pattern of lies AMR has employed to justify the faulty strategies they applied in their campaigns this year.

Because the cannabis reform movement is based largely on exposing the lies employed by the government to justify cannabis prohibition, I feel compelled to expose lies wherever I see them.

Fact: AMR did try to shut down activists across the country. It was part of their strategy.

Alaska: AMR introduced a ballot initiative in competition with the initiative being circulated by Alaskans for Cannabis Therapeutics, a local, grassroots organization of patients and patient advocates. The well-funded AMR initiative disrupted and destroyed ACT's initiative campaign. The AMR initiative, which contained provisions that were unacceptable to the ACT supporters, passed by 58% of the vote.

Maine: AMR introduced a ballot initiative in competition with the initiative being circulated by Maine Citizens for Medical Marijuana, a local, grassroots organization of patients and patient advocates.

Proponents of the MCMM petition had already gathered a third of their signatures when AMR introduced their initiative, which, like the Alaska petition, contained provisions that were unacceptable to the local patients and patient advocates.

AMR spent \$250,000 in Maine, but failed to collect enough signatures to have the initiative placed on the ballot. The MCMM petition campaign was disrupted by the influx of AMR money, and MCMM supporters were not able to collect enough signatures to have their initiative placed on the ballot either.

Washington, D.C.: AMR introduced a ballot initiative (I-60) in competition with the initiative (I-59) being circulated by ACT UP/DC, a local, grassroots organization of patients and patient advocates. ACTUP was the only local organization that was able to successfully overcome AMR's interference and get their own initiative on the ballot.

See: <http://www.levellers.org/patients.htm> and
<http://www.levellers.org/locals.htm>

Fact: It was part of AMR's strategy to "shut down" the local activists. They thought that by showing their opposition to the "legalizers" and trying to distance themselves from the grassroots, that they would appear more conservative and thus more appealing to voters. This has been part of their strategy since the Prop. 215 campaign in California where Dennis Peron, father of the medical marijuana movement, was consistently trashed in the press by Bill Zimmerman and AMR.

Bill Zimmerman said, "AMR never, ever tried to shut down local activists or prevent them from talking. What we did instead was ignore them." But then he said that you can only run an election campaign "on the shoulders of the activists that came before us."

We have been saying since last year that AMR purposefully went into the states with the most organized cannabis reform movements since those were the states with the highest polling numbers. AMR had previously said that the work of local activists had nothing to do with the pre-existing support for cannabis in those states. Now we see AMR admitting that they didn't ignore the activists and patients, they -used- them. Bill Zimmerman stood on the shoulders of activists and patients and used the groundwork that they had made over many years of activism and public education to achieve symbolic election wins, but destroy the grassroots efforts.

Bill Zimmerman thinks "election" campaigns are somehow different from "movement-building" campaigns and in order to win an election, you need to manipulate voters, not educate them. In order to win an election, you need to stop trying to build a movement.

Bill, you won three elections with this philosophy (AK, OR, NV), but you LOST three other states because of this philosophy (CO, DC, ME) where you didn't even get your initiative on the ballot. Election campaigns and building movements are not mutually-exclusive. In fact, most successful elections have strong movements behind them.

Election-winning and movement-building are completely dependent on each other. I know that there are differences in the strategies employed, but you can't just ignore the movement for sake of an election win. Do you honestly think that this is progress, when you have passed a law that has no organized grassroots support to create further reforms after the

campaign or, worse, when you have passed a law that has divided the existing grassroots support, or worse yet, when you divide grassroots support and then fail to pass any law at all? How do you move forward after the election without a movement?

Fact: All the states that passed medical marijuana legislation would have passed with virtually no campaigning, no advertising, no "sophisticated press strategies." These initiatives passed because people are ready for change. Heck, they were even willing to vote for a -bad- medical marijuana initiative in many of these states.

Fact: AMR could have had election wins in 8-12 states this year instead of only four by:

- 1) Providing funds to gather signatures and hire local organizers in the states with the highest polling numbers, instead of wasting money on lawyers, consultants, and PR firms.
- 2) Not alienating grassroots support.
- 3) Spending the bulk of the money on the other states that had marginal polling results to educate people and get out the vote.

AMR spent \$800,000 in Colorado, \$250,000 in Maine, and an estimated \$100,000 in D.C. on failed attempts to get an initiative on the ballot. I don't know what they spent on their successful campaigns and on their salaries. So that's over \$1 million dollars that could have been used to help support those local organizations, instead of fighting against them. You only need to look at the successful campaign of ACTUP on Initiative 59 in D.C. to see that local organizers will give you more bang for your buck

than any hired "professionals" will. I'm confident that you'd never see any grassroots reform organization that I know of spend \$1 million and not be successful.

GOOD NEWS

The good news to come from Bill Zimmerman at the conference is that AMR may not be refunded for the next election cycle.

The keynote speaker of the conference, Ethan Nadelmann of the Lindesmith Center, controls most of the funding for AMR from billionaire George Soros.

Mr. Nadelmann stated during his speech that he wasn't sure which direction to take the funding to in the future: if he should put it back into AMR to do more ballot initiatives or if he should try some other strategy. He said he was open for suggestions.

I'd like to encourage people to send Mr. Nadelmann your comments. Surely, there are hundreds of ideas about what particular campaigns would be the most effective, but we are more concerned with the strategy employed to win these campaigns.

Like I've said many times over the past year, you can "buy" an election, but that won't create any long-term reform if you don't have a strong grassroots to carry on after the election. And when an organization steps on activists and patients to accomplish their goal, and demoralizes and deceives them in the process, that organization will destroy the movement, not advance it. You need the grassroots before, during, and after an election. They are an essential part of reform, not some stepping stone on

the way to election day.

Please write or call Mr. Nadelmann and let him know that you are concerned with the future and urge him to abandon strategies that include dividing the grassroots and introducing competing initiatives. Encourage him to adopt strategies that bring all reformers together to work on a common goal. Encourage him to hire a campaign director who, unlike Bill Zimmerman, is able to accomplish these goals without alienating grassroots support.

Ethan Nadelmann, Director

The Lindesmith Center

400 West 59th Street

New York, NY 10019

Phone: (212) 548-0694

Email: enadelmann@sorosny.org

Web: www.lindesmith.org

Send a copy to Bill Zimmerman:

Email: 76322.1165@compuserve.com

And to the activists in Maine, Alaska, Colorado and D.C. who have been affected by the AMR strategy this year c/o CO-HIP: cohip@levellers.org

Imagine if you had spent years of your time and energy on writing and circulating a ballot initiative, only to have well-funded outsiders come in at the last minute with a competing initiative which disrupted your years of hard work. This happened to activists in Maine, Alaska, and D.C. this

year. Will it happen again? Will activists constantly have to be looking over their shoulders in case AMR or some other outside organization comes in to their state to disrupt their local campaigns? Or will we have a new commitment to honesty and unity in the cannabis reform movement?

The power to answer these questions is in the hands of Mr. Nadelmann and the funders he represents. Please take a minute to encourage him to adopt strategies that unite, not divide.

Laura Kriho

December 9, 1998

Colorado Hemp Initiative Project

P.O. Box 729

Nederland, CO 80466

Vmail: (303) 448-5640

Email: cohip@levellers.org

Web: www.levellers.org/cannabis.html

POST SCRIPT

"Voter Revolt" Fraud:

Ralph Nader describes Bill Zimmerman as a "turncoat"

We have just been made aware of information of how Bill Zimmerman has "used" grassroots organizations in the past.

The Foundation for Taxpayer and Consumer Rights is a nationally-recognized, California-based, non-profit education and advocacy organization. The Foundation's Executive Director and founder is Harvey Rosenfield, one of the nation's foremost consumer advocates. A public interest lawyer and protégé of consumer advocate Ralph Nader, Rosenfield authored Proposition 103 and organized the campaign which led to its passage by California voters in 1988.

According to documents on their web page (www.consumerwatchdog.org), written in 1997, Bill Zimmerman worked briefly on the campaign for Prop. 103, but quit because the organization could not pay him.

Harvey Rosenfield says about Bill Zimmerman that "it quickly became clear that financial concerns drove Bill as much as anything else. Over the years, I tried to give Bill a greater role in Voter Revolt and to permit him to earn some money if there was a way we could pay him. But his financial needs led to a number of serious blunders and ultimately his financial failures bankrupted the organization. In retrospect, it seems clear that had we been able to compensate Bill, he would not have needed to switch sides and join the Alliance."

The Alliance to Revitalize California hired Bill Zimmerman to promote three ballot initiatives in 1995 (Prop. 200, 201, and 202) that were supported by the insurance industry but opposed by consumer groups. Bill Zimmerman purposefully linked the name "Voter Revolt", which was associated in the public's mind with Ralph Nader and consumer advocacy, with these three initiatives, which were opposed by Ralph Nader and every major consumer

advocate group in California.

The documents on consumerwatchdog.org state, "Long before election day rolled around, it became clear that the use of the Voter Revolt name had been part of a deliberate strategy to win passage of the initiatives by misleading voters as to the identity of the true supporters of the three March initiatives: Wall Street, large corporations and financial interests, including the insurance industry. (Attachment #3)."

"An internal memorandum from the Alliance to Revitalize California that was released by opponents to the press explained the strategy succinctly: 'If voters believe that consumer groups are affiliated with both sides of the battle, the prospects for adoption of no-fault insurance are very favorable...This observation underscores the critical importance of Voter Revolt being put forward as an equal partner in the fight for no fault and other initiatives.' (Attachment #4)."

The documents also state:

"Zimmerman refers to himself as the Alliance's campaign manager. But Zimmerman also attempts to cloak himself in the garb of Voter Revolt. He routinely refers to himself as Voter Revolt's 'Political Director.' Once again, however, the use of the Voter Revolt name is a deception. Zimmerman is not employed by Voter Revolt, and has no official tie to it."

"Zimmerman, Johnson and Westermeyer were apparently taken off-guard. Acknowledging to reporters that the 'Voter Revolt' organization had

previously opposed as anti-consumer the very proposals the group was now sponsoring, they repeatedly referred to their credentials as consumer advocates and leaders of 'Voter Revolt.' They told reporters that they and the organization had changed their minds. As for Voter Revolt now working with the business and financial interests it had often combated, this, William Zimmerman explained, was the new model for the '90s. 'It's time to overcome the worn-out polarization between consumer groups and business leaders, and find ways to work together for the benefit of all,' the press release stated."

"The purchase of Voter Revolt may prove cost-effective for insurance companies and other supporters of anti-consumer tort law restrictions. Recently, testifying before Congress in support of Newt Gingrich's 'tort reform' measures, Michael Horowitz invoked Voter Revolt's 'support' of the contingency fee initiative as evidence that consumer groups back such measures. (No legitimate consumer group supported any of the Gingrich/business-backed tort proposals). Horowitz told the congressional panel that Voter Revolt was a 'Nader' organization. Ralph Nader responded in a letter disavowing the characterization and describing Zimmerman and Johnson as 'turncoats who now provide their services for anti-consumer initiatives.' See Exhibit 24."

Do we want someone who Ralph Nader described as a "turncoat" working on drug policy reform? Bill Zimmerman clearly goes where the money is. What if next time the money comes from enemies of drug policy reform? Will Bill Zimmerman take all that he has learned working on medical marijuana initiatives and use it to work for the other side? With a history like

this, one has to wonder.

Please write or call Ethan Nadelmann and ask him to fire Bill Zimmerman.

Ethan Nadelmann, Director

The Lindesmith Center

400 West 59th Street

New York, NY 10019

Phone: (212) 548-0694

Email: enadelmann@sorosny.org

The quotes above were taken from these documents provided by:

The Foundation for Taxpayer and Consumer Rights

1750 Ocean Park Blvd. Suite 200

Santa Monica CA 90405

prop103@consumerwatchdog.org

Fax: 310-392-8874

"VOTER REVOLT!" is a FRAUD!

November 21, 1997

http://www.consumerwatchdog.org/public_hts/corporate/voterrev.htm

Report on Voter Revolt

June 24, 1997

Part I

http://www.consumerwatchdog.org/public_hts/corporate/press/co100006.htm

Part II (Profiting from the Use of the Non-Profit)

http://www.consumerwatchdog.org/public_hts/corporate/press/co100008.htm

Part III (Voter Revolt Paid by Insurance Industry to Oppose HMO Reform)

http://www.consumerwatchdog.org/public_hts/corporate/press/co100010.htm

Part IV

http://www.consumerwatchdog.org/public_hts/corporate/press/co100011.htm

The Consumer Impostors: A Report to the Public

March 1, 1997

http://www.consumerwatchdog.org/public_hts/corporate/press/co100032.htm=====

ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)
id <01J5AILT23RK00BJ5Q@PMDf.EOP.GOV> for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov; Sun,
13 Dec 1998 14:08:02 EST

Received: from storm.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)
with ESMTP id <01J5AILNPZA800B6F5@PMDf.EOP.GOV> for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov;
Sun, 13 Dec 1998 14:07:58 -0500 (EST)

Received: from www.drikka.net ([209.235.14.254])
by EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.2-29 #34437) with ESMTP id <01J5AILIUMWS0006FL@EOP.GOV>
for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov; Sun, 13 Dec 1998 14:07:48 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from server@localhost) by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9)
id NAA13523; Sun, 13 Dec 1998 13:59:58 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from drcnet@localhost) by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9)
id NAA09709 for server; Sun, 13 Dec 1998 13:48:15 -0500 (EST)

Received: from saturn.eagle-access.net (IDENT:ammo@[206.168.38.1])
by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9) with ESMTP id NAA09702 for
<drctalk@drcnet.org>; Sun, 13 Dec 1998 13:48:14 -0500 (EST)

Received: from localhost (ammo@localhost) by saturn.eagle-access.net
(8.8.7/8.8.4) with SMTP id LAA03759 for <drctalk@drcnet.org>; Sun,
13 Dec 1998 11:49:58 -0700

X-Sender: ammo@saturn.eagle-access.net

X-Listprocessor-version: 8.2.08 -- ListProc(tm) by CREN

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: owner-drctalk (owner-drctalk@drcnet.org@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-DEC-1998 16:57:00.00

SUBJECT: Re: Comments Requested: Future of Drug Policy Reform

TO: David B. Des Roches (David B. Des Roches@EOP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

The official opposition to the ballot measure formed within weeks of the general election, they had less funding than Alaskans for Medical Rights, and were fighting a very popular issue with the Alaska people.

I did receive a call from Matthew Fagnani the head of the official opposition. Matthew did confirm what was told to me by David Finkelstien that numerous people in the Alaska state legislature were planning on doing something to the medicinal cannabis measure. He also confirmed what Mr Finkelstien had said when Finkelstien claimed that almost all legislators opposed medicinal cannabis. I had always known and claimed that the majority of legislators strongly opposed medicinal cannabis.

I request everyone not to be so naive to reply "well Gee, the legislature wouldn't subvert the will of the people". The only thing that will limit this Damage is if Alaskans for Medical Rights can build in a grass roots network fast enough to discourage legislative tampering. I will be interesting to see if they can do it.

>The Future of Drug Policy Reform

>Can you move forward after the election without a movement?

>

>>From Laura Kriho <cohip@levellers.org>

>Colorado Hemp Initiative Project

>December 9, 1998

>

>Fellow reformers:

>

>As you may know, many activists around the country have been very critical

>of the tactics used by Americans for Medical Rights in their medical

>marijuana ballot initiative campaigns this year. AMR employed a strategy

>of dividing and demoralizing grassroots organizations in most of the
states

>they worked in. We criticised this as being a serious threat to the
reform

>movement. Our analysis of the AMR strategy is available online at:

><http://www.levellers.org/inits98anal.htm>

>

>AMR has been mostly silent about these criticisms, refusing to answer even

>the simplest questions about their initiatives, until recently. Bill

>Zimmerman, the head of AMR, spoke at the NORML conference on November
12.

>Some of his comments are transcribed below.

>

>Surprisingly, Bill Zimmerman confirmed many of the criticisms that

>activists around the country have been making against AMR for over a year.

>But he also continued the pattern of lies used by AMR, when he said "AMR never, ever tried to shut down local activists."

>-----

>Partial Transcript of the panel on medical marijuana initiatives at the

>NORML conference in Washington, D.C. on November 12, 1998.

>This conference session is available online at:

><http://www.legalize-usa.org/TOCs/video7.htm> (76 minutes)

>

>Q and A part of session:

>

>Author Chris Conrad asked a question about how the differences between

>activist/grassroots organizations and the funded groups could be resolved.

>

>Bill Zimmerman replied:

>"We did not run grassroots campaigns in the states where we ran

>initiatives."

>...

>"We came in with outside money. We bought the signatures and we didn't use

>volunteers to get them. We had television advertising. We had

>sophisticated press strategies" that were not targeted at the activists

but

>at the mainstream public.

>...

>"We did that because we were playing an electoral game, not a

>movement-building game and there's a big difference."

>...

>"You cannot build a mainstream campaign, generally, unless there is first

>an activist movement that brings the issue that you're trying to

mainstream

>to the public..."

>

>"But once you're ready to move from an activist, movement-building

>stage...to mainstreaming an issue ... you've got to go about it in a

>different way."

>

>"Election campaigns...are focused on the people in the middle because

>they're the people whose votes can be moved..."

>

>"Who are those people? They're the people that don't give a shit about

>most things."

>...

>"So you're stuck in a bad dynamic when you work on elections and that

>dynamic is you've got to talk to people who are least informed. That's

>exactly the opposite dynamic than when you're trying to build a movement.

>When you're trying to build a movement, and you're trying to recruit

>activists and you're trying to get people to do something more than just

>punch a hole in the ballot on election day, then you've got to educate

>people; you've got to talk to what's best in people. You don't manipulate

>them, you educate them because you know there's time and there's

commitment

>and there's energy to learn things, develop new knowledge, read magazines,

>read books, get educated, come to meetings, talk to people, all those

>things."

>...

>"So those of us that work on movement building and developing activism and

>coordinating grassroots movements, have a set of requirements or
procedures

>or biases that are very different from those of us who work on election

>campaigns."

>

>"We shouldn't be enemies because neither of us can work without the
other.

>You can't bring an issue to the ballot unless there has been, in the years

>preceding your bringing it to the ballot, a great deal of activism. We
can

>only do elections standing on the shoulders of the activists that came
>before us."

>

>-----

>

>Don Wirtshafter, of the Ohio Hempery, asked whether AMR had learned

>anything from the campaign in Washington state where the Killian brothers

>had been able to get the activists and the funded people to work together

>on a common goal.

>Bill Zimmerman replied, "No," he had not learned anything.

>

>Don Wirtshafter also asked if AMR had purposefully tried to alienate the

>activists in the states that they worked in.

>Bill Zimmerman replied, "AMR never, ever tried to shut down local
activists

>or prevent them from talking. What we did instead was ignore them."

>

><End partial transcript>

>-----

--

>

>Commentary and Request for Comments

>

>This last statement is a continuation of a pattern of lies AMR has
employed

>to justify the faulty strategies they applied in their campaigns this
year.

>Because the cannabis reform movement is based largely on exposing the lies
>employed by the government to justify cannabis prohibition, I feel
>compelled to expose lies wherever I see them.

>

>Fact: AMR did try to shut down activists across the country. It was part
>of their strategy.

>

>Alaska: AMR introduced a ballot initiative in competition with the
>initiative being circulated by Alaskans for Cannabis Therapeutics, a
local,

>grassroots organization of patients and patient advocates. The
well-funded

>AMR initiative disrupted and destroyed ACT's initiative campaign. The AMR

>initiative, which contained provisions that were unacceptable to the ACT

>supporters, passed by 58% of the vote.

>

>Maine: AMR introduced a ballot initiative in competition with the

>initiative being circulated by Maine Citizens for Medical Marijuana, a

>local, grassroots organization of patients and patient advocates.

>Proponents of the MCMM petition had already gathered a third of their

>signatures when AMR introduced their initiative, which, like the Alaska

>petition, contained provisions that were unacceptable to the local

patients

>and patient advocates.

>

>AMR spent \$250,000 in Maine, but failed to collect enough signatures to

>have the initiative placed on the ballot. The MCMM petition campaign was

>disrupted by the influx of AMR money, and MCMM supporters were not able to

>collect enough signatures to have their initiative placed on the ballot

>either.

>

>Washington, D.C.: AMR introduced a ballot initiative (I-60) in competition

>with the initiative (I-59) being circulated by ACT UP/DC, a local,

>grassroots organization of patients and patient advocates. ACTUP was the

>only local organization that was able to successfully overcome AMR's

>interference and get their own initiative on the ballot.

>

>See: <http://www.levellers.org/patients.htm> and

><http://www.levellers.org/locals.htm>

>

>Fact: It was part of AMR's strategy to "shut down" the local activists.

>They thought that by showing their opposition to the "legalizers" and

>trying to distance themselves from the grassroots, that they would appear

>more conservative and thus more appealing to voters. This has been part

of

>their strategy since the Prop. 215 campaign in California where Dennis

>Peron, father of the medical marijuana movement, was consistently trashed

>in the press by Bill Zimmerman and AMR.

>

>Bill Zimmerman said, "AMR never, ever tried to shut down local activists

or

>prevent them from talking. What we did instead was ignore them." But

>then he said that you can only run an election campaign "on the shoulders

>of the activists that came before us."

>

>We have been saying since last year that AMR purposefully went into the

>states with the most organized cannabis reform movements since those were

>the states with the highest polling numbers. AMR had previously said that

>the work of local activists had nothing to do with the pre-existing

support

>for cannabis in those states. Now we see AMR admitting that they didn't

>ignore the activists and patients, they -used- them. Bill Zimmerman stood

>on the shoulders of activists and patients and used the groundwork that

>they had made over many years of activism and public education to achieve

>symbolic election wins, but destroy the grassroots efforts.

>

>Bill Zimmerman thinks "election" campaigns are somehow different from

>"movement-building" campaigns and in order to win an election, you need to

>manipulate voters, not educate them. In order to win an election, you
need

>to stop trying to build a movement.

>

>Bill, you won three elections with this philosophy (AK, OR, NV), but you

>LOST three other states because of this philosophy (CO, DC, ME) where you

>didn't even get your initiative on the ballot. Election campaigns and

>building movements are not mutually-exclusive. In fact, most successful

>elections have strong movements behind them.

>

>Election-winning and movement-building are completely dependent on each

>other. I know that there are differences in the strategies employed, but

>you can't just ignore the movement for sake of an election win. Do you

>honestly think that this is progress, when you have passed a law that has

>no organized grassroots support to create further reforms after the

>campaign or, worse, when you have passed a law that has divided the

>existing grassroots support, or worse yet, when you divide grassroots

>support and then fail to pass any law at all? How do you move forward

>after the election without a movement?

>

>Fact: All the states that passed medical marijuana legislation would have

>passed with virtually no campaigning, no advertising, no "sophisticated

>press strategies." These initiatives passed because people are ready for

>change. Heck, they were even willing to vote for a -bad- medical

>marijuana initiative in many of these states.

>

>Fact: AMR could have had election wins in 8-12 states this year instead of

>only four by:

>1) Providing funds to gather signatures and hire local organizers in the

>states with the highest polling numbers, instead of wasting money on

>lawyers, consultants, and PR firms.

>2) Not alienating grassroots support.

>3) Spending the bulk of the money on the other states that had marginal

>polling results to educate people and get out the vote.

>

>AMR spent \$800,000 in Colorado, \$250,000 in Maine, and an estimated

>\$100,000 in D.C. on failed attempts to get an initiative on the ballot.

I

>don't know what they spent on their successful campaigns and on their

>salaries. So that's over \$1 million dollars that could have been used to

>help support those local organizations, instead of fighting against them.

>You only need to look at the successful campaign of ACTUP on Initiative 59

>in D.C. to see that local organizers will give you more bang for your buck

>than any hired "professionals" will. I'm confident that you'd never see

>any grassroots reform organization that I know of spend \$1 million and not

>be successful.

>

>GOOD NEWS

>The good news to come from Bill Zimmerman at the conference is that AMR
may

>not be refunded for the next election cycle.

>

>The keynote speaker of the conference, Ethan Nadelmann of the Lindesmith

>Center, controls most of the funding for AMR from billionaire George Soros.

> Mr. Nadelmann stated during his speech that he wasn't sure which direction

>to take the funding to in the future: if he should put it back into AMR to

>do more ballot initiatives or if he should try some other strategy. He

>said he was open for suggestions.

>

>I'd like to encourage people to send Mr. Nadelmann your comments. Surely,

>there are hundreds of ideas about what particular campaigns would be the

>most effective, but we are more concerned with the strategy employed to win

>these campaigns.

>

>Like I've said many times over the past year, you can "buy" an election,

>but that won't create any long-term reform if you don't have a strong

>grassroots to carry on after the election. And when an organization steps

>on activists and patients to accomplish their goal, and demoralizes and

>deceives them in the process, that organization will destroy the movement,

>not advance it. You need the grassroots before, during, and after an

>election. They are an essential part of reform, not some stepping stone on

>the way to election day.

>

>Please write or call Mr. Nadelmann and let him know that you are concerned

>with the future and urge him to abandon strategies that include dividing

>the grassroots and introducing competing initiatives. Encourage him to
>adopt strategies that bring all reformers together to work on a common
>goal. Encourage him to hire a campaign director who, unlike Bill
>Zimmerman, is able to accomplish these goals without alienating grassroots
>support.

>

>Ethan Nadelmann, Director

>The Lindesmith Center

>400 West 59th Street

>New York, NY 10019

>Phone: (212) 548-0694

>Email: enadelmann@sorosny.org

>Web: www.lindesmith.org

>

>Send a copy to Bill Zimmerman:

>Email: 76322.1165@compuserve.com

>And to the activists in Maine, Alaska, Colorado and D.C. who have been

>affected by the AMR strategy this year c/o CO-HIP: cohip@levellers.org

>

>Imagine if you had spent years of your time and energy on writing and

>circulating a ballot initiative, only to have well-funded outsiders come
in

>at the last minute with a competing initiative which disrupted your years

>of hard work. This happened to activists in Maine, Alaska, and D.C. this

>year. Will it happen again? Will activists constantly have to be
looking

>over their shoulders in case AMR or some other outside organization comes

>in to their state to disrupt their local campaigns? Or will we have a new
>commitment to honesty and unity in the cannabis reform movement?
>
>The power to answer these questions is in the hands of Mr. Nadelmann and
>the funders he represents. Please take a minute to encourage him to adopt
>strategies that unite, not divide.

>

>

>Laura Kriho

>December 9, 1998

>-----

>Colorado Hemp Initiative Project

>P.O. Box 729

>Nederland, CO 80466

>Vmail: (303) 448-5640

>Email: cohip@levellers.org

>Web: www.levellers.org/cannabis.html

>-----

>POST SCRIPT

>"Voter Revolt" Fraud:

>Ralph Nader describes Bill Zimmerman as a "turncoat"

>

>We have just been made aware of information of how Bill Zimmerman
>has "used" grassroots organizations in the past.

>

>The Foundation for Taxpayer and Consumer Rights is a
nationally-recognized,

>California-based, non-profit education and advocacy organization. The
>Foundation's Executive Director and founder is Harvey Rosenfield, one of
>the nation's foremost consumer advocates. A public interest lawyer and
>prot?g? of consumer advocate Ralph Nader, Rosenfield authored Proposition
>103 and organized the campaign which led to its passage by California
>voters in 1988.

>

>According to documents on their web page (www.consumerwatchdog.org),
>written in 1997, Bill Zimmerman worked briefly on the campaign for Prop.
>103, but quit because the organization could not pay him.

>

>Harvey Rosenfield says about Bill Zimmerman that "it quickly became clear
>that financial concerns drove Bill as much as anything else. Over the
>years, I tried to give Bill a greater role in Voter Revolt and to permit
>him to earn some money if there was a way we could pay him. But his
>financial needs led to a number of serious blunders and ultimately his
>financial failures bankrupted the organization. In retrospect, it seems
>clear that had we been able to compensate Bill, he would not have needed
>to switch sides and join the Alliance."

>

>The Alliance to Revitalize California hired Bill Zimmerman to promote
three

>ballot initiatives in 1995 (Prop. 200, 201, and 202) that were supported
by

>the insurance industry but opposed by consumer groups. Bill Zimmerman
>purposefully linked the name "Voter Revolt", which was associated in the
>public's mind with Ralph Nader and consumer advocacy, with these three

>initiatives, which were opposed by Ralph Nader and every major consumer
>advocate group in California.

>

>The documents on consumerwatchdog.org state, "Long before election day
>rolled around, it became clear that the use of the Voter Revolt name had
>been part of a deliberate strategy to win passage of the initiatives by
>misleading voters as to the identity of the true supporters of the three
>March initiatives: Wall Street, large corporations and financial
>interests, including the insurance industry. (Attachment #3)."

>

>"An internal memorandum from the Alliance to Revitalize California that
was
>released by opponents to the press explained the strategy succinctly: 'If
>voters believe that consumer groups are affiliated with both sides of the
>battle, the prospects for adoption of no-fault insurance are very
>favorable...This observation underscores the critical importance of Voter
>Revolt being put forward as an equal partner in the fight for no fault and
>other initiatives.' (Attachment #4)."

>

>The documents also state:

>

>"Zimmerman refers to himself as the Alliance's campaign manager. But
>Zimmerman also attempts to cloak himself in the garb of Voter Revolt. He
>routinely refers to himself as Voter Revolt's 'Political Director.' Once
>again, however, the use of the Voter Revolt name is a deception. Zimmerman
>is not employed by Voter Revolt, and has no official tie to it."

>

>"Zimmerman, Johnson and Westermeyer were apparently taken off-guard.
>Acknowledging to reporters that the 'Voter Revolt' organization had
>previously opposed as anti-consumer the very proposals the group was now
>sponsoring, they repeatedly referred to their credentials as consumer
>advocates and leaders of 'Voter Revolt.' They told reporters that they and
>the organization had changed their minds. As for Voter Revolt now working
>with the business and financial interests it had often combated, this,
>William Zimmerman explained, was the new model for the '90s. 'It's time to
>overcome the worn-out polarization between consumer groups and business
>leaders, and find ways to work together for the benefit of all,' the press
>release stated."

>
>"The purchase of Voter Revolt may prove cost-effective for insurance
>companies and other supporters of anti-consumer tort law restrictions.
>Recently, testifying before Congress in support of Newt Gingrich's 'tort
>reform' measures, Michael Horowitz invoked Voter Revolt's 'support' of the
>contingency fee initiative as evidence that consumer groups back such
>measures. (No legitimate consumer group supported any of the
>Gingrich/business-backed tort proposals). Horowitz told the congressional
>panel that Voter Revolt was a 'Nader' organization. Ralph Nader responded
>in a letter disavowing the characterization and describing Zimmerman and
>Johnson as 'turncoats who now provide their services for anti-consumer
>initiatives.' See Exhibit 24."

>
>Do we want someone who Ralph Nader described as a "turncoat" working on
>drug policy reform? Bill Zimmerman clearly goes where the money is. What
>if next time the money comes from enemies of drug policy reform? Will

Bill

>Zimmerman take all that he has learned working on medical marijuana

>initiatives and use it to work for the other side? With a history like

>this, one has to wonder.

>

>Please write or call Ethan Nadelmann and ask him to fire Bill Zimmerman.

>

>Ethan Nadelmann, Director

>The Lindesmith Center

>400 West 59th Street

>New York, NY 10019

>Phone: (212) 548-0694

>Email: enadelmann@sorosny.org

>-----

>The quotes above were taken from these documents provided by:

>

>The Foundation for Taxpayer and Consumer Rights

>1750 Ocean Park Blvd. Suite 200

>Santa Monica CA 90405

>prop103@consumerwatchdog.org

>Fax: 310-392-8874

>

>"VOTER REVOLT!" is a FRAUD!

>November 21, 1997

>http://www.consumerwatchdog.org/public_hts/corporate/voterrev.htm

>

>Report on Voter Revolt

>June 24, 1997

>Part I

>http://www.consumerwatchdog.org/public_hts/corporate/press/co100006.htm

>Part II (Profiting from the Use of the Non-Profit)

>http://www.consumerwatchdog.org/public_hts/corporate/press/co100008.htm

>Part III (Voter Revolt Paid by Insurance Industry to Oppose HMO Reform)

>http://www.consumerwatchdog.org/public_hts/corporate/press/co100010.htm

>Part IV

>http://www.consumerwatchdog.org/public_hts/corporate/press/co100===== ATTACHMENT 1
=====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)

id <01J5APL1ZP9S004BTP@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov; Sun,
13 Dec 1998 17:28:15 EST

Received: from storm.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)

with ESMTTP id <01J5APKZJK1S00A730@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov;
Sun, 13 Dec 1998 17:28:12 -0500 (EST)

Received: from www.drikka.net ([209.235.14.254])

by EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.2-29 #34437) with ESMTTP id <01J5APKW2S8A0006TG@EOP.GOV>
for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov; Sun, 13 Dec 1998 17:28:07 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from server@localhost) by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9)

id RAA25213; Sun, 13 Dec 1998 17:21:11 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from drcnet@localhost) by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9)

id RAA23596 for server; Sun, 13 Dec 1998 17:16:49 -0500 (EST)

Received: from bigbyte.mosquitonet.com (bigbyte.mosquitonet.com [206.129.11.2])

by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9) with ESMTTP id RAA23540 for

<drctalk@drcnet.org>; Sun, 13 Dec 1998 17:16:38 -0500 (EST)

Received: from LOCALNAME (ppp214.mosquitonet.com [206.129.11.214])

by bigbyte.mosquitonet.com (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id MAA13857 for

<drctalk@drcnet.org>; Sun, 13 Dec 1998 12:57:00 -0900

X-Sender: chuck@mosquitonet.com

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Version 1.4.4

X-Listprocessor-version: 8.2.08 -- ListProc(tm) by CREN

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: owner-medmj (owner-medmj@drcnet.org@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-DEC-1998 11:38:00.00

SUBJECT: US DC MMJ: In D.C., marijuana dispute hits a raw nerve

TO: David B. Des Roches (David B. Des Roches@EOP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Source: Philadelphia Inquirer

Contact: Inquirer.Letters@phillynews.com

Website: <http://www.phillynews.com/inquirer/>

Pubdate: December 13 1998

IN D.C., MARIJUANA DISPUTE HITS A RAW NERVE

The issue, some say, is not whether smoking pot helps the sick but home rule for city residents.

By Chris Mondics

INQUIRER WASHINGTON BUREAU

WASHINGTON -- When Wayne Turner finally managed, after years of sidewalk activism, to gather enough signatures in August for a referendum here on the medical use of marijuana, he felt a sense of accomplishment.

His domestic partner, Steve Michael, whose weight had dropped from 185 to

110 pounds as a result of AIDS, had started smoking marijuana in a last-ditch attempt to stimulate his appetite. Last May, just before he died,

Michael asked Turner to keep up the fight.

But Turner's joy in getting the issue on the November ballot soon turned to frustration.

Three weeks before the election, after the ballots had been printed, Congress passed legislation barring district officials from carrying out the election. Sponsors of the bill said they feared that the referendum would legalize the recreational use of marijuana -- an outcome that Turner said was not his intent.

The election went forward, and, according to one exit poll, the measure was approved. But city officials have declined to release the results, saying that to do so would violate the restrictions Congress passed.

The controversy over whether the outcome should be made public has opened old wounds among Washington residents who have long chafed at Congress' power, established by the Constitution, to manage district government. Many say the matter has less to do with the medical use of marijuana than with the rights of district residents to govern themselves.

'Huge resentment'

"There is huge resentment over this," said Eleanor Holmes Norton, the district's nonvoting member of Congress. "The taking away of [a] vote is one of those insults that is felt from the poorest communities to the richest. This was a gratuitous election-year stunt."

In August, Norton pleaded with Rep. Bob Barr (R., Ga.), the sponsor of the bill in Congress, to drop the measure as he prepared to offer it as an amendment to the budget bill. She failed. The measure was soon approved by a voice vote. Barr, who said he had not been convinced that there were medical benefits to using marijuana, said district residents must accept such congressional oversight in exchange for the money the federal government spends on the city.

"The majority of the taxpayers who provide these dollars are opposed to efforts to legalize mind-altering drugs," Barr said. "This is nothing more than a thinly veiled attempt to legalize a frequently abused [drug] ."

City officials, saying Barr's law violates the First Amendment rights of district residents, have joined with the American Civil Liberties Union in a suit asking the federal District Court here to reverse Congress and let the vote count be made public.

Proponents acknowledge that the Constitution probably does give Congress the right to overturn the election results, even if the court eventually rules that they should be made public and certified. But they say Congress does not have the authority to prevent an election that gives district residents a chance to be heard on the issue.

Critics want to see limits

The ballot question, called Initiative 59, would allow marijuana to be used, under a physician's direction, in the treatment of AIDS, glaucoma, muscle spasms, cancer, and "other serious illnesses." What troubles some critics is that it places no limits on how much a person may possess, simply saying patients are entitled to have "sufficient" amounts for the treatment of their illnesses.

The medical community is divided over the benefits that smoking marijuana can provide to seriously ill patients.

Turner, president of the local chapter of ACTUP, the gay activist organization, was supported in his campaign by the Whitman Walker clinic in Washington, which treats up to 5,000 AIDS patients a year. For a small number of patients, said clinic associate director Patricia Hawkins,

marijuana helps stimulate the appetite and moderate the effects of chemotherapy.

"We believe it is a decision that ought to be left up to the patient and the physician," she said.

Alaska, Washington, Oregon, Nevada and Arizona passed initiatives in November legalizing the medical use of marijuana. Only the District of Columbia, with its unique relationship to the federal government, was stopped from having its votes counted.

"You can't get a more glaring example of congressional interference," said Mark Plotkin, a Washington radio commentator. "This is just a punitive and embarrassing attempt to humiliate us."

The battle is the latest in a long-standing conflict between district residents and the federal government over how the district should be governed. Some constitutional scholars say the conflict dates back to 1783, when a band of former Revolutionary War soldiers marched on Independence Hall in an attempt to force the Pennsylvania legislature to pay them back wages.

Congress, which also was meeting in Philadelphia at the time, grew alarmed by the disturbance and blamed Pennsylvania authorities for failing to control the situation. When the Constitution was adopted several years later, the framers, some of them citing that incident, gave Congress

authority over all matters in the national capital.

Congress has not been shy in using that power. It wasn't until 1961 that

the

23d Amendment to the Constitution was approved giving district residents

the

right to vote in presidential elections. A few years later, in 1974,

Congress permitted district residents to elect their own mayor and council.

But district residents have no voting representatives in the House or

Senate. Moreover, Congress periodically steps in to veto laws that it deems

objectionable. That was the case several years ago when Congress overturned

legislation passed by the City Council establishing a needle-exchange

program.===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)
id <01J5AE7SXJN400ACAC@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov; Sun,
13 Dec 1998 12:02:12 EST

Received: from storm.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)
with ESMTP id <01J5AE7R6UPC00BPVJ@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov;
Sun, 13 Dec 1998 12:02:09 -0500 (EST)

Received: from www.drikka.net ([209.235.14.254])
by EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.2-29 #34437) with ESMTP id <01J5AE79GSMM000672@EOP.GOV>
for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov; Sun, 13 Dec 1998 12:01:46 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from server@localhost) by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9)
id LAA03429; Sun, 13 Dec 1998 11:58:17 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from drcnet@localhost) by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9)
id LAA27329 for server; Sun, 13 Dec 1998 11:39:09 -0500 (EST)

Received: from mailgw02.execpc.com (mailgw02.execpc.com [169.207.3.78])
by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9) with ESMTP id LAA27323 for <medmj@drcnet.org>;

Sun, 13 Dec 1998 11:39:08 -0500 (EST)

Received: from pop01.execpc.com (pop01.execpc.com [169.207.2.114])
by mailgw02.execpc.com (8.9.0) id KAA01030; Sun,
13 Dec 1998 10:39:08 -0600 (CST)

Received: from geocities.com (farboon-72.mdm.mad.execpc.com [169.207.41.72])
by pop01.execpc.com (8.8.8) id KAA04211; Sun, 13 Dec 1998 10:39:06 -0600
Organization: Rx Cannabis Now! <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Lobby/7417/>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.04 [en] (Win95; I)

X-Listprocessor-version: 8.2.08 -- ListProc(tm) by CREN

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: owner-drctalk (owner-drctalk@drcnet.org@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-DEC-1998 17:25:00.00

SUBJECT: New Barr comments on D.C.

TO: David B. Des Roches (David B. Des Roches@EOP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Here's a little more Bob Barr fodder. First, from the included Philly

Inquirer story way, way below:

"The majority of the taxpayers who provide these dollars are opposed to efforts to legalize mind-altering drugs," Barr said. "This is nothing more than a thinly veiled attempt to legalize a frequently abused [drug] ."

Barr is saying that a majority of federal taxpayers oppose initiatives like Initiative 59. Therefore, they wouldn't want their money used on an election like the one Barr has prevented from happening in D.C.

That's demonstrably false, of course, not only from this year's election results, but from every national poll ever taken on the issue of medical use of marijuana.

I guess if you want to parse Barr's statements a-la-Clinton, he wasn't exactly saying this -- he was saying the majority of taxpayers oppose a full-legalization scheme for all drugs. But it seems only fair to take Barr's comments in context and with the meaning a reasonable person would ascribe to them. After all, that's what he demands of higher officials...

Speaking of impeachment -- when Thursday morning's impeachment session broke for lunch, CSPAN's cameras caught different members doing side interviews. A D.C.-politics commentator for the local NPR affiliate (WAMU), Mark Plotkin, pulled aside Bob Barr in front of the CSPAN cameras, and asked him questions about I-59.

What follows is something like a transcript of the q & a. An exact transcript may be impossible to obtain because these were essentially "dead air" moments on CSPAN. The last quote from Barr is closest to verbatim....

FROM CSPAN, Thurs. Dec. 10, 1998 --

Plotkin: Congressman Barr, I have a question about the District, about Initiative 59. Why did you sponsor an amendment to keep the vote from being counted?

Barr: Because it was relevant to the legislation before the Congress at the time. It was the District appropriations bill. And Congress routinely, historically, makes policy statements about what the District can and cannot do with federal funds in these appropriations bills. And that's what the amendment does. So I was following precedent.

Plotkin: Well Congress can overturn any legislation passed by the District. Why prevent the vote from taking place, when Congress can go in and overturn the legislation after it's passed?

Barr: Congress was in a position to prevent something from happening. And it's always easier to prevent something from happening, than to wait until it's happened and then go back and try and untangle and undo it.

Plotkin: What if Benjamin Wilson, the chairman of the DC elections board, just releases the results of the vote on Initiative 59. What if he were to just release the results, but not certify the election, would that trouble you?

Barr: It would trouble me, because I believe in the rule of law. But I'm not going to answer hypothetical questions.

<END EXCHANGE>

This last comment helps explain why the DC Elections Board still refuses to release the results of the election, even though the Justice Dept. explicitly argued, in court papers otherwise defending the Barr Amendment, that the board could respond to a pending FOIA request with the final vote tally. (Justice argued that the election could not be "certified," which was the position taken by the board pre-election, before last-minute threats were made to the elections board by someone in Congress.) The board doesn't want to follow this bit of written advice while Barr still indicates a willingness to sue them or further disrupt D.C.'s funding...

You could argue that this threat constitutes a wholly separate First Amendment threat.

- Dave Fratello

Americans for Medical Rights

Philadelphia Inquirer (PA), Sunday, Dec. 13, 1998

IN D.C., MARIJUANA DISPUTE HITS A RAW NERVE

The Issue, Some Say, Is Not Whether Smoking Pot Helps The Sick But Home Rule For City Residents

Author: Chris Mondics, Inquirer Washington Bureau

WASHINGTON -- When Wayne Turner finally managed, after years of sidewalk activism, to gather enough signatures in August for a referendum here on the medical use of marijuana, he felt a sense of accomplishment.

His domestic partner, Steve Michael, whose weight had dropped from 185 to

110 pounds as a result of AIDS, had started smoking marijuana in a last-ditch attempt to stimulate his appetite. Last May, just before he died, Michael asked Turner to keep up the fight.

But Turner's joy in getting the issue on the November ballot soon turned to frustration.

Three weeks before the election, after the ballots had been printed, Congress passed legislation barring district officials from carrying out the election. Sponsors of the bill said they feared that the referendum would legalize the recreational use of marijuana -- an outcome that Turner said was not his intent.

The election went forward, and, according to one exit poll, the measure was approved. But city officials have declined to release the results, saying that to do so would violate the restrictions Congress passed.

The controversy over whether the outcome should be made public has opened old wounds among Washington residents who have long chafed at Congress' power, established by the Constitution, to manage district government. Many say the matter has less to do with the medical use of marijuana than with the rights of district residents to govern themselves.

'Huge Resentment'

"There is huge resentment over this," said Eleanor Holmes Norton, the

district's nonvoting member of Congress. "The taking away of [a] vote is one of those insults that is felt from the poorest communities to the richest. This was a gratuitous election-year stunt."

In August, Norton pleaded with Rep. Bob Barr (R., Ga.), the sponsor of the bill in Congress, to drop the measure as he prepared to offer it as an amendment to the budget bill. She failed. The measure was soon approved by a voice vote. Barr, who said he had not been convinced that there were medical benefits to using marijuana, said district residents must accept such congressional oversight in exchange for the money the federal government spends on the city.

"The majority of the taxpayers who provide these dollars are opposed to efforts to legalize mind-altering drugs," Barr said. "This is nothing more than a thinly veiled attempt to legalize a frequently abused [drug] ."

City officials, saying Barr's law violates the First Amendment rights of district residents, have joined with the American Civil Liberties Union in a suit asking the federal District Court here to reverse Congress and let the vote count be made public.

Proponents acknowledge that the Constitution probably does give Congress the right to overturn the election results, even if the court eventually rules that they should be made public and certified. But they say Congress does not have the authority to prevent an election that gives district residents a chance to be heard on the issue.

Critics Want To See Limits

The ballot question, called Initiative 59, would allow marijuana to be used, under a physician's direction, in the treatment of AIDS, glaucoma, muscle spasms, cancer, and "other serious illnesses." What troubles some critics is that it places no limits on how much a person may possess, simply saying patients are entitled to have "sufficient" amounts for the treatment of their illnesses.

The medical community is divided over the benefits that smoking marijuana can provide to seriously ill patients.

Turner, president of the local chapter of ACTUP, the gay activist organization, was supported in his campaign by the Whitman Walker clinic in Washington, which treats up to 5,000 AIDS patients a year. For a small number of patients, said clinic associate director Patricia Hawkins, marijuana helps stimulate the appetite and moderate the effects of chemotherapy.

"We believe it is a decision that ought to be left up to the patient and the physician," she said.

Alaska, Washington, Oregon, Nevada and Arizona passed initiatives in November legalizing the medical use of marijuana. Only the District of Columbia, with its unique relationship to the federal government, was stopped from having its votes counted.

"You can't get a more glaring example of congressional interference," said Mark Plotkin, a Washington radio commentator. "This is just a punitive and embarrassing attempt to humiliate us."

The battle is the latest in a long-standing conflict between district residents and the federal government over how the district should be governed. Some constitutional scholars say the conflict dates back to 1783, when a band of former Revolutionary War soldiers marched on Independence Hall in an attempt to force the Pennsylvania legislature to pay them back wages.

Congress, which also was meeting in Philadelphia at the time, grew alarmed by the disturbance and blamed Pennsylvania authorities for failing to control the situation. When the Constitution was adopted several years later, the framers, some of them citing that incident, gave Congress authority over all matters in the national capital.

Congress has not been shy in using that power. It wasn't until 1961 that the 23d Amendment to the Constitution was approved giving district residents the right to vote in presidential elections. A few years later, in 1974, Congress permitted district residents to elect their own mayor and council.

But district residents have no voting representatives in the House or Senate. Moreover, Congress periodically steps in to veto laws that it deems objectionable. That was the case several years ago when Congress overturned

legislation passed by the City Council establishing a needle-exchange
program.

Distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in
receiving the included information for research and educational purposes.

Checked-by: Richard Lake===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)
id <01J5C4ERZWOG00B0TR@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov; Mon,
14 Dec 1998 17:43:06 EST

Received: from storm.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)
with ESMTP id <01J5C4EOQ0UO00BKUS@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov;
Mon, 14 Dec 1998 17:43:01 -0500 (EST)

Received: from www.drikka.net ([209.235.14.254])
by EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.2-29 #34437) with ESMTP id <01J5C4DNWJ5S0009LU@EOP.GOV>
for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov; Mon, 14 Dec 1998 17:42:31 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from server@localhost) by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9)
id RAA08085; Mon, 14 Dec 1998 17:37:08 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from drcnet@localhost) by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9)
id RAA02097 for server; Mon, 14 Dec 1998 17:23:02 -0500 (EST)

Received: from mailhost.lainet.com (root@mailhost.lainet.com [207.218.88.3])
by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9) with ESMTP id RAA02080 for
<drcnet@drcnet.org>; Mon, 14 Dec 1998 17:22:59 -0500 (EST)

Received: from [207.218.88.148] (max1-wan1-6.lainet.com [207.218.88.148])
by mailhost.lainet.com (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with ESMTP id OAA23654 for
<drcnet@drcnet.org>; Mon, 14 Dec 1998 14:22:51 -0800 (PST)

X-Sender: amr@mailhost.lainet.com

X-Listprocessor-version: 8.2.08 -- ListProc(tm) by CREN

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: owner-drc-natl (owner-drc-natl@drcnet.org@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:24-DEC-1998 12:28:00.00

SUBJECT: The Week Online with DRCNet, Issue #72

TO: David B. Des Roches (David B. Des Roches@EOP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

The Week Online with DRCNet, Issue #72 -- December 24, 1998

A Publication of the Drug Reform Coordination Network

----- PLEASE COPY AND DISTRIBUTE -----

(To sign off this list, <mailto:listproc@drcnet.org> with the line "signoff drc-natl" in the body of the message, or <mailto:lists@drcnet.org> for assistance. To subscribe to this list, visit [<http://www.drcnet.org/signup.html>](http://www.drcnet.org/signup.html).)

(This issue can be also be read on our web site at [<http://www.drcnet.org/wol/072.html>](http://www.drcnet.org/wol/072.html). Check out the DRCNN weekly radio segment at [<http://www.drcnet.org/drcnn/>](http://www.drcnet.org/drcnn/).)

PERMISSION to reprint or redistribute any or all of the contents of The Week Online is hereby granted. We ask that any use of these materials include proper credit and, where appropriate, a link to one or more of our web sites. If your publication customarily pays for publication, DRCNet requests checks payable to the organization. If your

publication does not pay for materials, you are free to use the materials gratis. In all cases, we request notification for our records, including physical copies where material has appeared in print. Contact: Drug Reform Coordination Network, 2000 P St., NW, Suite 615, Washington, DC 20036, (202) 293-8340 (voice), (202) 293-8344 (fax), e-mail drcnet@drcnet.org. Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. A Message to our Readers

<http://www.drcnet.org/wol/072.html#message>

2. Livingston Out as Speaker, Drug Warrior Hastert Set to Take Gavel

<http://www.drcnet.org/wol/072.html#hastert>

3. Court Hears Case to Decide Fate of D.C. Medical Marijuana Initiative

<http://www.drcnet.org/wol/072.html#I-59>

4. Monitoring The Future Survey Released

<http://www.drcnet.org/wol/072.html#mtf>

5. Appalachia: Under the Gun

<http://www.drcnet.org/wol/072.html#appalachia>

6. EDITORIAL: Impeach This

<http://www.drcnet.org/wol/072.html#editorial>

=====

1. A Message to our Readers

HAPPY HOLIDAYS TO OUR READERS! Dave, Adam, Karynn and Kris would like to wish all of our subscribers a happy and healthy holiday season. A special thanks to all of you who have supported our work this year, during what has been a very promising time for the reform movement. Your help makes our work possible, and in 1999, that work will be more effective and higher-profile than ever.

For those who have not gotten around to sending a check, or who are considering sending an additional contribution before the year ends, please note that DRCNet will send a free copy of Shattered Lives to persons who donate \$35 or more, or a copy of the video, Sex, Drugs and Democracy to persons donating \$75 or more. And while we won't be able to get them to you until after New Year's, we will send them to anyone on your list who could use a little education on the destructiveness of the Drug War (Shattered Lives) or on the benefits of a freer society (Sex, Drugs and Democracy).

In any case, in this time of giving and renewal, please

consider sending what you can to support DRCNet, and by so doing, promote the cause of a Drug War Free millennium!

To donate, please visit our web form at <https://www.drcnet.org/cgi-shl/dcreg.cgi> and wire in your credit card donation on our secure form or print out a copy to mail in with your check or money order -- or just send them to DRCNet, 2000 P St., NW, Suite 615, Washington, DC 20036. Donations to the Drug Reform Coordination Network are not tax-deductible, and are the primary source of support for our legislative programs. If you wish to make a tax-deductible contribution, please make your check payable to the DRCNet Foundation. (If the URL above doesn't work, try <http://www.drcnet.org/cgi-shl/dcreg.cgi> instead -- in this case we recommend sending your check or credit card donation in by mail rather than online, as the transmission will not be encrypted.)

Thanks again, and Happy Holidays!

=====

2. Livingston Out as Speaker, Drug Warrior Hastert Set to Take Gavel

In the wake of last week's resignation of House Speaker-elect Bob Livingston, the latest casualty of the circus

maximus that has become our national political scene, J. Dennis Hastert of the 14th district of Illinois looks to have the speakership sewn up. Hastert has been portrayed in the media this week as a "conciliator and a technocrat" (New York Times editorial, 12/22/98), but a closer look, especially in the context of drug policy reform, reveals Hastert to be more of an ideologue.

Hastert was reelected to a sixth term in 1998, receiving 64% of the vote in the suburban/rural 14th district. Prior to his apparent ascension to the speaker's chair, he was Deputy Majority Whip under Tom DeLay. More relevant to drug reformers is Hastert's co-chairmanship of outgoing speaker Newt Gingrich's "Speaker's Task Force for a Drug Free America" (<http://www.drcnet.org/wol/040.html#battle>).

Hastert was also a co-sponsor, with Georgia Rep. Bob Barr, of language in the 1999 District of Columbia Appropriations Bill forbidding the district from spending money to count or certify the results of this fall's medical marijuana initiative, I-59 (see below).

Hastert, who was recently given a 100% favorable rating by the Christian Coalition, was also one of the architects of "super-ban" legislation which would have prevented federal anti-AIDS monies to be distributed by states and localities to any entity that practices syringe exchange, whether or not the federal monies would go directly to such programs.

This bill (S. 1959) would have permanently barred the Department of Health and Human Services from lifting the funding ban.

Not surprisingly then, Hastert has indicated that he stands in favor of spending more federal dollars on prison construction, increasing penalties for drug offenses, mandatory minimum sentences, and the death penalty for those convicted of drug smuggling.

Hastert has also served as Chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs and Criminal Justice. It was Hastert's subcommittee that sponsored, in September of 1997, hearings titled "Needle Exchange, Legalization, and the failure of the Swiss Heroin Experiments." The hearing, curiously titled as it was held days before the results of the successful Swiss heroin maintenance trial were released, featured testimony from opponents of syringe exchange, included testimony from the sponsors of Switzerland's "Youth Against Drugs" initiative. That initiative would have outlawed syringe exchange and opiate maintenance in Switzerland, and sent that country back down the road of punitive prohibition. The initiative lost 71% to 29% (see <http://www.drcnet.org/wol/013.html>).

In a press release after the hearings, and just weeks before the referendum would be voted upon, Hastert badly

underestimated the level of Swiss support for reform when he said of the opiate maintenance trials, "this is a national security issue, and I can only say that we applaud the Swiss people for understanding the nature of the threat and organizing to oppose the immoral act of giving away heroin and expanding the risk of even higher youth drug use. The Swiss have long resisted forces such as Germany in World War II and Cold War Communism, and they are again resisting a threat to both our cultures when they stand up to this insidious, international effort to legalize these poisons."

Hastert's strong ideological opposition to public health measures such as the availability of sterile syringes and legal access to marijuana for medicinal purposes stands in philosophical contrast to his long-time support for "patients' rights." In 1995, Hastert was the co-author of the Food and Dietary Supplement Act of 1995 (H.R.1951), an FDA reform measure allowing for the communication of "truthful, non-misleading" health information regarding natural supplements to consumers via packaging and advertising, and forbidding the FDA from classifying foods and dietary supplements as "drugs." Such efforts seek to open doors for citizens to become informed about and incorporate natural substances into their health care regimen.

J. Dennis Hastert, a relative unknown on the national

political scene, thus steps into the void created first by the resignation of Newt Gingrich and then by the resignation of Bob Livingston. Hastert's other interests appear to include making the Internet "safe for children," as evidenced by his support of both the Communications Decency Act of 1995 (struck down as unconstitutional) and of a similar bill in 1997. In short, Hastert has shown that while he might not share the high profile of some of his better known "social conservatives," he is certainly no stranger to intruding, from his federal perch, into the private lives of citizens, both here and abroad, in an effort to make them conform to his own ideas of morality.

(To learn more about J. Dennis Hastert, including the identities of his major contributors, go to the web site of the Center for Responsive Politics at <<http://www.crp.org>>.)

=====

3. Court Hears Case to Decide Fate of D.C. Medical Marijuana Initiative

Scott Ehlers, Drug Policy Foundation, <http://www.dpf.org>

When District of Columbia voters went to the polls on November 3 to vote on Initiative 59, the D.C. medical marijuana initiative, most of them assumed that their vote

would be counted and the results of the election certified.

Unfortunately for District residents, Congress outlawed the expenditure of funds on the vote thanks to the efforts of Rep. Bob Barr (R-GA), the author of the anti-democratic amendment. Now the federal government has to expend more tax dollars in an attempt to defend its actions in federal court.

On December 18, the ACLU (representing Wayne Turner, the sponsor of Initiative 59) and the D.C. Board of Elections argued that the Barr Amendment violated the First Amendment and amounted to viewpoint discrimination by the federal government. According to Graham Boyd, the ACLU lawyer trying the case, the Supreme Court has established that such discrimination is "per se unconstitutional" and therefore the election results must be certified. The Clinton Justice Department defended the Barr Amendment, arguing that "Congress can legislate on anything in regard to the District." Government lawyers also argued that the initiative process was a power delegated to the District by Congress, and "what Congress gives, it can take away."

The Barr Amendment prohibits federal funds from being "used to conduct any ballot initiative which seeks to legalize or otherwise reduce penalties associated with the possession, use, or distribution of any schedule I substance under the

Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802) or any tetrahydrocannabinols derivative." In the August 6 debate to support the amendment, Barr argued that the amendment was necessary because "history dictates to us that these drug legalization people do not give up... All this amendment does is it prevents funds, appropriated funds, from being used in any way to fund a ballot initiative. It strikes not only at the ballot itself, but at using any funds for the development of that ballot, for publicity surrounding that ballot, the whole range of things that these drug legalization people do, over and over and over again."

Barr's stated intention of trying to prohibit the views of "these drug legalization people" became an issue at least twice during the trial. The plaintiffs used the statement as proof that the purpose of the amendment was to discriminate against certain views, and U.S. District Judge Richard Roberts referred to the statement in his cross-examination of the Justice Department. The government eventually admitted that the Barr Amendment did contain a particular viewpoint, but it was constitutional because Congress was simply doing its job of adopting public policy.

Also supporting the amendment was Rep. Dennis Hastert (R-IL), a frontrunner in the battle for Speaker of the House. Described in the press as a "moderate" and by Barr as "a leader in the war against mind-altering drug usage," Hastert

said the amendment was necessary to insure the safety of the millions of constituents who visit the nation's capitol. On the House floor he said: "If we want a drug-free America, if we want a drug-free workplace, if we want drug-free prisons and drug-free schools and drug-free highways, we probably ought to have a drug-free capital, to say to prohibit the legalization of marijuana in the District of Columbia, where millions of our constituents come, year in and year out, day in and day out, week in and week out. They ought to be safe."

Surprisingly, the federal government defense lawyers argued that the Barr Amendment did not prohibit the D.C. Board of Elections and Ethics from releasing the results of the initiative vote, and that the vote tally should be made public. They also argued, however, that the amendment did prohibit the certification of the election.

Wayne Turner of ACTUP-DC (<http://www.actupdc.org>) told the Associated Press that the federal government's reasoning is "basically turning an election into a public opinion poll. This is about the right of the people of the District of Columbia to have their votes counted and to have them count."

No date has been set for Judge Roberts' decision, but lawyers are hoping for a ruling within the next two weeks,

according to the Washington Post. Stay posted to the Week
Online for news on the ruling.

=====

4. Monitoring The Future Survey Released

War against Iraq and impeachment proceedings against President Clinton meant that the latest teen drug use statistics released last week fell beneath the national radar screen. But U.S. Drug Czar General Barry McCaffrey and Secretary of Health and Human Services Donna Shalala were on hand December 18 to announce the results from this year's Monitoring the Future Survey, which tabulates the answers from a cross section of 50,000 8th, 10th, and 12th graders each spring in an effort to determine trends in adolescent drug use. The 1998 study from the University of Michigan shows that use of some drugs, including marijuana, tobacco, alcohol, amphetamines, and inhalants has fallen slightly since for the second year in a row. The most significant decline was seen with lifetime marijuana use by 10th graders, which fell 2.7 percent to 39.6 percent in 1997. Lifetime marijuana use by high school seniors fell only 0.5 percent to 49.1 percent. The use of some other drugs like cocaine and heroin has leveled off.

Shalala, McCaffrey, and the study's director, Lloyd

Johnston, agreed that the improvements were a modest but hopeful sign that teen drug use, which had increased slowly but steadily in the early 90's, was beginning a general downward trend. All three say the decline in drug use is linked to an increase in the perceived harmfulness of drugs by teens, for which they credit increased efforts by the government to, in the words of Secretary Shalala, "convince our young people that drug use is illegal, dangerous and wrong." General McCaffrey agreed, saying the current drug war strategy of prevention, treatment, and enforcement is working. Currently, about two thirds of the 17 billion dollar Federal drug war budget is spent on enforcement.

But other experts say long-term trends in drug use tell a different story. Lynn Zimmer, Professor of Sociology at Queens College and co-author of the book "Marijuana Myths, Marijuana Facts: A Review of the Scientific Evidence," told the Week Online, "If we look at the results from this study since it began in 1975, we see a general pattern of rising and falling rates of the use of different drugs over time. It's not clear that anti-drug campaigns have any direct effect on these patterns; in fact, it's obvious that teen drug use trends rise and fall independently of the government and the media."

Sandee Burbank, director of Mothers Against Misuse and Abuse (MAMA), agrees. "Anybody who has been watching these trends

knows that drug use comes and goes naturally according to the popularity of a given drug among a given age group," she said. Burbank was critical of the "just say no" approach to drug education favored by the government, because it doesn't give teens the information they need to stay safe if they, or their friends, do experiment with drugs. "What we have to focus more on is getting good educational materials out there to help people make informed decisions about all drugs, legal, illegal, and over the counter. And we have to teach people about the extremely punitive laws that target young people, laws that would take their drivers licenses away if they're caught with any amount of illegal drugs, laws that would deny them scholastic advantages or student loans if they have been caught with an illegal substance."

One of the most consistent figures in the Monitoring the Future Survey has been the perceived availability of drugs by high school seniors. Since 1975, from 80 to 90 percent of 12th graders have ranked marijuana as "easy to get" or "very easy to get." Burbank says these numbers show that years of increased budgets for enforcement, which resulted in more than 640,000 arrests on marijuana-related charges alone in 1997, have failed to keep drugs away from schools and kids. She said, "Putting parents in jail, and all the other draconian methods in place, do not seem to have reduced the availability of these drugs."

Figures from the 1998 Monitoring the Future Survey are available on the web at <<http://www.isr.umich.edu/src/mtf/>>.

Mothers Against Misuse and Abuse is on the web at <<http://www.mamas.org>>.

For information on ordering Marijuana Myths, Marijuana Facts, visit <<http://www.marijuanafacts.org>>.

Read Adam J. Smith's editorial, "Spin, You Win," on the subject of drug use statistics, from the August 1998 Week Online at <<http://www.drcnet.org/wol/056.html#editorial>>.

=====

5. Appalachia: Under the Gun

Paul Lewin, Common Sense For Drug Policy,
<http://www.csdp.org>

In May of this year, the Federal Government designated 65 counties of Kentucky, Tennessee and West Virginia in the Appalachian Mountain Range, a High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA). This means that the DEA, ATF, FBI, IRS, National Park Service, U.S. Forest Service and the U.S. Attorney's Office will coordinate with each other, and the local sheriffs, police departments, and DAs to stomp out all

forms of drug production, trafficking and use. The designation also comes with a \$6 million federal grant as "seed money" to set up the new agency with staff, computer equipment, offices and the typical array of vehicles.

If past experiences are any guide to what the residents of Appalachia can expect, the alphabet soup of law enforcement agencies will set up road blocks on rural roads to perform search and seizure sweeps, armed men in camouflage with automatic weapons will patrol by helicopter, and a small army of undercover narcotics agents will set up local men and women for arrest.

Poverty and Little Economic Opportunity Cited As Justification

The federal government's labeling of 65 counties in 3 states as a High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area would seem to imply that violent gangs and Colombian drug cartels were terrorizing millions of residents of Appalachia, necessitating a massive federal response. In fact, nothing could be further from the truth.

In the official 'Appalachia HIDTA FY 98 - Threat Abstract,' the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) states that Appalachia warrants a federal crackdown because "in this tri-state area financial development is limited,

poverty is rampant, and jobs are few. Marijuana has become a substantial component of the local economy, surpassing even tobacco as the largest cash crop. This has contributed to a high level of community acceptance of marijuana production, distribution, and consumption. Many honest local merchants do not recognize signs of illegal drug enterprises and in effect help launder drug proceeds. In such an environment eradication and interdiction efforts are difficult, as is obtaining intelligence, indictments, or an unbiased jury." In other words, people are poor, locals aren't that concerned about residents who are doing this, and people aren't informing on their friends and neighbors to the extent that the government desires.

The economic stress felt by the residents of Appalachia is not adequately described in the ONDCP's "Threat Assessment."

In reviewing the latest census data, one quickly notices that these folks aren't just poor, this is one of the most economically deprived regions of America. West Virginia ranks dead-last (50th) for median household income and unemployment (48.6% of the civilian population was unemployed in 1996 - of course, prisoners aren't counted). Kentucky and Tennessee are also in the bottom 10% of the nation for median household income, and they rank 8th and 11th, respectively, in the nation for the highest number of infant deaths per 1,000 live births. In fact the only categories where these three states lead the nation is in

their percentage of public aid recipients, their percentage of population living below the poverty line, and in teen pregnancy. Of course, the 65 counties designated as HIDTA, have fared even worse.

The New War on the Poor

In the 1960s, federal officials toured Appalachia and witnessed its tragic poverty. The attention brought to it shocked America, which overall was enjoying an era of unprecedented economic growth and prosperity. Together, the federal government and the people of America vowed to fight a War on Poverty so that all Americans would have an equal opportunity in life. In that era, roads were built, schools provided, and utilities like clean water and electricity reached deep into Appalachia to bring relief. In the 1990s, we live in another era of unprecedented economic prosperity, yet this new War on Poverty has taken an ominous turn, courtesy of the War on Drugs.

Rather than respond to the economic disparity which still plagues most of the region with investment and development, the federal government intends to respond by arresting fathers and mothers (creating a generation of Drug War orphans), seizing family homes, cars and businesses. Rather than small business loans or investment in infrastructure, federal dollars will be spent on guns, prisons and payoffs

to informants.

Citizen Observation Groups Can Work

Forewarned is forearmed, or so the saying goes. Gathering together the forces of the U.S. Government to pounce on Appalachia will take time -- perhaps up to an entire year. A lot can happen in one year, and if the citizens of the HIDTA counties exercise their civil right to influence their local government, the states involved can reject federal plans.

In Northern California, residents have turned out to oppose aggressive marijuana eradication, because of the negative community impact it has.

Forming "Citizen's Observation Groups," locals have documented government helicopters violating federal laws on flying altitude, environmental regulations, and endangered species protection, plus they have kept track of illegal search and seizure operations, and how many children have been terrified by the men with face paint and automatic guns. More importantly, by documenting what the government was doing, they have been able to raise awareness within their own communities and present a united front to their local government, which eventually led to some county supervisors voting to reject funding for the program.

(For more information on citizens' efforts to halt federal eradication programs in Northern California, go to <<http://www.civilliberties.org>>.)

You can contact Paul Lewin via e-mail at csdp@erols.com.

=====

6. EDITORIAL: Impeach This

Adam J. Smith, DRCNet Associate Director

As the nation holds its collective breath in anticipation of the next wave of absurdity from Washington, the questions are being asked, over and over again, by pundits, reporters and anyone else with an interest in sex, er, politics: "what does all of this mean for the future of our country? To the office of the Presidency? To our system of government?"

As we commoners sit, aghast, and watch the tawdry and partisan proceedings, knowing full well that there is more to come, these have become serious and highly relevant queries. Here we have an institution, the American Presidency, which represents the pinnacle of power in the known universe, disgraced first by the President himself, and now being dragged through the muck by the corrupt

denizens of the second most powerful institution in the world, the United States Congress. Our elected representatives to that body could not, of course, take the President to task for his most destructive acts: the auctioning off of the power of the United States Government to the highest bidder in the campaign fundraising game, as on that count they are as guilty as he. And so we are down to sex, and lying about sex, which, it is becoming apparent, many of our legislators do as well. Though not under oath, save perhaps to their spouses.

But when we consider the taxpayer-financed spectacle that these power-hungry cretins are making of our nation, we must be careful to remember that the future of the country is a wholly different matter than the future of either the Democratic or the Republican party. Look carefully, if you will, at our Constitution. Nowhere, you will note, does that proud document specify anything about a two-party monopoly on power. And although both parties have done their best to institutionalize the status quo through difficult ballot-access requirements and acts of political perversion performed on large corporate donors, there is nothing in either our laws or our traditions that assures the existence of either party. If anything, we are all watching the best argument against it.

And the parties, in addition to providing ample rationale

for their demise, are also unwittingly providing the means.

One by one over the past year, in an effort to make their constituencies more relevant in the choosing of a standard-bearer, the majority of states have opted to move their primaries to dates earlier on the political calendar. Now, with all of the fighting to the front of the line accomplished, both parties will have chosen their next presidential candidate in March of 2000, almost eight full months before the actual election.

This stroke of genius will have two significant ramifications. First, and most obviously, by shortening the primary season, the parties have made it nearly impossible for any but the most well-financed front-runner to win the nomination. That insures that the candidates will be insiders in the extreme, people with well-oiled connections, party support, and established political organizations behind them. Which leads us to the second point: in a political cycle wherein both the donkeys and the elephants have made asses of themselves, how excited, exactly, will the American people be about the prospect of a choice between two men (yes, they will be men... this is still Washington, D.C.) who personify the sordid mess that appears before us now on C-Span and the evening news?

Given this, and an interminable eight month campaign, couldn't we assume that Americans, including those who are

stuck covering the campaign in the media, will have both the time and the inclination to look for an interesting alternative? And isn't it conceivable that the right individual could come to the fore (General Colin Powell springs immediately to mind), with a message that would capture the large runoff Republican vote, some of the moderate Democratic vote, and inspire large numbers of people who would not have otherwise voted? Given that potential base, the message would likely be economically conservative -- with an eye toward creating real opportunity for people and reigning in corporate power by disentangling money from government; as well as socially libertarian - reasserting the liberty of the individual to make personal choices without being controlled or persecuted by the state. Sort of Libertarian Light.

In this scenario, the American people could, for the first time in living memory, elect a leader from outside of the stagnant cesspool of the major parties. At the least, given a strong effort to recruit statewide candidates behind a well-known national ticket, we could see a significant number of governorships and Congressional seats stripped from both parties.

In 1992, Ross Perot, wealthy and steadily showing himself to be insane, proved that at least 18% of the American people would vote for a cucumber if they knew who the candidate

was, and he offered an alternative to the two major parties. And in 1998, Jesse "The Governor" Ventura rode the reform party's ballot access in Minnesota to win the state's highest office on a policy platform very much like the one described above. Many of the people who voted for Ventura had previously given up on the system, or had never voted before. Many others cast their ballot in sheer defiance of the establishment candidates who had publicly ridiculed the idea of "wasting votes" on one who was not a member of their political club.

What Ventura's victory showed is that there is at least a plurality, if not a majority of potential voters who yearn for something more real than professional politicians, addicted to power and disdainful of sovereignty of the individual. There are Americans, lots and lots of Americans who, dared to do it, will think, and even vote outside the proverbial box. The behavior in recent months of our elected leaders shows that they do not take this threat seriously. But given the traps they have set for themselves, they might very well find that the folly is theirs.

There is, you see, the potential for a good result to come of this madness. The Republicans and the Democrats have become so alike in their corruption, in their arrogance, in their disdain for their constituents as to have become

joined as one at the heart. And in the blindness born of
their power-lust, they are unable to see that in gouging at
the jugular of the co-sanguine other, they are bleeding
themselves to death. It must be remembered, when
contemplating the current mess, that the fortunes of the
United States are wholly separable from the fortunes of the
current political establishment. That separation, in fact,
might be vital to the survival of the nation.

DRCNet needs your support! Donations can be sent to 2000 P
St., NW, Suite 615, Washington, DC 20036, or made by credit
card at <<http://www.drcnet.org/drcreg.html>>. Donations to
the Drug Reform Coordination Network are not tax-deductible.
Deductible contributions supporting our educational work can
be made by check to the DRCNet Foundation, a 501(c)(3) tax-
exempt organization, same address.

DRCNet DRCNet DRCNet DRCNet DRCNet DRCNet DRCNet DRCNet

JOIN/MAKE A DONATION <http://www.drcnet.org/drcreg.html>

SUBSCRIBE TO THIS LIST <http://www.drcnet.org/signup.html>

DRUG POLICY LIBRARY <http://www.druglibrary.org/>

DRCNET HOME PAGE <http://www.drcnet.org/>

=====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)

id <01J5Q2V2499S00FVS6@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov; Thu,

24 Dec 1998 17:30:01 EST

Received: from storm.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)

with ESMTP id <01J5Q2V046QO00GBB1@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov;

Thu, 24 Dec 1998 17:29:59 -0500 (EST)

Received: from www.drikka.net ([209.235.14.254])

by EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.2-29 #34437) with ESMTP id <01J5Q2UBBYHI000EJT@EOP.GOV>

for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov; Thu, 24 Dec 1998 17:29:26 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from server@localhost) by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9)

id MAA05687; Thu, 24 Dec 1998 12:58:14 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from drcnet@localhost) by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9)

id MAA21061 for server; Thu, 24 Dec 1998 12:22:44 -0500 (EST)

Received: from hawk.prod.itd.earthlink.net

(hawk.prod.itd.earthlink.net [207.217.120.22]) by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9)

with ESMTP id MAA21051 for <drc-natl@drcnet.org>; Thu,

24 Dec 1998 12:22:43 -0500 (EST)

Received: from drcnetisdn.earthlink.net

(ip219.washington11.dc.pub-ip.psi.net [38.30.47.219])

by hawk.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.8.7/8.8.5) with SMTP id JAA18203 for

<drc-natl@drcnet.org>; Thu, 24 Dec 1998 09:22:49 -0800 (PST)

X-Sender: drcnet@drcnet.org

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.2

X-Listprocessor-version: 8.2.08 -- ListProc(tm) by CREN

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: owner-drctalk (owner-drctalk@drcnet.org@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-JAN-1999 18:45:00.00

SUBJECT: AMR

TO: David B. Des Roches (David B. Des Roches@EOP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I've been remiss in not posting this earlier.

At the NORML conference after the AMR/ACTUP panel I spoke with Bill

Zimmerman privately about other strategies for winning at the polls.

Bills take during that panel was that MMJ victories had to be won in the mushy middle, among voters that really don't give a FF about the issue, and can hence be manipulated easily by either side. Hence the watered down, catering to Law Enforcement style initiatives, to take away some ammunition from our opposition for swaying the mushy voters.

Another strategy is to register new voters, or to empower already registered

voters to go to the polls and make their voices count. Laura Kriho was touted as an advocate of this by speakers at the conference. I'm also a believer that this is needed in the long run, if our country is to have any chance of policy decisions being made by other than soundbites.

Bill Zimmerman's response to the "GoNV" (Get out New voters) strategy is that it wouldn't work for our causes. He gave to illustrations of campaigns using this strategy: Tom Hayden's run for Senate in California in the 70's, and Harold Washington's run for mayor of Chicago. Tom Hayden's

run failed, because the young, hip, turned on, progressive people just didn't see that they could matter, and the alternatives weren't that bad.

Washington's campaign succeeded because he was able to play on fears in the black community that the white candidates would ignore and marginalize them, and hence was able to get out a significant vote among new and/or infrequent voters.

Jesse Ventura appears to have done this last year. Those of us that believe that the key to reform is not in the mushy middle, but in getting more people involved should probably be looking carefully at how he did it.

We could be contacting GoTV coordinators from his campaign and asking them for strategies to do the same in our states and localities. Some of their techniques won't work everywhere; Minnesota has election day registrations, which I don't believe exists anywhere else. But some of their tactics should carry over. I, for one, am very interested in how the 18-30 year old vote was convinced they could matter.

--

Bill D'Amico | "Every wave is new until it breaks"

damico@cs.indiana.edu | - Neil Young_Reactor_===== ATTACHMENT 1
=====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)
id <01J6W2SE90XS005K23@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov; Sat,
23 Jan 1999 19:01:09 EST

Received: from storm.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)
with ESMTP id <01J6W2SC8OS000689P@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov;
Sat, 23 Jan 1999 19:01:06 -0500 (EST)

Received: from www.drikka.net ([209.235.14.254])
by EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.2-29 #34437) with ESMTP id <01J6W2RNA6WW000BI8@EOP.GOV>
for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov; Sat, 23 Jan 1999 19:00:32 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from server@localhost) by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9)
id SAA26077; Sat, 23 Jan 1999 18:49:57 -0500 (EST)
Received: by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9) id SAA24246 for server; Sat,
23 Jan 1999 18:45:34 -0500 (EST)
Received: from sheepskin.cs.indiana.edu
(sheepskin.cs.indiana.edu [129.79.254.197]) by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9)
with ESMTP id SAA24235 for <drctalk@drcnet.org>; Sat,
23 Jan 1999 18:45:33 -0500 (EST)
Received: (from damico@localhost) by sheepskin.cs.indiana.edu
(8.8.7/8.8.7/IUCS_2.21) id SAA04663 for drctalk@drcnet.org; Sat,
23 Jan 1999 18:45:34 -0500 (EST)
X-Mailer: ELM [version 2.4 PL25]
X-Listprocessor-version: 8.2.08 -- ListProc(tm) by CREN
===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: owner-drctalk (owner-drctalk@drcnet.org@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:24-JAN-1999 12:08:00.00

SUBJECT: GOTV and Gov. Ventura

TO: David B. Des Roches (David B. Des Roches@EOP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

On Sat, 23 Jan 1999, Bill D'Amico wrote:

> I've been remiss in not posting this earlier.

>

> At the NORML conference after the AMR/ACTUP panel I spoke with Bill

> Zimmerman privately about other strategies for winning at the polls.

> Bills take during that panel was that MMJ victories had to be won in

> the mushy middle, among voters that really don't give a FF about the

> issue, and can hence be manipulated easily by either side. Hence the

> watered down, catering to Law Enforcement style initiatives, to take

> away some ammunition from our opposition for swaying the mushy voters.

>

> Another strategy is to register new voters, or to empower already

registered

> voters to go to the polls and make their voices count. Laura Kriho was

> touted as an advocate of this by speakers at the conference. I'm also

> a believer that this is needed in the long run, if our country is to

> have any chance of policy decisions being made by other than soundbites.

>

> Bill Zimmerman's response to the "GoNV" (Get out New voters) strategy

> is that it wouldn't work for our causes.

Bill Zimmerman is full of **it. What he really means is that he wouldn't be able to make as much money off of it. See <http://www.levelers.org/normlconf.htm> for a transcription of some of his comments at the conference, and how Ralph Nader called him a "turncoat."

In 1988, activists in Arizona registered 300,000 new voters in a campaign to recall Gov. Evan Mecham from office (remember him? he rescinded Martin Luther King day and made comments like "maybe we have become a little bit too much of a democracy") The recall vote was never held, as Mecham was impeached and removed from office. But Joe Vigorito, who helped organize the recall campaign, says the effect of these 300,000 new voters may still be seen today in Arizona. Remember, Arizona voted for LSD twice in recent years.

>

> Jesse Ventura appears to have done this last year. Those of us that believe

> that the key to reform is not in the mushy middle, but in getting more

> people involved should probably be looking carefully at how he did it.

> We could be contacting GoTV coordinators from his campaign and asking

> them for strategies to do the same in our states and localities.

I saw Ventura's campaign managers give a talk after the election on CSPAN.

Surprisingly, they said they did not have an active GOTV strategy.

The speakers were Bill Hillsman, advertising consultant to the campaign, and Dean Bardley (sp?), the campaign chairman. One of their campaign slogans was "Retaliate in '98"

Despite no active campaign to register new voters, 300,000 new voters registered and voted in the election. 15% of those new voters registered at the polls on election day. 78% of that 15% voted for Jesse Ventura.

They didn't do any phone banks, direct mail, or GOTV campaigns. They didn't have any serious money until 3 weeks before the election.

They attribute the success of the campaign to:

- Jesse's notoriety
- the fact that the campaign was "fun"
- they "made it cool to vote for Jesse"
- radio ads
- the fact that MN laws allow people to register on election day
- Jesse would scold people for low voter turnout
- a 72 hour/38 city bus tour "Drive to Victory"
- the Internet

They knew they needed a 60% voter turnout to win, and that's what they got. The amazing thing to me is that this high turnout came about more or less spontaneously, without a direct GOTV campaign.

Shows people are more than ready for change. These people are going to come out to the polls in droves, eventually, whether we do anything about

it or not. All we need to do is focus this energy and give the people something to vote for.

Bill Zimmerman's strategy is to convince Republicans to vote for reform. Our strategy is the exact opposite. For the time it takes to convince one conservative over to your side, you can register 10 people to vote that already agree with you.

Bill Zimmerman's strategy is not about empowerment, but about making money.

- > Some
- > of their techniques won't work everywhere; Minnesota has election day
- > registrations, which I don't believe exists anywhere else. But some of
- > their tactics should carry over. I, for one, am very interested in how
- > the 18-30 year old vote was convinced they could matter.

I think that Jesse's interview in High Times in the summer before the election also had an impact on these young non-voters. Did you see Jesse at his inauguration? He was wearing a Jimi Hendrix T-shirt!

It also helped that it was a three-way race. Jesse won with only 38% of the vote. I don't know if he could have gotten 50% + 1 in a two way race.

Laura Kriho

>
> --
> Bill D'Amico | "Every wave is new until it breaks"

> damico@cs.indiana.edu | - Neil Young _Reactor_

> ===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)
id <01J6X32WIJE8006A3S@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov; Sun,
24 Jan 1999 12:20:25 EST

Received: from storm.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)
with ESMTP id <01J6X32UZCIO003IDA@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov;
Sun, 24 Jan 1999 12:20:23 -0500 (EST)

Received: from www.drikka.net ([209.235.14.254])
by EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.2-29 #34437) with ESMTP id <01J6X32P25MA000DOY@EOP.GOV>
for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov; Sun, 24 Jan 1999 12:20:14 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from server@localhost) by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9)
id MAA25320; Sun, 24 Jan 1999 12:16:34 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from drcnet@localhost) by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9)
id MAA22115 for server; Sun, 24 Jan 1999 12:08:19 -0500 (EST)

Received: from saturn.eagle-access.net (IDENT:ammo@[206.168.38.1])
by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9) with ESMTP id MAA22108 for
<drctalk@drcnet.org>; Sun, 24 Jan 1999 12:08:18 -0500 (EST)

Received: from localhost (ammo@localhost) by saturn.eagle-access.net
(8.8.7/8.8.4) with SMTP id KAA16272 for <drctalk@drcnet.org>; Sun,
24 Jan 1999 10:08:29 -0700

X-Sender: ammo@saturn.eagle-access.net

X-Listprocessor-version: 8.2.08 -- ListProc(tm) by CREN

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: owner-nep (owner-nep@drcnet.org@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-FEB-1999 18:25:00.00

SUBJECT: Rod Sorge and NY Times Obit

TO: David B. Des Roches (David B. Des Roches@EOP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I know it was important to some who loved and/or respected Rod that the

NY Times recognize his loss so I post this.

New York Times

February 9, 1999

Rod Sorge, 30, Promoted Services for Drug Users

By ERIC PACE

NEW YORK -- Rod Sorge, a former executive of the Harm Reduction Coalition, a private organization that promotes services for drug users and other people on the fringes of society, was found dead in his upper Manhattan apartment on Jan. 28. He was 30.

He died of AIDS-related causes, the coalition said in announcing his death.

Sorge was the coalition's development director, in charge of fund raising until October 1997, when he stopped working because of his illness. He

joined the staff in 1995 after having worked for other organizations with goals similar to those of the Harm Reduction Coalition.

Edith Springer, senior trainer at the Harm Reduction Coalition's training institute in Manhattan, said Sorge was a writer who "wrote grant proposals that brought tears to your eyes." The coalition gets most of its support from foundations, she said.

Sorge was born in Texas and grew up in Chicago. He attended Vassar College.

A decade ago he moved to New York and became a founder of an underground needle exchange program operated in the Bronx and Harlem by Act Up, the AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power. The program's goal was to reduce the spread of the human immunodeficiency virus, which causes AIDS, among addicts who injected drugs intravenously.

Before joining the Harm Reduction Coalition, Sorge worked for Health-PAC, a Manhattan-based health policy group, and for the American Civil Liberties Union. He and a colleague there, Ruth Harlow, jointly edited a book, "ACLU Briefing Book on Needle Exchange, Harm Reduction and HIV Prevention in the Second Decade" (1994).

He then became the first administrative director of the New York Peer AIDS Education Coalition.

In 1996, he received the Drug Policy Foundation's Robert C. Randall Award

for Achievement in the Field of Citizen Action.

You don't need to buy Internet access to use free Internet e-mail.

Get completely free e-mail from Juno at <http://www.juno.com/getjuno.html>

or call Juno at (800) 654-JUNO [654-5866]===== ATTACHMENT 1

=====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)
id <01J7KD2DIA5C000B1U@PMDf.EOP.GOV> for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov; Wed,
10 Feb 1999 04:14:32 EST

Received: from storm.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)
with ESMTP id <01J7KD29X49S0008IP@PMDf.EOP.GOV> for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov;
Wed, 10 Feb 1999 04:14:30 -0500 (EST)

Received: from www.drikka.net ([209.235.14.254])
by EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.2-29 #34437) with ESMTP id <01J7KD205S420004Z6@EOP.GOV>
for desroches_d@a1.eop.gov; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 04:14:16 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from server@localhost) by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9)
id SAA05783; Tue, 09 Feb 1999 18:55:26 -0500 (EST)

Received: by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9) id SAA26100 for server; Tue,
09 Feb 1999 18:33:39 -0500 (EST)

Received: from x15.boston.juno.com (x15.boston.juno.com [205.231.100.28])
by www.drikka.net (8.9.1/8.6.9) with ESMTP id SAA26097 for <nep@drcnet.org>;
Tue, 09 Feb 1999 18:33:38 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from sstancliff@juno.com) by x15.boston.juno.com (queuemail)
id D22668SX; Tue, 09 Feb 1999 18:30:34 -0500 (EST)

X-Mailer: Juno 2.0.11

X-Juno-Line-Breaks: 1-10,14-15,17-18,22-23,27-28,30-31,36-37,42-43,45-46,48-55

X-Juno-Att: 0

X-Listprocessor-version: 8.2.08 -- ListProc(tm) by CREN

=====END ATTACHMENT 1=====